United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2013 No. 94

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A DAY MAKES

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a short time after the Supreme Court ruled that the Defense of Marriage Act violated the Constitution of the United States, an immigration judge in New York stopped the deportation of a man who was legally married to an American citizen.

According to press reports, the bonds of marriage that tied Sean, an American citizen, to Steven, a native of Colombia, were invisible in the eyes of the law before 11 a.m. Eastern Standard Time yesterday; but after the Supreme Court announcement, the bonds of marriage that drew these two individuals together in love and in the sight of God all of a sudden became visible to the United States Government. They materialized before our eyes, allowing a spouse of a U.S. citizen to live peacefully in the United States with his spouse as our immigration laws intended. What a difference a day makes.

Well, actually, this step towards justice took a great deal longer than a day. I'm proud that the Supreme Court finally caught up to Sean and Steven. I'm glad that the law of the land finally caught up to the American people, who generally feel that marriage equality, like other forms of equality, is a good thing. I'm glad the Supreme Court caught up to the 21st century, and I'm glad the Supreme Court caught up to me. In fact, what does a 21st century Congressman do on such occasions? I tweeted. And what did I tweet? ''I told you so.''

It was right here on this spot, on July 11, 1996, that the House of Representatives passed DOMA. I came to this well and walked up to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Barney Frank, who controlled the time on the Democratic side, and I asked him if I could speak on the bill. I had a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I have a great deal of respect for him today, now that he's happily retired and happily married. But on that particular day, he said to me, Luis, I have no time for people who are against the bill. Shoo. Go away.

Who knows, maybe it was a mild case of profiling. He saw a Latino Catholic from the Midwest and said he can't be a friend. I assured the gentleman that as a Chicago alderman, as a Congressman—you know something, just as a man—I was against discrimination, bigotry, and unfairness wherever and whenever I saw it and that I had fought in Chicago to pass a groundbreaking ordinance on LGBT equality in the 1980s. The gentleman from Massachusetts smiled, welcomed me to the team, and yielded me 3½ minutes.

I went back to check the RECORD to see what I had said on that night, and you know what? The 2013 me agrees wholeheartedly with the 1996 me. I pointed out that the supporters of DOMA were wrapping themselves up in family values when, in fact, they were preventing families from being recognized as families.

> I don't know many Americans—regardless of their political party, race, religion, or sexual orientation—who don't believe that family values are vitally important. But I also don't know many Americans who want a couple of hundred politicians in Washington to impose their values on everyone else's families.
>
> Let me tell you about some very basic values I think we're talking about when we stand up against this bill: the values of people who love each other; people who share each other's lives; people who care about their future and the future of those around them; people who want to make a commitment that is legal and official and is important to them. To me, that sounds like family values.

I am proud to have spoken up; I am proud to have voted against that bill; and I am proud to have stood shoulder to shoulder with Barney Frank and other heroes who said ''no'' and today say ''I told you so.''

Now we need to take another vital step right away. The immigration judge that stopped Steven's deportation because of his legal marriage to an American citizen was absolutely right, but we need to make sure our immigration law reflects the post-DOMA reality across the board. If the Obama administration needs to write regulations to make sure our immigration laws match the Constitution of our Nation, then they better get to work. We can't afford delay.

Printed on recycled paper.

Same-sex couples form families. Our immigration laws are supposed to honor families. So, Mr. President, please make it clear, from your office on down that family unity means all families. We've waited long enough.

The Highest Court in the land helped us take another step against discrimination. Now we must make sure that the administration of the law catches up with the letter and the spirit of the law. All families, like Steven and Sean, must be recognized as families for the purposes of our immigration law.

What a difference a day makes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

HONORING MAX FLEISCHMANN, JR., A GREAT AMERICAN FROM THE GREATEST GENERATION

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor my father, Max Fleischmann, Jr.

My dad passed away last Saturday. We buried him Monday in the National Cemetery in Chattanooga, Tennessee, and I wanted to talk to America today about a very special man.

My dad was born in Astoria, New York, on December 29, 1925. He grew up during the Great Depression. His stories were legend. He talked to me about dime movies and penny candy, about radio, about what it was like to grow up in the Great Depression when his father had to take in other families to live with them. This generation was coined, later, as the Greatest Generation, and now I know why.

He would have folks come and visit the house. A fellow by the name of Moe Howard and his wife, Helen, would come by and sing and play the piano. Moe Howard was playing with a little-known group then called The Three Stooges. He would have a lady by the name of Gladys Weiss come and visit their home. Her late brother was a magician, an escape artist who had been deceased, called Harry Houdini. These stories were tremendous. He talked to me about his first Coca-Cola at the 1939 World's Fair and what it was like to drink that.

He was an incredible man. He had one good eye. He stood 5 feet, 2½ inches. He took 7 years to graduate from high school because he quit high school to join World War II.

When he showed up to serve in the United States Army, they said, Young man, you can go home. You're what we call 4–F. You've got one good eye. You've got poor skin. You're short. You can go home. He said, No, I want to serve; I want to serve.

And serve he did. They let him serve. And he went to the China-Burma-India theater. He didn't even know a war was going on in that part of the world because his brother was serving in the South Pacific and he had cousins serving in Europe. But he was 18 years old, and he went on a ship and on a plane and on a train and ended up in Burma. Over 2½ years later, he returned home and he went and finished high school.

My dad was a hardworking man, a company man. He always showed up and gave 100 percent wherever he worked. But he had a lot of hard work and he had a lot of hard luck. Sometimes these companies would go out of business that he worked at.

He did not have a formal education. An education was something that stood out to him.

□ 1010

And the reason I say that is in honoring him today I wanted to talk about the importance of education. I was the first person to get to go to college in my family. He married my mother in 1961. I was born in 1962. But tragically, when I was 9 years old, an only child, my mother got cancer and passed away a few years later. She lost that tragic battle. There were times he had no health insurance, there were times he didn't have a job. He would go all over the country—New York, Philadelphia, Chicago.

But one thing he insisted on. He said: ''My son is going to get an education.'' That was so important. And I did. He put 20 bucks away a week so that I could have an education. I got to go to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

But we didn't know that was not going to be the end of the story. Because when I finished up at Illinois he said: ''What are you going to do?'' He said: ''You're bright, you have an education, but what are you going to do?'' So he said: ''Go to law school.'' He helped me through law school and paid for law school too. He got to see me get a college education and get a law degree.

He had a lot of hard luck, but he always worked hard and he made a great decision. He retired to Chattanooga, Tennessee. When he retired to Chattanooga, my wife and I started a law firm. In that law firm, we succeeded as a small business. He saw me scrimp and save and work hard 6 and 7 days a week. He always said: ''Work hard, make sure your kids get a good education.'' He did that.

He was a big part in the life of my three sons, Chuckie, Jamie, and Jeffrey. They're 24, 22, and 16 now. They honored him this week with me at the National Cemetery. What a man. He loved this country, he served this country, he never forgot the Greatest Generation who gave so much for this country, and he was a good guy. He was honest to the core.

He got to live to see me elected to this great House. Sometimes we get ratings 6 percent, 10 percent, 11 percent. He loved to watch this House. He really liked it when I got to sit in the Chair. He would call all the relatives: ''My son is presiding over the House today.'' But ladies and gentlemen, we have a great country, a wonderful country. He knew that. Only in America could you do something like this—come from last to first.

So I just wanted to say today: Thank you to my dad. Staff Sergeant Max Fleischmann, Jr., you did well. God bless you.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. HOYER. I know that I—before I get to my remarks—join all the House in saying thank you to your father and to the Greatest Generation, who not only fought the terrorists of their time but came home and built the greatest economy the world has ever seen and gave us all opportunities of our generation. I'm older than you are, but of our generation. So I thank you for your comments. I know that your father is extraordinarily proud of you and extraordinarily proud of the remarks you just made showing how proud you are of him.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the majority party is set to recess this House for a week, leaving in place their economy-stifling and irrational policy of sequester.

We talked about the Greatest Generation. I fear that this generation is going to be the greediest generation, who are not going to leave our children the great economy that was left to us but will leave an economy that is limping because of the policies that we pursued and the debt that we have incurred.

When sequester took effect 17 weeks ago, it was the culmination of an effort by the extreme wing of the majority party to impose severe and senseless cuts across the Federal Government without regard for the real consequences to our economy, our national security, and our most vulnerable citizens.

Let me review just some of its many consequences.

Head Start and title I:

We will lose between 70,000 and 130,000 seats in Head Start for some of the most vulnerable children in America; 10,000 teachers' jobs will be at risk in title I to teach some of our most vulnerable children.

Social Security Administration:

Furloughs will cause delays in processing retirement and disability claims.

Nutrition for vulnerable populations:

Four million fewer Meals on Wheels for our seniors who rely on them for a daily nutritional meal.

Housing:

125,000 housing vouchers, perhaps more, will be eliminated for people who need housing.

Unemployment insurance:

Emergency unemployment insurance past 26 weeks will be cut 11 percent for people who cannot find a job, in part

because there has been no jobs legislation put on this floor since we've been here this year.

FDA:

2,100 fewer food safety inspections, an 18 percent reduction in making sure that the food we eat is safe and healthy.

On top of these, it also erodes our military readiness, with one-third of our combat aircraft on the ground, not being flown, training not being done.

As the Washington Post columnist David Ignatius pointed out last Friday, sequestration is forcing the military to cut back on training programs vital to our defense readiness, and yet we fiddle while Rome is burning.

David Ignatius writes:

> The Army is sharply cutting training above the basic squad and platoon level. All but one of the combat training center rotations scheduled for brigades this fiscal year have been canceled. Depot maintenance has been halted for the rest of the fiscal year. The Army will cut 37,000 flying hours from its aviation training.

The list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

In February, Army Chief of Staff General Ray Odierno told Congress:

> Should a contingency arise, there may not be enough time to avoid sending forces into harm's way unprepared.

On July 12, Mr. Speaker, civilian defense personnel at the Pax River Naval Air Station, which I represent, are scheduled to begin furloughs as a result of the sequester. That's a personal concern to me, it's a concern to their families, but more broadly than that it's a concern to the national security of every American citizen. Those folks are among the hundreds of thousands of civilian defense workers in Maryland and across the country who are set to be furloughed next month unless—unless—Congress acts. Congress can end these arbitrary and irrational cuts by replacing the sequester in its entirety as part of a big and balanced solution to deficits.

We had a deal. It was called the Budget Control Act. OMB now estimates it cut $1.4 trillion. It's not as if we've ignored the deficit—$1.4 trillion. But we didn't get all the way to where the Speaker said we needed to be and, therefore, we adopted the sequester, which irrationally cuts across the board the highest priority and the lowest priority.

□ 1020

Our ranking member on the Budget Committee, Democrat CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, has tried seven times to bring to this floor legislation to exactly modify this policy so that we have a rational, national security protecting, vulnerable citizens-protecting alternative while saving and getting to the same budget deficit reducing number—the same. However, our Republican colleagues have refused the opportunity to consider that on this floor.

We hear a lot about the Speaker saying, Let the House work its will. Seven times we have asked this House leadership to give us the opportunity to work our will. The best way to achieve the balanced alternative to the sequester and put America's fiscal house in order would be through a bipartisan agreement on a budget. Leader PELOSI is going to name our conferees in just a few minutes. This Saturday will be the 100th day since the House passed its budget and after we demanded that the Senate pass a budget, Mr. Speaker. Still, 100 days later, no action on this floor by the majority party to go to conference—to sit down and try to come to an agreement. That's what democracy is about, coming to an agreement. This House should not be going into recess without first appointing conferees.

Ten percent of Americans think we're worth anything. I need to talk to them because they're not sure what's going on here, apparently.

I believe there is a bipartisan majority of Members—I hope that's the case—who will support a balanced approach that restores fiscal discipline and ends this irrational, commonsense-defying sequester. Let the House work its will, Mr. Speaker. It's time to appoint budget conferees. It's time for a balanced alternative to the sequester. As the sequester continues, there is no time to waste; and we ought to stay here and get the job done. Regular order, regular order, regular order—I hear it all the time. The problem is we are not following regular order—to the detriment of our country and our citizens.

ATTACK ON SHIITE MUSLIMS IN EGYPT

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. First of all, I want to say nice job to CHUCK FLEISCHMANN for his comments on his father.

Then, before my colleague from Maryland leaves, I want to make sure that he understands that we understand the history of this whole budget process.

The Nation is $16 trillion in debt. It was the President's proposal to sequester; and it was his vote, along with my vote, that passed the Budget Control Act that enacted sequester. So, many of us are not just going to come to the floor and get lectured to on this process of how do you eventually get control of this national debt.

Sequester is a tough process. It's a tough pill to take. It's the first time we've ever cut real dollars. As I tell my colleagues, in the big picture of a $16 trillion debt, it's pocket lint. It's such a small percentage of our future obligations, and that's where the debate on entitlement programs has to go. It's Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and the interest payment on our debt that, if we don't get control actuarially in the out-years, we will continue to have to cut the discretionary budget, which is damaging to all of those things my colleague mentioned.

Yet for him to come down and profess outrage over a proposal that the President presented to this body and then to profess outrage when he voted for the bill, I think it's just the height of hypocrisy.

That's not what I came down to the floor to talk about, but this gives us an opportunity to respond. I did want to talk about the recent occurrences in Egypt which identify persecution.

The Middle East is a continually changing region. We have had citizens protesting their nondemocratic governments numerous times in calling for change and freedom across the region. In 2012, the world would watch incredible change in Egypt following the election of Mohamed Morsi, when he became the President. This country continues to struggle in instituting a democratic government. However, the work of the Morsi government is not met without opposition, and attacks on minority groups are still an ongoing issue.

In the recent past, Coptic Christians have been persecuted; and on Sunday, June 23, Shiite Muslims were attacked by a mob of Sunni Muslims in the village of Zawyat Abu Musalam. Four Shiites died in this attack, and many others were injured. Shiite Muslims make up roughly 2 percent of the Egyptian population of 80 million people.

While President Morsi has condemned these attacks, further steps need to be taken to address the ongoing persecutions of Egypt's religious minorities. Persecution will continue if sentiments towards minorities are not changed. For Egypt to have a successful, lasting democratic government, people of all religions will need to be included.

The United States was created on the principle that all people should have the right to practice their religions freely and openly and without fear of persecution. As a Christian and as a Member of the House of Representatives, which is composed of a vast array of Members with different beliefs, it is my hope that this country will continue to be an example that Egypt can look to.

I urge the Egyptian Government and the people to continue to condemn these religious-based attacks and to take positive steps towards religious freedom. I will continue to keep the country of Egypt and their religious minorities in my prayers, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to address the House on the need to end hunger now. This is the 14th time that I've done so this year.

Next week, the Members of this House will return home to their districts for the 4th of July district work

period. There will be parades and fireworks and picnics for all of us, but for too many of our neighbors there will be no such festivities. They will be too busy working two or three jobs just to make ends meet.

They will be worrying about their children, who, during these summer months, are too often forced to go without enough nutritious food to eat because school is out of session, because in our country, Mr. Speaker, in the richest, most powerful Nation in the history of the world, the reality is that 50 million of our fellow Americans struggle with hunger.

I am also sure that, during the 4th of July activities, many Members will be getting quite an earful from the farmers in their districts. Those farmers are now facing confusion and uncertainty as they prepare for yet another season without a long-term reauthorization of the farm bill. They will wonder why this House of Representatives can't seem to get its act together.

I hope that my colleagues will tell them the truth, which is that the reason the farm bill failed in the House last week is that it would have thrown 2 million people off the SNAP program. It would have caused over 200,000 children to lose access to the free school breakfast and lunch program. It would have made hunger worse in America. It would have forced struggling Americans to jump through all sorts of hoops, like drug testing, while not requiring the same of wealthy farmers who receive Federal subsidies. It would have not only allowed but actually encouraged States to find ways to kick people off the SNAP program. In short, it would have continued the Republican majority's assault on hard-working, struggling poor people; and for many of us on our side of the aisle, that price was simply too high.

As columnist E.J. Dionne wrote after the defeat of the bill:

> This is, above all, a story about morality. There is something profoundly wrong when a legislative majority is so eager to risk leaving so many Americans hungry. That's what the bill would have done and why defeating it was a moral imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I want a farm bill. Our farmers deserve a farm bill. I am honored to represent hundreds of small farmers, and I am honored to serve on the Agriculture Committee. I know that Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON worked incredibly hard to thread a very small needle. If the Republican leadership really wants a farm bill, it should do away with these draconian SNAP cuts and bring a bill to the floor that acknowledges the struggles faced by millions of our neighbors.

□ 1030

My fear, however, is they will do just the opposite, that they will go even further, make even deeper cuts to food and nutrition programs, make even more Americans hungry in a vain attempt to convince some of their more right-wing members to support this bill. Indeed, we see that dynamic at work with the agriculture appropriations bill before us this week, a bill that makes drastic cuts to the Women, Infants and Children program.

I would like to once again urge the White House to take an active leadership role on this. Last week, the administration issued a veto threat against the farm bill because of the devastating SNAP cuts that it contained, and I welcomed that threat. It was a positive sign. It was a positive sign that the White House understands that throwing 2 million people off of SNAP would be devastating not just to those individuals, but to our economy, as well.

But the administration, quite frankly, needs to do more. They need to convene a White House conference on food and nutrition so that we can get everyone in a room, including our farmers, to address the issue of hunger in America. Let's solve this problem. This is a solvable problem, but it needs attention and we need to have a plan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reflect over the next week about where we should go from here. Do we want to live up to the bipartisan tradition of giants like Bob Dole and George McGovern, who came together and helped create this anti-hunger safety net that we have in this country? Their leadership almost ended hunger in this country in the 1970s. Unfortunately, we have strayed so far away from what they've done that we now find ourselves with 50 million hungry people.

Do we want to unite to provide a circle of protection around our most vulnerable neighbors? I hope so, Mr. Speaker. I hope that this House of Representatives understands that one of our obligations is to make sure that the needy and the poor and the most vulnerable are not forgotten, that we don't sit back and allow them to fall through the cracks.

We can do this. We can end hunger now. All we need is the political will.

FREEDOM IN THE BALANCE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, three major developments have occurred within the last 6 weeks that are each disturbing by themselves, but extremely alarming when viewed together.

The first was the revelation that for more than 2 years, one of the most powerful and feared agencies of the Federal Government was used to harass and intimidate individual Americans into silence because of their political beliefs. Evidence has already established that hundreds of conservative groups were subjected to invasive interrogations when they sought to participate in the political process. This pattern of conduct was not limited to applications under section 501(c) but included audits of established conservative groups and individuals, as well. This conduct reached the highest levels of the IRS. A similar pattern of abuse has been documented in several other agencies, including the Department of Labor and the Environmental Protection Agency. These facts are undisputed, and their implications are utterly toxic to a free society.

The second development was news that the Justice Department had surreptitiously seized the telephone records of some 20 reporters covering Congress for the Associated Press in an obvious attempt to discourage whistleblowers from talking to the press. Fox News reporter James Rosen and his family were stalked by authorities as he tried to get to the bottom of the Benghazi scandal. To obtain the search warrant allowing this, the Attorney General of the United States filed an absolutely spurious claim with the Federal court charging that Rosen had conspired to violate the Espionage Act. That's the same act under which Julius and Ethel Rosenberg was executed in 1953. The message to reporters asking inconvenient questions of this administration could not possibly have been more powerful or terrifying, and this week the head of AP reported that their news sources have indeed dried up in response to these naked acts of intimidation.

The third development is news that the Federal Government has swept up the phone and Internet records of millions of Americans in the name of state security just months after the official in charge categorically denied the existence of this program in sworn testimony to Congress.

The practice of the government searching your personal records without having first established reason to believe that you have committed a crime is expressly forbidden by the Fourth Amendment, adopted in direct response to British officials indiscriminately searching homes and records for evidence of contraband, yet this government has done precisely that on a scale unimaginable in colonial times, in this case searching for evidence of terrorism.

If I know the Web sites that you've visited and what phone numbers you've called, I know a great deal about your political and religious beliefs, your personal relationships, your sexual interests, your mental and physical health and your family finances. And with that information in the hands of officials who already have demonstrated a clear intention and ability to use their power to intimidate political adversaries into silence or to discourage reporters from asking embarrassing questions, our society could very quickly cross a very bright line between freedom and authoritarianism.

As if to underscore the point, the administration spokesman recently told a national television audience that

''the law is irrelevant.'' He called these matters ''a distraction.'' What does that say about a society that once prided itself on being a Nation of laws and not of men?

All around this Capitol, we are surrounded by the trappings of the Roman Republic. They serve as an inspiration, but they should also serve as a warning. The Roman Republic didn't end because Caesar crossed the Rubicon with his legion. It was because that illegal act was not effectively resisted and led to another usurpation and then another and then another over a period of years. It was the accumulation of many such infringements that brought the inexorable decline of freedom and set the stage for Rome's age of tyrants. That's what Jefferson meant when he said the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

My great fear, as we adjourn tomorrow to celebrate the 237th anniversary of American freedom, is that sometime between the barbecues and the fireworks we shrug off these profound developments and go about as if nothing has happened. The summer of 2013 has brought us to a crossroads, and I rise today to urge the House to give these events its full and undivided attention.

''REDSKIN'' OFFENSIVE TO NATIVE AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday on the cover page of The Washington Post newspaper, there was an article written by journalists Jon Cohen and Rick Maese that, according to a recent poll taken among the sports fans of the Washington, D.C. area:

> A large majority of area sports fans say the Washington Redskins should not change the team name, even though most supporters of the nickname feel the word ''redskin'' is an inappropriate term for Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the term ''redskin'' inappropriate, but it is just plain offensive and derogatory towards Native Americans. And I want to share with my colleagues in Congress, and especially the American people, how the word ''redskin'' came about and its history.

In 1749, it was a standard procedure among settlers who lived in what is now known as Maine and Nova Scotia to kill and scalp as many of the Indians as members of the Micmac Tribe. The same policy was also implemented in 1755 by settlers who lived in what is now known as the State of Massachusetts—that their object was to kill and scalp members of the Penobscot Indian Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the policy was you get paid for killing and/or scalping Native American Indians. And if you kill an Indian boy, you get paid 50 pounds. If you get a scalp of an Indian, you also get paid 40 pounds. For any female, Mr. Speaker, under 12 years old that you killed or scalped, you also get paid 25 pounds. Mr. Speaker, I submit that these scalps were also called ''redskins.'' Mr. Speaker, this is why this word is so offensive to Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, there's a saying in Indian country: ''Walk in a man's moccasins for 2 weeks before you pass judgment on that person.''

□ 1040

Mr. Speaker, my point is what if that scalp belonged to your mother or to your wife or daughter or your brother or sister or to your son or father? Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that our Washington fans and the American public will come to realize why the usage of the word ''redskin'' has brought nothing but a stark reminder of the horrors of how Native Americans have been treated for centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe in the fairness and decency of the American people. I believe that many of our fellow Americans did not know of the history of the word ''redskin,'' and I sincerely hope many others will come to a better understanding as to why Native Americans feel obviously offended by the use of the word.

I hope Mr. Roger Goodell, commissioner of the National Football League, and all the NFL club owners will seriously raise this matter with Mr. Dan Snyder to try to change the name of his Washington football franchise. The NFL has a moral responsibility to take corrective action on this matter. It is the right thing to do.

Under the mandate of the U.S. Constitution, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress has both a legal and moral responsibility to look after the needs of our Native American nations. It is for this reason that the bill, H.R. 1278, was introduced to not allow or to cancel the registration of the word Redskins as a trademark name simply because it is a derogatory term and a racial slur against Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, don't get me wrong. I'm a great supporter and fan of the sport of football. In fact, I played 4 years of football in high school. Many of my relatives played both at the college level and in the NFL: the late Junior Seau of the San Diego Chargers; Troy Polamalu of the Pittsburgh Steelers; Jesse Sapolu of the 49ers, just to name a few. There are many others. My point, Mr. Speaker, is we need to correct this inequity. We need to show a little more respect for members of the Native American community.

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 2013]

WASHINGTON REDSKINS NAME: WASHINGTON POST POLL FINDS MOST D.C. AREA FANS SUPPORT IT

(By Jon Cohen and Rick Maese)

A large majority of area sports fans say the Washington Redskins should not change the team name, even though most supporters of the nickname feel the word ''redskin'' is an inappropriate term for Native Americans, according to a new Washington Post poll.

The debate over the team's name has intensified in recent months as members of Congress, activists and media commentators criticized it as offensive to Native Americans and lobbied for change. But most Washingtonians—61 percent—say they like the team's name, and two-thirds say the team should not change it, according to the poll.

Among Redskins fans, about eight in 10 say the team should keep its name. Also, there's some evidence that changing it might undermine support from some of the team's most ardent backers.

''It's been associated with the team for so long, I just don't see any reason to change it now,'' said retiree Joseph Braceland, 70. ''It was not meant to be derogatory.''

A quarter of all area adults and slightly more than half of self-described Redskins fans say they ''love'' the team name, yet both groups overwhelmingly say that in general a new name wouldn't make much difference to them.

Among those who want to keep the Redskins' name, most—56 percent—say they feel the word ''redskin'' is inappropriate. Only half as many—28 percent—consider the term as an acceptable one to use.

''I think any word that you deal with, it depends on the context,'' said Stephan Bachenheimer, a District resident who works for the World Bank and supports the Redskins' name. ''A lot of people have a hard time separating these issues.''

The name has been subject to much criticism and public debate this offseason, with both local and national leaders urging the team to consider a name change, a request the team has fervently resisted.

In the new poll, 28 percent of all Washingtonians say the team should change its name, far above the 11 percent nationally who said so in a recent Associated Press poll.

''I don't believe in being super politically correct—I have a sense of humor—but I think this name came about at a time when there was very different awareness about the plight of the American Indians,'' said Mary Falvey, 60, who works in communications for the Food and Drug Administration. ''I just don't think it's appropriate. There's increased sensitivity about race in this country today—for the good.''

While feelings about the team's nickname were similar across most demographics, the percentage advocating a shift in the D.C. area peaks at 39 percent among African Americans with college degrees. (There weren't enough Native Americans among the poll's 1,106 respondents for meaningful comparison; Native Americans make up less than 1 percent of the population in the region, according to Census data.)

According to poll results, education plays a role more broadly: 34 percent of all area college graduates say change the name, compared with 21 percent of those with less formal education.

''Leave the name alone,'' said Eileen Schilling, 52, who works in construction sales. ''It's ridiculous. It's getting completely out of hand. Pretty soon we won't be able to dye our hair because it might offend someone. I'm Irish. Should the Notre Dame Fighting Irish change their name because I don't like it? Hell no. What about the Kansas City Chiefs? The Cleveland Indians? Should the Eagles change their names because it's a national symbol? It's ridiculous.''

PRESIDENT PANDERING TO ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President this week declared he's going

to unilaterally stop climate change. That's right, he's going to part the oceans and change the temperature to his liking. How's he going to do this? Well, he's declaring war on fossil fuels—again.

This week it's coal. Mr. Speaker, coal counts for 37 percent of our Nation's electricity. How does the President plan to make up for that 37 percent? Well, the ruler doesn't really say. I guess that 37 percent will just have to do without heat come winter. In his radical climate change manifesto, to a room packed full of his environmental lobby, the President issued a edict to the EPA to regulate coal out of existence.

Both Congress and the American people have overwhelmingly rejected this policy in the past. Never mind the will of the people, never mind Congress has said ''no'' to these ideas. The President is pandering to the environmental groups, and he wants it his way. So he's just going to issue another one of those—what I believe is unconstitutional—executive orders.

Mr. Speaker, there are consequences for such rash actions by the President. The White House war on coal will raise the cost of energy for American families, cripple the economy, and destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs of people who work in the energy industry. The war on coal is really a war on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the President is not aware that the coal plant over here on South Capitol Street heats part of the Capitol. Is this his way to silence Congress? Who knows. But this is just another day from the administration whose energy policy is ''nothing from below.'' Nothing from below the ground, nothing from below the sea. No oil, no coal, no gas, and no jobs. That's the result of this policy. That's why I've introduced the Ensuring Affordable Energy Act. My bill will put an end to this back-door attempt by this administration to go around Congress and circumvent the will of the people. This bill would prohibit any EPA funds from being used to implement the regulation of greenhouse gases. This has passed in the House, but it has yet to become law.

Now let's talk about natural gas. Down the street from the White House is another marble bureaucratic palace they call the Department of Energy. Sitting on their oak desks are dusty folders holding applications to export liquefied natural gas. In 2010, the oil and gas industry contributed almost $500 billion to our economy. And over the last 7 years, the amount of recoverable natural gas in our country has skyrocketed. For the first time in our Nation's history, we have more natural gas than we can use here in the United States, even if we tried. America can sell that gas on the global market for billions of dollars, creating thousands of jobs in the process; but we're not doing it, for one simple bureaucratic red-tape reason—the Department of Energy.

In typical Washington-style fashion, we've seen delay, delay, delay by the Department of Energy to approve these permits. Over the last 70 years, this bureaucratic hurdle was hardly noticed as the U.S. was an importer of natural gas, but not so anymore. Technology has changed all of this. There are some 18 export applications sitting over there on those desks in those dusty folders for the DOE to approve. The Department's response: no response. In the last 3 years, the DOE has granted only two applications. Meanwhile, countries that want to buy American natural gas are going to our worldwide competitors, like China and Russia. Isn't that lovely.

Understand this, Mr. Speaker, there is already an agency, FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, that is in the pipeline to approve applications such as this. So we have duplication with the DOE and FERC. So what we have to do is remove the DOE from the process, remove this duplication.

Mr. Speaker, we have enough oil, natural gas, and coal in America to make the Middle East turmoil, Middle East politics, and Middle East energy irrelevant if we would just use our own God-given natural resources. Washington bureaucrats sit at their large oak desks sipping on those lattes every day, and they are regulating American energy out of business. It's time to take the padlock off the marble palaces of the EPA and the DOE and remove the bureaucrats from the energy business. Let's use the resources the good Lord has given us to take care of America.

And that's just the way it is.

STRUGGLE FOR EQUALITY

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for equality, for justice, for freedom, for democracy is an awesome force. No force, no historical circumstance has done more to shape our Nation, but that struggle has always been confronted by an endless series of attempts to block, minimize, sidetrack, undo, and weaken our democracy. Through all these struggles, those most oppressed have repeatedly taken the lead to reinforce our democracy and solidify our Nation.

We fought a bloody, wrenching Civil War to end a Nation that was suffocating ''half slave and half free.'' Three million men fought in that war, and 620,000 died. Although African Americans made up 1 percent of the population of the North, they made up 10 percent of the Union Army.

In the aftermath, Congress sought to enshrine in the Constitution, forever, basic democratic rights: in the 14th Amendment, the power to enforce the Bill of Rights, due process, and equal rights; and in the 15th Amendment, voting rights regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. But a violent, terrorist backlash led by the Ku Klux Klan prevented the implementation of our Constitution for a hundred years until a new civil rights struggle, based on nonviolence, but no less powerful, forced our Nation, the courts, and this Congress to recognize those promised constitutional rights.

Among the forms of recognition were the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965. They transformed the political landscape of America.

□ 1050

But the truth is that, beginning as far back as the Nixon administration, efforts sought to chip away at those rights. Yesterday's Supreme Court decision undermining the enforcement of voting rights is the latest attempt to roll back history.

Shall we go forward or shall we go backwards?

The rapidly changing demographics of our Nation is calling new forces into the struggle for civil and voting rights every day, and our response to yesterday's Supreme Court decision presents a challenge for every Member of this Congress. And we have to ask ourselves: Which side are you on?

For me, the path is clear. We need a Federal right to vote enshrined in our Constitution, one clearly, unambiguously, boldly, proudly asserting that we will not tolerate any infringement on our rights as citizens to express the will of the people.

Those who seek to dilute voting rights, to place barriers on every citizen's right to participate in this government, will find themselves on the wrong side of history and, in the end, will be no more able to stop the movement for equality, for justice, for freedom, for democracy than they're able to stop the sun from rising in the morning or setting in the evening or to stop people who've decided that they love each other from expressing it.

OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I want to just express my appreciation to our colleague, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and my respect for him and the eloquent tribute that he paid his father. Indeed, his father was a member of the Greatest Generation, and we thank him, his father, for his service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about my number one priority in serving the Second District of Virginia and this incredible country that we have the privilege to live in, and that's jobs. That's the number one focus for our office.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 2231, Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, that will come before this House either today or tomorrow. That bill includes language that I authored and introduced, and it creates a clear path,

an opportunity that can really change the lives of hardworking Americans.

And I'm awfully proud of what the bill will do—ideally, when it's passed through the Senate and made into law by the President—in job creation.

But before I share with this House what the bill actually does and what the language does, I want to make clear what it's not. It's not a bill that spends more money. In fact, it's just the opposite. It's a bill that actually creates Federal revenue.

Here's how it works:

Right now, there is a moratorium, a full stop, on offshore exploration of energy off the coast of Virginia. And what our bill does and what the language does is it breaks through that, and it opens up that tremendous job-creating potential of Virginia's offshore energy.

The first benefit of this bill, of course, is jobs. Eighteen thousand jobs are estimated to be created by this bill, just in Virginia alone. And, Mr. Speaker, every one of those jobs is a life-changing job.

I'm an entrepreneur in what I refer to as a season of public service, and I've had the privilege, hundreds and hundreds of times—perhaps thousands, I don't know—of being able to look at an applicant and say these incredible words, ''You're hired.'' And I know the person goes home and says, ''I got the job.'' That's what Americans are looking for is opportunity, and that's what this bill advances.

And as we become more energy independent, what happens is we've reduced our need to have our young men and women around the world protecting our sources of energy. It makes America a safer country.

Right now, more money than any one of us would like is going to countries like Venezuela and Saudi Arabia. These countries don't share our values, and we're fueling their economies. We should be fueling our economy.

It creates the revenue, Mr. Speaker, that we need. I'm a Republican who talks about the need for more revenue, but we get that by growing our economy. This is the way we can invest in our schools and have better roads, make the investments that we need to make into our infrastructure.

And look, it fast-tracks a great renewable—wind. It has tremendous opportunity. Frankly, it's too expensive right now. But we're Americans. We're smart. We can innovate. We can think our way through this and find a way to make wind energy more affordable.

In this very body right here, the President came in and he said, I'm all of the above with respect to energy. Mr. Speaker, that's common ground, and I'm delighted to say it's common ground.

Right now, I'm having difficulty reconciling what he said with this full moratorium off the coast of Virginia, and this bill represents common ground. We've got the Governor of Virginia. We have our two U.S. Senators, interestingly, both Democrats, Senator KAINE and Senator WARNER, both support, in principle, this same objective. In fact, they're introducing similar legislation in the Senate. The General Assembly of Virginia wants to move forward. There is a clear consensus in Virginia that this legislation ought to go forward.

Right now, the only thing holding up these jobs, every one of these life-changing jobs, is the administration. We're not asking for a tremendous amount of money. As I mentioned, in fact, we're just asking for the administration to get out of the way.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't mention what tremendous local support this bill has: We have the local NAACP behind the bill. The mayor of Virginia Beach, the largest city in our district, is behind the bill; Hampton Roads Chamber of Commerce, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, Hampton Roads Global Commerce Council, the Virginia Port Authority.

And we can do this, Mr. Speaker, while meeting the deep obligation that we have, the moral obligation to leave our children with clean air and clean water and clean soil.

To those who put one against the other, that it's either jobs or a good environment, I reject that outright. Why? Because we're Americans. It's in our DNA to innovate and to think through these things. We can have a reliable source of energy. We can help right off the coast of Virginia. We can create the local jobs that we need to give our young people opportunity and our veterans that are exiting the military, so many of whom exit the military right there in Hampton Roads.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill.

THE DEFEAT OF THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last week the 1,200 page farm bill was defeated. I'm told that the Senate's immigration bill is now 1,922 pages.

The previous Speaker of this body, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI), famously said that we would have to pass the very misnamed Affordable Care Act, we would have to pass it before we could figure out or find out what was in it.

The last issue of the Weekly Standard magazine includes an article entitled, ''Our Masters, the Bureaucrats.'' The article says that today there's only one Member of Congress for each 5,150 Federal bureaucrats and says that this bureaucracy is ''too insulated from the people.''

This gigantic bureaucracy has produced so many laws, rules, and regulations that they have not even designed a computer that could keep up with all of them, much less a human being.

Almost everyone has violated a Federal law at some point, especially a tax law. An innocent mistake is not supposed to be criminal, but a zealous prosecutor can make almost anything criminal.

A few days ago, a woman who described herself as a progressive or liberal Democrat and, thus, would favor all these regulations testified in one of my committees and said, ''at the time each rule was created, it made sense; but over time, the accretion, or accumulation, of rules and regulations ends up costing us money and frustrating the public.''

Our Federal Government has grown so big that it is now almost completely out of control, and the people are suffering because of it. Jobs are killed, small businesses go under, and on and on and on.

I started this morning by mentioning the farm bill, so complicated that cost estimates ranged all the way from $500 billion to $1 trillion. We didn't even know how much it was going to cost.

Everyone respects and appreciates farmers. We must help small farmers as much as we can. Small farmers are important for our quality of life and our economy.

However, one part of the bill that I want to discuss here briefly this morning is the subsidy for crop insurance.

Every other business in this country, small or large, pays 100 percent of their insurance on their own.

□ 1100

These businesses do not expect or request subsidized Federal insurance. Right now, Federal taxpayers are paying for two-thirds of farmers' subsidies in Federal crop insurance. Most of these subsidies go to the biggest giants in agriculture. These subsidies also primarily benefit a very few multinational insurance companies. The biggest crop insurer is Wells Fargo. And several of these crop insurance giants are operated by foreign companies based in places like the Bahamas, Japan, and Switzerland. That's who the U.S. taxpayers are subsidizing.

I'm not advocating doing away with the entire crop insurance program. However, the excessive amount of this subsidy just last year cost taxpayers $6 billion and was one of several reasons the farm bill went down to defeat. Actually, the farm bill should more accurately be called the food stamp bill. I think 20 percent of it dealt with farmers and 80 percent for food.

But I did offer an amendment to the farm bill to eliminate premium subsidies from being paid on any Federal crop insurance policy with what is known as the harvest price option. Under the harvest price option, if the price of the covered crop increases between planting and harvest, the farmer's revenue guarantee is recalculated, using the higher harvest price. In other words, giving the farmer more money—sometimes, significantly more money—than he expected when he first planted the crop. As a result, harvest price options can cause a farmer to receive

much more revenue than was guaranteed at planting.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, my amendment would have saved at least $7.7 billion over the next 10 years, and possibly even much more in years with a severe drought, such as the $6 billion last year. This amendment was endorsed by the Citizens Against Government Waste, Americans for Tax Reform, the National Taxpayers Union, Heritage Action, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and a slew of other fiscally conservative organizations, as well as the Environmental Working Group.

Professor Bruce Babcock, a professor from Iowa State University who helped invent revenue coverage in the mid-1990s, has said:

> Crop insurance is not an insurance program. It's a social program.

And, he says, because of how American agriculture works, it's a social program that helps the biggest agribusinesses the most.

My amendment even got a tacit enforcement from the Farm Bureau because they realized this subsidy has now become too lucrative and too excessive. But the agribusiness lobby was afraid of my amendment and kept it from even being presented on the floor because they were almost certain it would pass.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make changes in the future so too much tax money will not go to Cadillac crop insurance programs.

COAL

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in May, more than 130 employees at PBS Coals in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, were laid off. It was the third round of layoffs by the company in less than a year. The men and women of PBS Coals joined more than 5,000 coal miners who lost their jobs in 2012.

With his announcements of ''Cap-and-Trade: The Sequel,'' the President recently declared not just a war on coal but a war on jobs. It won't just be coal miners who lose their jobs or boilermakers who no longer are building and maintaining power plants, but also thousands of laborers, electricians, operating engineers, steamfitters, welders, plumbers, carpenters, machinists, and railroad workers will be out of work—real people, real faces, real families. They'll join the 130 at a Joy Mining factory in Millersburg, Kentucky, who were laid off in March; in Peoria, Illinois, the hundreds of boilermakers at a Komatsu equipment factory who were let go; and, in Erie, Pennsylvania, where GE is laying off 950 workers at its locomotive plants because less coal means less work for the railroads.

These men and women are out of work because, at the country's 600 coal plants, more than 20 percent of all coal-fired units are being shut down in part due to EPA regulations. And that was before the President's speech on Tuesday announcing new global warming regulations. Now, more families will be out of work and struggling to get by. These are American families trying to pay off mortgages, car loans, put their children through school. Real Americans who sweated and toiled, all in hopes that the next generation of their children would climb higher towards the American Dream.

The President's new coal regulations will come at a cost of $184 billion and 180,000 fewer jobs each year in mining, transportation, manufacturing, and power generation. As coal energy is cut off, it means higher electric bills. Families will spend $400 more each year on their energy bill. That's on top of the $2,000 more each year they pay for gasoline. And higher energy bills means higher manufacturing costs, hurting our steel industry even more as it struggles to compete in world markets.

We should be modernizing, not shutting down these coal-powered plants. We can burn coal cleanly. Since 1970, coal has tripled in its use. Meanwhile, sulfur dioxide emissions are down 56 percent and nitrous oxide is down 38 percent. Mercury emissions in the U.S. dropped roughly 60 percent since the 1950s.

Let's bring back the campaign promise made by President Obama for clean coal and use the talent of our scientists and engineers and our tradesmen for better technology.

This week, families throughout America were startled when a top Obama science adviser was quoted in The New York Times saying, ''A war on coal is exactly what's needed.''

But this is not just a war on coal. It's a war on the American worker and their family. These families want high-paying jobs and lower energy bills. They want doors to open, not to have them slam in their faces. They do not want Washington to surrender American jobs to foreign manufacturers. These fathers, these mothers, and these children will not surrender. They are waking up and saying, Stop the war on our jobs. And they are not going to sit back quietly much longer.

AMERICAN ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULVANEY. I come before you today to talk a little bit about energy. Later on today, we'll be talking more about the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, part of the Republican Party's all-of-the-above energy program. It's a good opportunity for us to talk about various different things in energy.

I was home, Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago going through one of my manufacturing facilities in my district, and I asked some of the folks who were working there what we could do here to help create more American manufacturing jobs. And I was struck by the answer. The answer was very clear. They said, Keep our energy costs down.

They also talked about regulation. They also talked about health care. They talked about a lot of the things we hear all over the place. But the first thing that they mentioned to me, which was to keep energy costs down, was very interesting.

I said, Why is it so important? They make rolled rings, they do heavy manufacturing. It's a metal foundry. And they said that not only does lower energy keep their costs of materials down and make them more competitive in the world, but lower energy also keeps their cost of operations down, which makes them more competitive in the rest of the world, and, obviously, kept the cost to their employees down of simply getting back and forth to work.

Low energy costs were the best thing we could do for this heavy manufacturer back in South Carolina. I think that's very instructive to us, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to answering the question of what we're doing for jobs. We're here today to talk about not just energy but about jobs.

One of the big pieces to our all-of-the-above proposal is the Keystone pipeline. Many people have heard about it. I want to talk for a few minutes about it today.

One of the biggest objections the President made to it originally when it came out was environmental; and many people saw this map from Alberta, Canada, down to the Gulf of Mexico, in which the administration very prominently featured that this went through a large aquifer with a name that I cannot pronounce, in all seriousness. The administration wanted to draw attention to the fact that, Oh, my goodness, this pipeline went through this aquifer and it was going to poison the drinking water in all these Midwestern States and wasn't that a terrible thing. This is the map the administration wanted all of us to see.

□ 1110

This is the map of the real world. This is the map that shows where these pipelines already function and function extraordinarily well. There are pipelines all over the central part of this country, all over this aquifer already, without any harm to any person. Aquifers usually are several hundred feet deep and pipelines are 10 or 20 feet deep. We have the ability, we have the know-how, to do this safely and soundly. We've been doing it for over a century in this country. There are no environmental risks to going in this particular location through this particular aquifer. We know how to do it, and we know how to do it well.

Now we hear a new objection, Mr. Speaker. We hear an objection that the administration doesn't want to backslide. I heard an interview today where

a Democrat activist used that word six or eight times in about 2 minutes—didn't want to backslide on carbon, that we couldn't do this pipeline because it would encourage additional use of gasoline. It would make gas cheaper and that would be bad because we would use more of it. That's the administration's current position.

It's absolutely absurd. If you go to Canada, if you go to where the oil sands are, to where this raw material is, who will you see? You'll see the Chinese. If we don't use this oil, if we do not refine this oil, if we do not take advantage of this particular natural resource that is right across our border, the Chinese will; and it will be used in a fashion that would offend the sensibilities of most of the people who care about the environment.

I've been to China. I remember landing at the runway and not being able to see the end of the runway out of the window because the pollution was so bad. That is how this material is going to be used if we allow it to go overseas.

We have the ability now to keep this material in this country. We have the ability now to help keep our energy prices down. We have the ability now to help keep Americans at work and put additional Americans back to work. And to the extent we keep it out of the hands of the Chinese where there are no rules on how they use this material, we actually have a chance to help the environment.

The Keystone pipeline keeps energy prices down, puts American people back to work, and protects our environment. It is absolutely absurd that it hasn't been approved already, Mr. Speaker, and it needs to be approved now.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

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

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I speak today of the forthcoming sesquicentennial recognizing three bloody days that will forever remain emblazoned on our hearts. The battle of Gettysburg was a pivotal turning point in the American Civil War, one of the single most defining moments in American history and one that united the Nation and restored peace and prosperity to our great land.

Therefore, be it known as we recollect and observe the horrific and critical events that took place in July 1863 that the memory of these brave souls who sacrificed their lives is kept alive through the tireless efforts of the National Park Service and the work of countless organizations.

The Sons of the Union Veterans of the Civil War, Allied Orders of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Military Order of the Loyal Legions of the United States, along with the Sons of Confederate Veterans, United Daughters of the Confederacy and other Confederate heritage organizations honor all of the brave warriors lost on the fields of Gettysburg. These organizations work together tirelessly to preserve the hallowed ground upon which these Americans—our brothers and sisters—fought, bled, and perished.

For as long as there is breath in our chests and light in our eyes, we the people of these United States shall keep alive the memory of our ancestors and maintain the peace paid for with their sacrifice during the merciless 4 years of our Nation's history.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Chaplain Angel Berrios, 308th Military Intelligence Battalion, Fort Meade, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we take time at this moment to acknowledge Your presence with us here in this congressional Chamber. We realize that without You, all our efforts are futile to make good and right decisions for the people of the United States. Your word says that not a sparrow falls to the ground without You being fully aware, so indeed we are convinced of the truth that You govern in the affairs of men.

Divine Holy Spirit, make Yourself real to us by revealing truth about every issue that will be discussed on the floor today. Truth is powerful. Truth is necessary. And truth will bring true liberty of which our country has so long experienced. I rebuke the deceits of darkness that would attempt to deter us from true truth, which is Your holy word.

I ask these things according to Your will; therefore, no doubt You hear this prayer. In Your holy name I pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAYNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING CHAPLAIN ANGEL BERRIOS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce and to welcome to Washington U.S. Army Chaplain Angel Berrios, who is currently stationed at Fort Meade, located in the Second Congressional District of Maryland.

Chaplain Berrios, a captain in the U.S. Army, has been an ordained minister with the Assemblies of God for 24 years. For nearly two decades, he served as a full-time evangelist ministering in 47 countries and 47 States. Chaplain Berrios then joined the Army and was assigned to the 3rd Squadron of the 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment at Fort Hood.

He was deployed to southern Iraq during operation New Dawn and provided a church in the desert for 850 fellow American soldiers. In addition to regular services and Bible study, Chaplain Berrios counsels soldiers struggling with day-to-day life in a war zone.

His ministry earned him a Bronze Star. His father, a Vietnam veteran, also served in the Army for 20 years.

We welcome Chaplain Berrios and his guests today. I wish to thank him for his many years of service to his community and his country.

I'm honored to call Chaplain Berrios a constituent, and I offer thanks on behalf of this entire body for his delivery of the opening prayer today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IMPRISONMENT FOR TAX TARGETING OF AMERICANS ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents in the Third Congressional District of Texas to introduce the Imprisonment for Tax Targeting of Americans Act of 2013.

On May 10, the IRS admitted to targeting conservative groups. Worse, our broken Tax Code does not make jail

time mandatory for criminal offenses such as political targeting.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve better.

The bottom line is that the use of the IRS as a political weapon is outrageous and unacceptable. What's worse, this is the same agency that will be enforcing ObamaCare.

As this blatant abuse of power continues to be fully investigated, this commonsense bill sends a loud and clear message to the IRS: if you do the crime, you do the time. No exceptions, no excuses.

The American people want, need and deserve to know the truth and assurance that this never happens again. This bill is a step in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to join my efforts.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning a number of members of the CBC, the Congressional Black Caucus, will speak on the emotions, the value and the gift of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

I thank our chairwoman, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, and I'm delighted to lead that moment this morning. I will tell the Members of Congress you will hear us over the next couple of weeks and months as we proceed to do what the Supreme Court has said that Congress must do and has the authority to do, and that is to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I disagree with the court's decision, for that bill was firm. And just a few years ago, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, with 15,000 pages, 21 hearings, a vote of 390–33 in the House and 98–0 in the United States Senate, we reaffirmed every American's right to vote. In fact, since that passage, Virginia has had 11 of its jurisdictions opt out. Many other jurisdictions have opted out or taken the bailout provision. But yet, that decision now has left bare the soul of so many voters who will now be unable to vote because of the Voting Rights Act elimination or striking down of section 4.

Mr. Speaker, if the Voting Rights Act is wrong, then Fannie Lou Hamer was wrong, the three civil rights workers were wrong, and Martin Luther King, Jr., was wrong.

Today we stand together to encourage our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to work with us to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act.

OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, as of today, 85 percent of the offshore areas have been blocked from offshore drilling by the Obama administration. The energy legislation on the floor this week makes significant strides towards increasing our offshore production.

Additional energy production contributes to lowering fuel prices at a time when gas prices are over 100 percent higher than when President Obama took office.

H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, creates 1.2 million American jobs over the long term by removing Federal barriers to offshore energy production. According to the CBO, the legislation would also generate $1.5 billion in new Federal revenues over the 10-year period, which helps pay down our outrageous national debt.

This important legislation grows the economy and creates American jobs at a time of high unemployment and stagnant economic growth. Furthermore, it puts us on a path to energy independence and security by decreasing our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

We need to stand together to support this legislation that addresses our soaring gas prices and our sinking economy.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my colleagues to action.

Monday, the Supreme Court handed down its decision regarding the Voting Rights Act, ruling that the current formula for determining covered jurisdictions is outdated. Nearly 2 hours after the SCOTUS ruling, one prominent Texas leader said that they will move immediately to reinstate the State's voter ID laws that were passed in 2011.

Mr. Speaker, in 2011, the Justice Department objected to Texas' voter ID law because the State's own data indicated that the law would have a detrimental impact on minority voters, the poor and the elderly. Why in the world would a State as great as Texas want to implement a law that its own data said would hurt the very citizens in its own State?

For this very reason, me and six other plaintiffs have filed suit in Federal court to bar enforcement of Texas' discriminatory voter ID law. The lawsuit in place is to ensure that we do not disenfranchise voters and to protect the constitutional rights of all Americans.

I refuse to allow Texas or any other State to replicate laws that constrict our American values. I firmly stand here as proof that Texans and Americans need a voice. I call upon my colleagues to work together to ensure voter protections remain. The Supreme Court has overreached, and now it's time for us to act to protect the integrity of democracy.

□ 1210

NATIONAL PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of the National Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month.

Head injuries are the signature and oftentimes invisible wounds of our recent wars. These injuries are not a sign of weakness or a character flaw but, rather, the potential catalyst of more serious illnesses, like traumatic brain injury and PTSD. Nearly one-third of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who received VA health care in the decade after 2001 were diagnosed with PTSD, and the numbers, unfortunately, are only expected to climb.

We must tear down the stigma surrounding head injuries and ensure veterans have timely access to quality care, particularly in situations of TBI and PTSD. As we mark PTSD Awareness Month, let's work together to address these important issues by drawing attention to the real dangers head injuries present and encourage our servicemembers to seek treatment.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATE SET TO DOUBLE

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in 3 short days, the student loan interest rate is set to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent unless Congress takes action. This is unacceptable. College is already too expensive for far too many young people, and doubling the interest rate on student loans will only make things worse. We should be working together to solve this looming crisis.

Regrettably, the only vote we have had on this is a Republican-led bill that would make college more expensive and prevent students from locking in a fixed rate. By the time 2013's freshmen graduate, they will be paying more than double today's current rate for subsidized Stafford loans.

Rather than waging another partisan fight on a bill that will not pass in the Senate and the President is prepared to veto, we should consider legislation that has a chance of becoming law and that will provide real relief to students and their families. I, therefore, strongly urge House Republican leaders to allow a vote on legislation I proudly cosponsored by Congressman COURTNEY of Connecticut to extend the current low rate for an additional 2 years.

It is a moral and economic imperative that we provide a top-notch education to every student in this country regardless of their financial means. Congress must act to fix this problem, and the clock is ticking.

CONGRATULATING DUBOIS AREA MIDDLE SCHOOL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations as DuBois Area Middle School earns redesignation status as a Pennsylvania ''School to Watch.'' This is quite an achievement, and I highly commend the administrators, teachers, and students for their efforts. It is my understanding that DuBois Area Middle School is one of only three middle schools that has been redesignated a second time, after originally earning this designation in 2007 and again in 2010.

These selections by State educational leaders exemplify DuBois Area Middle School's outstanding responsiveness to the needs and interests of its students in helping them achieve their greatest potential.

Furthermore, by working together to improve curriculum and foster continuous academic growth, DuBois Area Middle School leadership has gone the extra mile to ensure success. The example your success has set for other schools is an excellent one, and I hope it will be shared widely.

Also, I encourage all people, students and adults, to continue to learn as it is probably the single most significant ingredient in leading a successful and fulfilling life.

EQUALITY FOR ALL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, in a historic decision yesterday, the Supreme Court rightly ruled that all married couples, regardless of gender of the spouses, are deserving of equal protections and rights under the law. In doing so, they recognize what 13 States, including my home State of New York, already knows: that a family is a family and that love is love.

Our Nation was founded on the basic principles of freedom and equality, and any law that discriminates against one group of individuals is an unjust law; and injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, the next step is in Congress's hand. We must bring to the floor and pass Congressman JERRY NADLER's Respect for Marriage Act. It is time to get rid of this discriminatory law once and for all and bring us one step closer to full marriage equality.

SUPPORT THE ROMEIKE FAMILY

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most treasured privileges of parents living in the United States is the freedom to choose the means to best educate their children. For many families, including my own, that choice is home schooling.

Unfortunately, for many parents living in countries where freedom of choice and expression is supposedly valued, home schooling can entail punitive fines, jail time, and even seizure of their children.

The Romeike family fled Germany after facing persecution for home schooling their six children and were granted asylum here in the United States. Now the Romeikes face deportation unless they are granted a hearing before the full Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals and receive a favorable decision.

Mr. Speaker, no parent should be faced with imprisonment, fines, or removal of their children simply for choosing to educate their children at home. I call on the Obama administration to persuade Germany to respect international human rights law that recognizes the authority of parents to direct their children's education. I also call on the administration to grant asylum to the Romeikes so they can be afforded the privilege our country offers to educate their children freely in the manner they choose.

BATTLING CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I agree with President Obama when he said this week that America is uniquely suited to take on the challenge of climate change. Those of us in the Northeast know firsthand what the President meant when he said that Hurricane Sandy's destruction left our mightiest city underwater and dark. Sandy destroyed homes, businesses, and, in some cases, entire neighborhoods. It halted our markets and damaged the infrastructure that the country depends on. These costs are real and they are personal.

Now is the time to improve the world our children and grandchildren will inherit. Now is the time to protect our beautiful natural resources. Now is the time to mitigate future natural disasters, and now is the time to take on the battle against climate change.

We know where to start. We need to reduce carbon pollution, utilize more renewable energy, improve energy efficiency, and oppose the Big Oil subsidies on the floor this week.

OBAMA'S WAR ON COAL

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, President Obama continued his relentless war on coal. He indicated he would circumvent Congress and use unelected bureaucrats to fulfill his anticoal agenda. He implied he had a moral obligation to do so because Congress is not acting. But Congress has, indeed, acted and simply doesn't agree with the President's ambitions. Congress realized that his agenda will destroy jobs and increase the cost of electricity. Electric bills will go up for everyone who uses power. Everyone will pay more.

The President is basing his call for action on flawed theories about what may happen in the future, but his actions will have an immediate negative impact today.

During his remarks, the President insulted his critics with sophomoric name calling and dismissed the opinions of over 32,000 scientists and physicists who contend that the issue of global warming has not been settled. In the coming months, we will highlight the devastating impact these anticoal policies will have on America's future, its families, and the economy in general. We will point out the flaws in his climate projections.

The President may believe that a war on coal is exactly what's needed, but the thousands who will lose their jobs and the millions who will pay more for electricity beg to differ.

□ 1220

THE SUPREME COURT'S VOTING RIGHTS DECISION

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, a vote at the ballot box transcends gender, race, religion, and socioeconomic status. Knowing that an 80-year-old veteran, a single mom, or an 18-year-old high school senior voting for the first time has an equal vote and, thus, an equal voice as does a millionaire or billionaire, this is what has separated us and made our Nation great.

Unfortunately, the recent Supreme Court decision to strike down section 4 of the Voting Rights Act is not only a major setback for civil rights and voting rights, but it is a major blow to basic fundamental democracy in this country.

Now is the time for Congress to rise above partisanship and create free and unfettered access to the ballot. Access to the ballot on election day may be one of the only times that the most disadvantaged in our communities have an equal voice, regardless of what they look like or where they come from.

And as a Member who represents some of the most disadvantaged, I am undeterred and will continue to fight so my constituents can have an equal access to the ballot box, from the wealthiest towns to the poorest cities; and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, in a June survey on business optimism, respondents cite regulations and red tape as one of their top concerns.

I can speak from experience from my own small business. When government imposes new red tape, it takes away precious resources that are needed for small businesses to create and expand jobs.

Under this administration, regulations have steadily increased. According to the Competitive Enterprise Institute, an annual cost of $1.8 trillion is inflicted on small businesses as a part of the Federal Regulatory Code that has now reached 174,000 pages.

Since coming to Washington, my priority has been to stand up for small businesses and improve the economic climate so employers and entrepreneurs can succeed and create jobs.

Throughout this fight to remove hurdles to job creation, the National Federation of Independent Business has been a steady ally, providing a voice to it's more than 350,000-member small businesses, and advocating for issues that would enable small businesses to succeed and create jobs.

This month marks the 70th anniversary of NFIB, and I'd like to congratulate the organization for its decades of service to small businesses.

REAUTHORIZE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the reauthorized Voting Rights Act was passed in a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and signed by a Republican President. Then the House and Senate Republican and Democratic leadership led Members of Congress to the front steps of the Congress to express their collective pride in the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

Yesterday, the Court did not nullify section 4 of the act. It invalidated it, as applied, and advised Congress to update the formula.

The leadership, who so proudly reauthorized the act on the front steps of the Capitol, remains in place today. If the pride they expressed then in the right of all Americans to vote remains, they will now resume their place of leadership to ensure that the entire Voting Rights Act remains proudly the law of the land.

OBAMACARE EXCHANGES

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week, on the front page of The Wall Street Journal, we read that the implementation of ObamaCare exchanges is falling behind schedule.

According to the GAO, both State and Federal exchanges have major work to complete before the October 1 start of open season. The administration has predicted some ''glitches and bumps.''

Would failure to open the exchanges on time be a bump?

Is the fact that some small business exchanges have only a single participant a glitch?

Millions of Americans will be required by the Federal Government to purchase insurance on these exchanges, but they're shaping up to be a train wreck.

GAO tells us that the 17 States running small business exchanges were late on an average of 44 percent of activities that should have been complete in March.

The signals are flashing, the sirens are wailing, but we keep rolling on towards ObamaCare implementation. The only way we can prevent the disaster is by putting a stop to a law that is failing on nearly every count.

THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Act has a strong bipartisan history. It was reauthorized by Congress in 2006 with the overwhelming support of both Democrats and Republicans.

Yet the Supreme Court, in striking down a key provision of this historic civil rights legislation 2 days ago, has undermined the integrity of the democratic process.

It was a jurisprudential hijacking of the principle of responsive and representative government. It's a decision that will go down in history, right next to the infamous Dred Scott opinion written way back in 1857.

The unencumbered right to vote is fundamental to the foundation of this democracy. In this regard, the Supreme Court has failed the Nation. Let's make sure that this Congress does not do the same.

THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, year after year, decade after decade, the American people have been held captive to the Middle East for what we pay for the price of gas. Even today, wartorn Syria, with its own civil war, has impacted the price of gas that each of us pays.

In my own city of Charlotte, we pay 14 cents a gallon more this year than we did last year. While families are going on vacation over the 4th of July, throughout the summer, or what they pay at the grocery store is all impacted because America is not energy independent.

Mr. Speaker, that's why I rise in support of H.R. 1613, to make America energy independent. We can develop oil and natural gas off our maritime border in Mexico, while creating new jobs and improving our economy.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for America to be independent and to stand alone and to bring and restore a solid economic period of time for this country. Let's vote today to support gas prices that will be lower for America, with energy independence from America.

RESTORE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Congressman GREEN for yielding to me the opportunity to speak out of order and to remind this body that, in a recent conversation I had with JOHN LEWIS, our hero and colleague, I asked him the question: Just what drove you to place your body in harm's way and your life in jeopardy for the civil rights movement?

And he said, because he had confidence in this country, the Congress, and he also had confidence in the Supreme Court.

Recently, he had to admit that the Court's action has really plunged a dagger in the heart of this legislation that so many Americans have depended on for fairness, which includes, of course, that basic constitutional right to vote. But that light was dimmed; it wasn't extinguished.

And as I recall the Voting Rights Act that we did pass overwhelmingly in both Chambers, it was the names of JIM SENSENBRENNER and JOHN CONYERS that come to mind. They both are still in this House. They both love the country, love the Congress, and love the Constitution. And I'm confident that, once again, they would bring together that coalition of Republicans and Democrats, that may see things differently as it relates to the ideology, but together they can bring the same forces that we had in 2006 to make certain that we restore the rights that the Supreme Court has taken away from us.

□ 1230

HONORING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD J. SEITZ

(Mr. HUELSKAMP asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to pay tribute to the life of Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz of Junction City, Kansas, who died on June 8 at the age of 95.

A native Kansan and Kansas State University graduate, Dick went through the sixth jump school class the Army ever had, becoming one of its first paratroopers. He was quickly promoted to be the Army's youngest battalion commander and led his battalion throughout its historic combat operations in Europe during World War II.

Dick ended the war with a Silver Star, two Bronze Stars, and the Purple Heart. During his lifelong Army career, including nearly 37 years of active duty, he also received the Distinguished Service Medal and Legion of Merit, among many other awards, promotions, and commands.

Dick retired to Junction City in 1975 but remained active in his community and at Fort Riley. Among other activities, he was on the board of the Eisenhower Presidential Library, president of the Fort Riley-Central Kansas Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army, and chaired Junction City's Economic Redevelopment Study Commission. Most recently, the General Richard J. Seitz Elementary School was named in his honor on the post at Fort Riley.

In short, General Seitz epitomized what it means when we refer to him and his peers as America's Greatest Generation.

THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we live in a world where it's not enough for things to be right. They must also look right. And while it may be right for the Supreme Court to strike down section 4 of the Voting Rights Act, it doesn't look right, given that just last year we had a multiplicity of cases wherein it was found that insidious discrimination existed such that those cases accorded voters rights that they would not have but for the Voting Rights Act.

Much is said about section 4 in the coverage. Little is said about section 4 and the opt-out, bail-out provision that has allowed many jurisdictions that were under the purview of the Voting Rights Act to extricate themselves.

The Voting Rights Act has functioned efficaciously. I'm so glad that medicine is very much unlike politics. Because in medicine, when a drug functions efficaciously, we market it, we extol the virtues of it, and we keep it. In politics, when a law succeeds, we demean it and we eliminate it.

I am here today because of the Voting Rights Act. I never thought I'd sit next to the Honorable CHARLIE RANGEL in the House of the United States Congress. Thank God for the Voting Rights Act. We must revise it. We must extend it. We've got to renew it.

STOPPING STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES FROM DOUBLING

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

Mr. MESSER. Four days. In 4 days, interest rates on student loans will double if nothing is done. A bill to stop that from happening passed this House last month. But the President and the Senate refused to do anything but posture. The truth is we don't disagree by much. The House plan mirrors a plan put forward by the President. Both plans use market rates. Both plans seek a long-term solution. But politics is getting in the way. And that is wrong.

Our plan gets politicians out of the student loan business. And that is good for students. America's students deserve affordable rates, not schoolyard antics. Let's work together and stop the rate hike.

CONGRATULATING ELIZABETH PALAFOX

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, since 1982, the Congressional Art Competition has recognized the special power that arts have in students throughout our country. In my district, the art competition winner this year was Elizabeth Palafox. Her piece has a message for every young woman in the San Joaquin Valley. When describing her work, Elizabeth stated clearly that her art ''defines women in our Valley that don't give up on their dreams, and live large, no matter the challenges it brings upon us.'' Her mother, who raised her as a single parent, has been a strong role model and taught her firsthand the lessons of hard work and life in her own artwork.

Sadly, Elizabeth could not make it to Washington to see her artwork unveiled this week. But she's watching back home. Her self-portrait is representing our Valley well here in the Capitol.

Elizabeth, your work reminds me of the hope that we all have not just in your future but for the future of our women in our Valley and throughout our Nation. Thank you for showing your talent, and congratulations on being chosen as the art winner from the San Joaquin Valley in the 16th District.

JOBS IN THE FOREST PRODUCTS INDUSTRY

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

Mr. DUFFY. Today, I rise to talk about jobs in America and jobs in Wisconsin. One of the largest centers of our economy in rural Wisconsin is our forest products industry. And that industry is under assault.

One of the largest portions of our forest is held by the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest. In fact, from 1986 to 1992 we harvested 150 million board feet of lumber a year, on average. Now, we harvest 98 million board feet a year. We've reduced that by 50 percent. What does that do? That causes thousands of jobs to be lost in rural Wisconsin.

Let's kick-start our economy. Let's put our loggers back to work. Let's open up our saw mills and paper mills. By opening up those mills, we have to open up our National Forests. Let's make sure our National Forests don't rot and burn but that we actually harvest them. They are a renewable resource and have a direct tie-in to jobs in rural Wisconsin.

STATISTICS 2013

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring your attention to an exciting global initiative, the International Year of Statistics, or Statistics 2013, which is supported by nearly 2,000 groups in more than 120 countries.

Organized in the U.S. by the American Statistical Association, Statistics 2013's primary objectives are to increase public awareness of the impact of statistical sciences on our society and to nurture an interest in statistics among our youth. Participants of Statistics 2013 are educating the public in how statistical sciences improve our lives in a myriad of ways, such as finding better cancer treatments and informing public policy. Statistics is an incredibly powerful tool that can be used in understanding complex phenomena. It's been used since antiquity.

Congratulations, Statistics 2013. I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions and goals of Statistics 2013.

IN MEMORY OF VINCE FLYNN

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, Lysa, her children, and thousands of admirers gathered at St. Paul Cathedral in St. Paul, Minnesota, to bury the legendary author Vince Flynn.

Vince Flynn was known and beloved as a Minnesotan and a great American. He lost his battle with cancer just this last week. He left behind a wonderful family, a beautiful family. He left behind a literary body of work. And, most importantly, he left behind his

deep and abiding faith in Jesus Christ. In his hand he held the rosary and also his beloved cell phone.

Vince educated America on the threat of Islamic jihad. We will forever remember his strength, courage, and his faith. He had a life well-lived. We will never forget the contributions to America by the wonderful and legendary Vince Flynn.

□ 1240

JUSTICE PREVAILS

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, our amazing, time-traveling Supreme Court has truly surprised me this week. It was able to take us back to the 1960s on Tuesday and to step into the 21st century the next day by striking down DOMA.

Yesterday's ruling was a long-overdue affirmation that married same-sex couples deserve the same Federal benefits as everyone else. It's a major step towards marriage equality. But this victory comes on the heels of a dangerous blow to voting rights. On Tuesday, the Court struck down a provision that has been vital to guaranteeing the right to vote for all Americans. The Voting Rights Act is a crucial guard against States backsliding on the progress of the civil rights movement, and we must now work to restore its protections.

The struggle for voting rights and marriage equality are not so different. Both have been long fights with victories hard won. And in each we have seen freedoms and progress once thought impossible become inevitable. Yet even as we celebrate a victory for marriage equality, the Voting Rights Act ruling shows us that we cannot take these gains for granted, that maintaining these liberties requires constant vigilance and continued advocacy.

These fights are far from over; but in time, I know we will succeed. In the words of Dr. King: The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.

ANOTHER DAY AT THE IRS, ANOTHER SCANDAL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, another day, another IRS scandal is revealed.

The Inspector General has identified improper use of taxpayer money by the people who collect taxes—the tax collectors. While the IRS was targeting conservative groups for audits, over 100 IRS employees improperly used government credit cards. ''I'm shocked.''

Tax collectors have been sticking it to the taxpayers with spending only the IRS can get away with, including—listen to this—thousands of dollars on diet pills, romance novels, baby bottles, baby clothes, smartphones, a popcorn machine, bandanas, stuffed animals, sunglasses, ''swag'' like kazoos, and Thomas the Tank Engine wristbands and bathtub toys. There's a lot more. You can't make this up, Mr. Speaker. Were they ever disciplined by the IRS? Of course not. This is the IRS. They are the law. They are the government.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to audit the tax man and the tax collectors. The squandered money should be returned in full to the Treasury—with interest penalty, just like the tax collectors charge citizens when they audit us.

And that's just the way it is.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to warn my colleagues about the Corker-Hoeven amendment within the Senate's immigration bill.

To my colleagues who are concerned with the fiscal health of our country, I call your attention to this provision, which will commit $50 billion to double the size of the Border Patrol, add 700 miles of walls and fencing between the U.S. and Mexico at a time when we have record-low northbound apprehensions and net migration from Mexico is zero.

To my colleagues who cherish our civil liberties and our constitutional rights, can you live with a $50 billion militarized buildup within the United States where more than 6 million of your fellow citizens live?

And to my colleagues who care about human rights and the sanctity of human life, more than 5,000 people have died crossing the border into the United States over the last 15 years. Let's not perpetuate this problem; let's solve it. We need comprehensive reform, but we need comprehensive reform that's rational, that's humane, and that's fiscally responsible.

THANK YOU TO CARL MEYER FOR HIS SERVICE TO PARKLAND COLLEGE AND CHAMPAIGN COUNTY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Carl Meyer for his years of service to Parkland College and the Champaign County community.

Carl originally moved to Champaign County in 1971 when he came to the University of Illinois to work as an assistant football coach. Years later, he left to work for the Universities of Arizona and Cincinnati before returning to Champaign County in 1992.

In 1997, Carl was asked by then-Parkland College president Zelema Harris to serve as the executive director of the Parkland College Foundation. Throughout his 16 years with the Parkland College Foundation, Carl oversaw a major gifts campaign, raising more than $14 million, as well as seeing projects like the Tony Noel Agricultural Technology Applications Center and the Parkland Automotive Technology Center go from inception to completion. This is in addition to the more than 140 scholarships he established and the dozens of partnerships he created with businesses and academic departments.

Words can't express how much Carl means to Parkland College and Champaign County. I would like to thank Carl for his commitment to Parkland College and its students, and for his leadership in the community. Enjoy your retirement, Carl, and know you will be missed. You deserve it.

VETERAN SPOUSE EQUAL TREATMENT ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. For far too long, DOMA denied legally married same-sex couples access to Federal benefits, including those provided by the VA. But with yesterday's decisions, the Supreme Court sent a clear message that all Americans, gay or straight, must be afforded equal protection under the law.

There is no question that now we must implement the Court's ruling throughout every department of the Federal Government. Accordingly, I'm proud to introduce the Veteran Spouse Equal Treatment Act to amend the VA's definition of spouse as an individual of the opposite sex. This is a basic matter of aligning the VA with our Nation's laws, of living up to the principles of fairness and equality, of extending benefits to thousands of deserving military spouses, and of defending all those who have proudly worn the uniform of the U.S. armed services and their families.

Yesterday, justice and freedom prevailed over intolerance and hate. So today I ask my colleagues to work with me to see that this legislation is passed without delay, to implement the Supreme Court's decision, and leave no question about equal protection under the law for all Americans.

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during consideration of H.R. 1613 and H.R. 2231 pursuant to House Resolution 274, amendment numbered 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–131 and amendments numbered 5 and 10 printed in part B of that report be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the amendment numbered 1 printed in part A of the report, strike ''Noting'' and insert ''Nothing''.

In the amendment numbered 5 printed in part B of the report, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$999,999,999''.

In the amendment numbered 10 printed in part B of the report, strike ''Noting'' and insert ''Nothing''

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reserving the right to object, I'd like to understand the reasons—I understand the typographical errors and appreciate that the chair wishes to revise those, but I'm curious about one provision.

As the chair would remember, I came to the committee and asked that they not waive the rule for the Cassidy amendment because the Cassidy amendment will increase the deficit by $15 billion over 30 years. And of course the rules of the House don't allow us to engage in additional spending without an offset, and there is no offset. But the chair did waive all points of order, so the rules of the House don't apply to this additional $15 billion of deficit spending.

But now my understanding is that they want to substitute a different amendment, which, instead of $15 billion of additional deficit over 30 years, would only create $14,999,999,970 of new deficit.

□ 1250

I would like to understand why we're bothering to do this. I think over the span of 30 years, increasing the deficit by $14,999,999,970 versus $15 billion, which is easier to say because it has got a lot of zeros in it, what's the rationale? Why would we do this? Why do we need UC for this? I'm just curious.

Could the gentleman respond.

Mr. SESSIONS. If the gentleman will yield under his reservation, with the adoption of this modification of the explanation of waivers, I would say to him that what is contained in the report is going to be accurate.

What was printed the other day as the final report from the Rules Committee before it came to the floor was, in fact, not accurate. The gentleman knows and does understand that there were several modifications that were made as a result of the final approval of the Rules Committee print.

Then we discovered there were some typos and some inaccurate figures that were presented. The gentleman knows that there have been previous times when the gentleman's amendment from Louisiana has been offered in reports and has been voted on and we made that consistent.

I appreciate the gentleman asking me.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Continuing to reserve the right to object, so the bottom line here, if I can define it for our colleagues in simple language, is the net difference in waiving the rules of the House of $30, apparently the total waiving of the rules of the House to allow additional deficit spending. In contradiction of what the other side of the aisle normally proposes, there is somehow a dramatic difference between $14,999,999,970 of new debt and deficit and $15 billion, which requires a substitution of this amendment, because it's my understanding it would somehow then violate the Budget Act twice. Is that accurate? Even though you've waived the rule and we can go ahead with the amendment, you would be violating the Budget Act twice. So we just want to say we're only violating the Budget Act once; is that the difference?

Mr. SESSIONS. Once again, yielding to the gentleman's question, I appreciate the gentleman not only coming to the floor, but making sure that we work together on an understanding of what the final package will look like.

I will state once again, and I appreciate the gentleman's clarification, what the Rules Committee did is made an agreement of what would be made in order and there was a mistake therein. We are simply, Mr. Speaker, asking for unanimous consent on a bipartisan basis, we believe with the gentleman who will consent, to modify the report to where it accurately denotes the amendments that were made in order and any wording, including grammatical misspellings. That's what we're trying to do here.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Further reserving the right to object, if you're going to waive the rules of the House to create $15 billion in new deficit, I don't know why we need unanimous consent to waive the rules yet again to create $14,999,999,970 in deficit. I guess that makes a difference somewhere to someone, so I would not object.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendments are modified.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 274, I call up the bill (H.R. 1613) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1613

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act''.

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

SEC. 101. AMENDMENT TO THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 32. TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—After the date of enactment of the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, the Secretary may implement the terms of any transboundary hydrocarbon agreement for the management of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs entered into by the President and approved by Congress. In implementing such an agreement, the Secretary shall protect the interests of the United States to promote domestic job creation and ensure the expeditious and orderly development and conservation of domestic mineral resources in accordance with all applicable United States laws governing the exploration, development, and production of hydrocarbon resources on the outer Continental Shelf.

''(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No later than 180 days after all parties to a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement have agreed to its terms, a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement that does not constitute a treaty in the judgment of the President shall be submitted by the Secretary to—

''(A) the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

''(B) the Majority Leader of the Senate;

''(C) the Chair of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

''(D) the Chair of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

''(2) CONTENTS OF SUBMISSION.—The submission shall include—

''(A) any amendments to this Act or other Federal law necessary to implement the agreement;

''(B) an analysis of the economic impacts such an agreement and any amendments necessitated by the agreement will have on domestic exploration, development, and production of hydrocarbon resources on the outer Continental Shelf; and

''(C) a detailed description of any regulations expected to be issued by the Secretary to implement the agreement.

''(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF SPECIFIC TRANSBOUNDARY AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO.—The Secretary may take actions as necessary to implement the terms of the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, signed at Los Cabos, February 20, 2012, including—

''(1) approving unitization agreements and related arrangements for the exploration, development, or production of oil and natural gas from transboundary reservoirs or geological structures;

''(2) making available, in the limited manner necessary under the agreement and subject to the protections of confidentiality provided by the agreement, information relating to the exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas from a transboundary reservoir or geological structure that may be considered confidential, privileged, or proprietary information under law;

''(3) taking actions consistent with an expert determination under the agreement; and

''(4) ensuring only appropriate inspection staff at the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement or other Federal agency personnel designated by the Bureau, the operator, or the lessee have authority to stop work on any installation or other device or vessel permanently or temporarily attached to the seabed of the United States, which may be erected thereon for the purpose of resource exploration, development or production activities as approved by the Secretary.

''(d) EXEMPTION FROM RESOURCES EXTRACTION REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Actions taken by a public company in accordance with any transboundary hydrocarbon agreement shall not constitute the commercial development of oil,

natural gas, or minerals for purposes of section 13(q) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (157 U.S.C. 78m(q)).

''(e) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(1) to authorize the Secretary to participate in any negotiations, conferences, or consultations with Cuba regarding exploration, development, or production of hydrocarbon resources in the Gulf of Mexico along the United States maritime border with Cuba or the area known by the Department of the Interior as the 'Eastern Gap'; or

''(2) as affecting the sovereign rights and the jurisdiction that the United States has under international law over the outer Continental Shelf which appertains to it.''.

TITLE II—APPROVAL OF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENT

SEC. 201. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO.

The Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, signed at Los Cabos, February 20, 2012, is hereby approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–131, as modified by the order of the House of today, if offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1613.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act.

This bill was introduced by my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee, and will provide the certainty needed to move forward with offshore energy development in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico along our Nation's maritime boundary with Mexico.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Mexican Foreign Secretary Espinosa signed this long-awaited agreement February 2012. Since that time, the House Committee on Natural Resources has repeatedly requested draft-implementing legislation from the Obama administration. But it was not until March 19, 2013, when the committee finally received just that—several short sentences to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to promote development of energy resources that lie along the boundary with Mexico.

Despite the Obama administration sitting on this agreement for over a year, that should not in any way downplay the importance of getting this agreement approved. This agreement is good for our economy, and it's good for our American workers.

Opening new acreage for energy exploration and development creates jobs, it creates more American-made energy, and it helps reduce our dependence on foreign countries for our energy needs.

According to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and the State Department, this agreement would open up nearly 1.5 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico. These areas are estimated to contain as much as 172 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

These areas are ready to be explored and developed, and this bill will give the U.S. job creators the certainty they need to move forward. Activity can begin once this agreement is enacted.

This bill executes the implementation of the U.S.-Mexico agreement, but it also looks to the future—providing a clear and transparent path for how future administrations should go about submitting future agreements with other countries with which we share international boundaries. Given the fact that this implementing legislation was bogged down within several agencies for over a year, I believe that Mr. DUNCAN's solution is a necessary step to ensure a smoother and more expedient process in the future.

H.R. 1613 also includes language to protect American workers by removing uncertainty surrounding the application of Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act disclosure requirements.

The agreement signed by the Obama administration and Mexico specifically provides what royalty payments Mexico would receive from energy developers. However, under current U.S. law, companies that commercially develop oil, natural gas, or minerals are required to disclose payments made to a foreign government. This could create a potential conflict because Mexico has yet to decide how they will collect royalties and could potentially set regulatory measures that prohibit disclosure of payments.

□ 1300

This would then block American workers from being able to develop these resources.

Waiving the Dodd-Frank requirement is necessary in order to help protect American jobs and American-made energy in this instance. Without it, foreign-controlled energy companies could develop this American energy resource. The royalty payments to Mexico would still be undisclosed and kept private, but the net result would be that Americans would lose out on this energy potential.

The Natural Resources Committee and Mr. DUNCAN have worked hard to advance this bill and get it signed into law. It's important to American energy, to American jobs, to American energy security, and it is important in order to support a positive relationship with our neighbor to the south, Mexico. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We could have done this bill as a suspension bill 2 days ago. That is, it probably could have passed the House by unanimous consent, which is very rare, if this provision had not been added.

There is consensus on both sides of the aisle that it's critical that we move forward with this agreement with Mexico to deal with shared resources in the western Gulf of Mexico. However, the Republicans have chosen to use this as a vehicle to launch yet another attack on Wall Street reform, on the Dodd-Frank reforms, which is totally unnecessary. Obviously, it was presented as: it's potentially, possibly, maybe a future problem for American oil companies if the Mexicans change their law. Under their existing law, there is no problem. We're going to see disclosure, and it will be disclosure by Mexican companies that are bidding or by American companies that are bidding or by any other foreign company that is bidding in the gulf. You will see full disclosure, so no one would be at a commercial or at an economic disadvantage.

But the premise here is that, someday, Mexico might change their law, and therefore our companies would have to disclose and theirs wouldn't. If that did happen at some potential possible future date by some potential possible future Mexican Government, then the Securities and Exchange Commission has adequate authority, even under the Dodd-Frank reforms, to waive that requirement because it would be in the public interest and commercial interest of the United States of America to waive that provision in this instance. Now, that's dealing with Mexico.

The second problem with what they're proposing here is that they actually want to totally repeal this section of Dodd-Frank for any future agreements with any other nations on a transboundary basis, which could certainly include Canada and, likely, with the conflicts that are looming over the Arctic Ocean and the resources up there, with Russia. Now, I get pretty

nervous when I start thinking that U.S. companies are going to be negotiating secret agreements with Russia and that somehow these are going to protect our taxpayers, that they're going to protect our shareholders, that they're going to protect our public interest. That, I think, is really a very, very, very disturbing trend with this bill.

So the issue is: do we want to get this done? If we want to get it done, this is not the way to do it, because this bill, as amended by the Republicans to change the agreement and waive the rules for oil companies so they can make secret payments to the Government of Mexico, that will not pass the Senate. So we'll have yet another one-House bill, and we will further delay what the Republican side wants to expedite, which is offshore oil and gas development.

I would suggest that, rather than expediting things here, we're messing them up, and I would suggest to my colleagues that we oppose this bill in this form, that we bring it back as a clean authorization with the existing agreement with Mexico, and that we move forward and get it done. I expect, if we got it done here, we could bring it up again and get it done in a day or under suspension or perhaps, I think, with unanimous consent, even between today and tomorrow. Then the Senate would pass it with unanimous consent, and we'd be done with it.

Instead, we're going to have yet another example of the dysfunction of the Congress because we're going to pass a version here that cannot pass in the United States Senate, and then, I guess, the Republicans will try and blame the Senate for not wanting to waive the rules and allow oil companies to make secret payments to the Government of Mexico in order to garner commercial deals.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of this legislation, a member of the Natural Resources Committee and of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to thank the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee for his leadership on this issue as well as to thank my friend, Mr. SALMON from Arizona, for his leadership in the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee on this issue because he understands what is at stake.

One thing this bill will do is attract jobs. It will help the United States Government create energy sector jobs. The second thing it will do is help meet our energy needs, and it will help lessen our dependence on foreign sources of energy by producing those energy resources here at home. That's a national security issue. By being less dependent on foreign sources of oil, we are less dependent on what goes on in that part of the world. There can be no national security without energy security, and this is a step in the right direction.

We are willing to say that the Obama administration got something right in forming this agreement and signing it. In February of 2012, Secretary Clinton signed this agreement with the Foreign Secretary from Mexico, Patricia Espinosa, to open up this area known as the ''western gap'' in the Gulf of Mexico so that both countries—Mexico and the United States—could explore and start producing oil and natural gas from this area.

What it does is to create a broader legal certainty along that U.S.-Mexico boundary area in order to foster more American energy development and job creation. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement estimates that this area contains as much as 172 million barrels of oil and 34 billion cubic feet of natural gas—shared resources. Yet they're shared under a common border, a border between the United States Government and Mexico. If you think of a border, think about it out in the middle of the Gulf of Mexico. It's a maritime boundary, and these resources lie underneath the Earth's Outer Continental Shelf. Underneath that border, who do they belong do? This agreement addresses that they are shared resources. They belong to both countries, and we ought to utilize this agreement in order to start harvesting those resources.

The gentleman talks about changes to Dodd-Frank and other things, but why is that necessary? Who will benefit? I'll tell you who won't benefit if we don't put this language in there. The people who won't benefit are the American consumers. They are paying almost $4 a gallon for gasoline. They won't benefit because we won't be producing American resources to meet their energy needs.

So why is this necessary? Without the changes to this agreement, the language in the agreement can create an impossible situation for American companies operating on transboundary hydrocarbon resources.

For example, Mexican confidentiality requirements may forbid the disclosure of the very information that the Dodd-Frank rule requires of American companies. This would lead to a situation in which companies that are regulated by the SEC have at the very least uncertainty about compliance with both Mexican and American disclosure laws. This uncertainty and potential disclosure conflict would place foreign state-owned oil companies, which are not regulated under Dodd-Frank or by the SEC, at a competitive advantage to the companies which operate under the United States' agreement and are regulated.

The change in this language will open up competition and allow American companies to actually go to work without the uncertainty as to which laws they need to comply with and which they don't. This is the right thing. The changes to this language will ensure that American energy development will go forward in the transboundary area and that those resources in that area will be harvested to provide the necessary energy for America, which drives our economy.

This is the right thing for America. We are willing to enact this agreement because we want to harvest those resources, and we want America to move toward American energy independence. Ultimately, we want to put Americans to work. We want to create jobs—good paying, long-term, energy sector jobs. We do that by moving toward American energy independence. We do that by enacting this agreement and by opening up 1.5 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico for energy exploration and development. It's the right thing for America. It's a movement toward an all-American energy policy, utilizing American resources to meet American energy needs and putting Americans to work.

□ 1310

I can only see a win-win for both Democrats and Republicans and for all Americans by moving this agreement forward. We asked, from February 2012 until now, for the United States Department of the Interior to send us the enacting legislation, to send us the enacting ability so that we could vote on something in the last Congress, and they failed to do that. So understanding that we need to do that, the Natural Resources Committee took the bull by the horns and said, We're going to do it. We're going to pass the implementing language to enact that agreement and put Americans to work and provide those resources that are so vital to moving this economy along.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That was very impassioned, and we can agree with the necessity of moving forward with the agreement. The problem is that the gentleman ignored the fact that the United States Senate will not pass this bill as written. They will not waive the Dodd-Frank disclosure rules to allow big oil companies to make secret deals with the Government of Mexico. They're not going to do that. So you're slowing things down by insisting on repealing part of these vital Wall Street reforms.

With that, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, who is an expert on this provision of law.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Financial Services Committee and a member of the conference committee that passed the Dodd-Frank reform legislation, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1613. I oppose the bill because of the exemption it includes for companies from the transparency requirements under section 1504 of Dodd-Frank Act.

Section 1504 of Dodd-Frank requires companies to disclose payments they

make to governments for oil, gas, and mining resources. It covers companies listed on U.S. exchanges, including the U.S., Chinese, Brazilian, Canadian, European, Australian and other companies.

Section 1504 has a long legislative history. The Financial Services Committee held its first hearing on extracted industry transparency in 2007. In 2008, our committee held a legislative hearing where we debated the specific provisions that eventually became law. The Senate introduced similar legislation, and they held hearings.

The provision was adopted into the Dodd-Frank Act through a bipartisan amendment. Then, before issuing a rule to implement the law, the Securities and Exchange Commission solicited input, held meetings, and considered hundreds of comments from industry, trade groups, Members of Congress, and civil society. Section 1504 was very carefully considered by Congress over the course of several years, with input from all quarters. It is now the law of the land.

Let me tell you why it's important.

Public disclosure of extractive industry payments help diminish the political instability caused by OPEC governance, which is not only a threat to investment, but also to our own national security. Resource revenue transparency also allows shareholders to make better informed assessments of opportunity costs, threats to corporate reputation, and the long-term prospects of the companies in which they invest.

Countries rich in natural resources are often developing countries that are politically unstable, many rife with corruption, with a history of civil conflict fueled, in part, by natural resources.

Opening the extractive industries to greater public scrutiny is key to increasing civil society participation in these countries. This is crucial in order for citizens in resource-rich countries to be able to demand greater accountability from their governments for spending that serves the public interest. This in turn can help reduce poverty and create more stable, democratic governments. It can also help create more stable business environments.

The provision in H.R. 1613 that exempts companies from the disclosure requirements under section 1504 is entirely unnecessary. The bipartisan Senate version of this bill includes no such exemption.

Also, the U.S.-Mexico agreement explicitly respects the domestic laws of both countries, so it already accommodates the Dodd-Frank disclosure requirement. Moreover, there are no laws in Mexico that would prohibit the disclosure of company payments.

Let's also listen to what the administration has to say about this. After all, this administration negotiated the terms of the agreement with Mexico. The administration very much wants legislation to implement the agreement, and they know what they need to do this. And they don't want this bill.

The White House issued a statement strongly opposing H.R. 1613 precisely because of the provision waiving the requirements for the public disclosure of extractive payments to governments. The exemption in this bill is nothing more than an effort to undermine transparency and to undo good public policy that has become an international standard.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill in its current form. Members deserve the opportunity to vote on a clean bill that they can support, and I urge the leadership to give the House that opportunity.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard talk from both sides of the aisle about how important this bill could be without this exemption. Why would you undo the work of both sides of the aisle, the conference committee, the Senate, and all in working out this agreement by putting this exemption in?

I want you to know that those of us who are working very hard to make sure that we implement reform, those of us who are very much involved with Dodd-Frank, we not only understand all of the ways that people are trying to get around Dodd-Frank, to get under Dodd-Frank, to undo the reforms of Dodd-Frank, why does this exemption show up in this bill? It has no place in this bill. This is another attempt to get around Dodd-Frank and not to comply with the law, and you're messing up a good agreement. It does not make good sense.

I oppose this bill in this form. The administration opposes this bill in this form. And if you want the kind of agreement that you say you want with Mexico, if you're interested in sharing those resources, if you're interested in what you claim can be done creating jobs, you would not move forward with this bill. You would not try to force this exemption on this agreement.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), who worked very hard on this agreement.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to address Congress today.

I'm very pleased, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere for the Foreign Affairs Committee, that we held a hearing on this issue. Afterwards, we decided—after some extensive consultation with folks from the Obama State Department, we worked with the chairman of the Resources Committee and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) to develop this language.

There is an old axiom that says ''let no good deed go unpunished.'' Nowhere in America could that be more true. Actually, nowhere on Earth could that be more true than here in Washington, D.C.

The fact is that this language reflects the agreement that the Obama administration signed almost a couple of years ago. Maybe there's some buyer's remorse and maybe there's an idea now that we don't like the fact that we agreed to this language a couple of years ago, but this reflects the agreement that was signed.

One other thing I'd like to mention is another great axiom, and that is that ''the road to hell is paved with good intentions.'' Unfortunately, I didn't know that that road went smack-dab in the middle of Washington, D.C.

The fact is, this is a good bill, and every American out there who is paying too much for their energy costs, paying too much every time you go to the pump and you fill up your car with gasoline or you go on a vacation and you curse those gasoline pumps, knows full well that we are trying to do everything we can on the Republican side of the aisle to lower your gas prices.

□ 1320

We're trying to do that by forming this agreement with Mexico. A win-win. You've heard that term a lot today, because it is. It will create jobs both in Mexico and the United States.

Pemex, the Mexican oil company, does not have the deepwater drilling capabilities that our oil companies do, and so Mexico reached out to us and asked us if we would agree to a treaty to work together with them so that we could jointly drill.

And isn't it about time that America looks to its neighbors, its friends, its allies in the region, like Mexico, instead of having to rely on the thugs in the Middle East for our oil.

I think it is about time that America and the Western Hemisphere become energy independent, that we produce our own oil in this country and in this continent. And when we do so, what's going to happen? We will reduce the likelihood that we will have to get into a war because of some oil issue. We reduce the likelihood that some of these despots from other countries, like Venezuela or other countries in the Middle East, literally hold us—excuse the pun—but hold us over the barrel, and ask us to commit to things that maybe we would rather not commit to, or play their silly games.

Wouldn't you much rather rely on a country and a friend and a neighbor like Mexico to be able to jointly drill, develop that oil, lower gas prices, and create jobs for American and Mexican citizens. This is truly a win/win. Let's not let, in some minds, the perfect be the enemy of the good. The fact is this is the language that Mexico had asked us to agree to, and we're simply trying to move the ball ahead. We can do a lot of gamesmanship today and spout off about this or that, but this is the agreement that was signed almost a couple of years ago. And again, the administration dragged their feet for the last couple of years to get this ultimately to the floor. Thank goodness we

have a chairman over here that took the bull by the horns and said, We're going to do this. We're going to do this for the American people because it's a no-brainer. So it's basically time, I agree, for us to do this in a bipartisan fashion, get off our dead derrieres, and get the job done.

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

If the gentleman would go to the microphone, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and I will yield to him.

Your assertion is that Mexico asked the Government of the United States to include a waiver of our financial services reform provisions in section 105 in this agreement, and the Obama administration didn't agree to that but Mexico signed the agreement anyway, and now you're trying to help out the government of Mexico to get something that you claim they wanted but didn't get from this administration; is that correct?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Actually, that is not correct.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, that's what you just said.

Mr. SALMON. No, that's not what I just said. I don't appreciate having words put in my mouth. That's not what I said.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, please clarify.

Mr. SALMON. What I said was that the language that we've agreed to here is the language that I believe embodies the spirit of the agreement between us and Mexico. I believe it's exactly what the President has been asking for.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Okay. With that, I would reclaim my time. I could ask to have the record read back, but I won't because it would delay things. But you said this is what Mexico wanted. You did say that just before as you spoke. Now you're saying that you believe that this is reflecting the spirit of the agreement. Now I will accept that. You believe that changing the agreement by waiving our financial services law is in the spirit of the agreement. I don't believe that. MAXINE WATERS, who serves on the Committee on Financial Services, doesn't agree with that. And, unfortunately, the President of the United States doesn't agree with that, so this bill is going nowhere. It's not going to get out of the Senate. They have a bipartisan bill over there that doesn't waive Dodd-Frank that they could pass by unanimous consent. We could be done with this. But no, we're not going to do that; we're going to play games.

So here's what the President said. He's got something to say about this in the end, he really does:

The administration cannot support H.R. 1613, as reported by the House Committee on Natural Resources because of the unnecessary, extraneous provisions that seriously detract from the bill. Most significantly, the administration strongly objects to exempting actions taken by public companies in accordance with the transboundary hydrocarbon agreements from requirements section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act and the Securities and Exchange Commission's natural resource extraction disclosure rule. As a practical matter, this provision would waive the requirement for the disclosure of any payments made by resource extraction companies to the United States or foreign governments in accordance with a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement. The provision directly and negatively impacts U.S. efforts to increase transparency and accountability, particularly in the oil, gas, and minerals sectors.

So if we proceed with this bill in this form, the President will veto the bill, and we'll be back again. And how many months that'll take, I don't know. But to assert that somehow Mexico wanted this, or the administration wanted it, and they just kind of forgot to put it in the agreement, and now we're helping them out, even though the administration says they don't want it, and I don't know what the government of Mexico says—and then there was another issue raised about confidentiality provisions.

In fact, the SEC has more than adequate capabilities to do general exemptions in sections 12(h) and 36 of the Securities and Exchange Act. They could issue exemptions from this disclosure requirement under this authority, should it be warranted. In fact, the SEC today confirmed with us that there is nothing that would prevent the SEC from issuing exemptions should they be warranted. Now, the objection here is to waiving any and all future agreements from any public disclosure of payments to foreign governments. That's what you're doing here today. It's not about this one agreement or problems that might crop up with Mexico. That could be accommodated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. It's about doing away with a critical section of Dodd-Frank. And if you want to do that, why not bring it up in the Financial Services Committee, have a hearing, have a debate, send us a bill and repeal it. But don't try and do it in the dark of night in the hope that if you attach it to this agreement, which we all agree should be entered into, Mexico wants, U.S. wants, that you're doing anybody a favor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

Mr. RADEL. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ultimately, we would hope that the Senate can agree on this, and the administration, regardless of what we hear. We would love to have some compromise, although it is important to debate this here today.

Here's what I know, and it's important to you—how much you're paying at the pump every single time you go and fill up. What you're paying at the pump is eating into what you pay for groceries, your rent, your mortgage. But House Republicans, right here, right now, have a plan to help you put more money in your pocket and save on the important stuff like your gas and your grocery bill.

We started by approving the Keystone pipeline, and what we're debating here today is an energy agreement with Mexico. The agreement encourages development of energy resources in both countries—development in the U.S. and in Mexico. You know, it strikes me, right now we have all of this talk about illegal immigration and how we're going to prevent it here in the United States. The best way is to make sure that we have a strong economy south of the border. Not only do I know that as the vice chair on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, but I've lived in Mexico.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows.)

There are mothers and fathers today looking for opportunities for their children.

Hay madres y padres buscando opportunidad para sus hijos.

Because at the end of the day, this is about jobs, jobs, jobs, and it's about improving our national security. Think about it: In terms of national security, do you really want to send your money to countries who really may not have our best intentions in mind? Or do you want to partner with our energy allies to the north and south of us, making us energy independent for generations to come, working with our neighbors and our friends.

Now Mexico ratified this agreement over a year ago. They sent it to the President. Now we are calling on the President to help us lower your price at the pump. This is as bipartisan as it gets. What we're trying to do here in Washington is just help make everyday life a little easier for you. Our goal is to save you money so you can spend less time worrying about your budget and enjoying more time with your family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The gentleman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks, and Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1330

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I hear my friends on the opposite side of the aisle keep talking about this is as bipartisan as you can get. It was bipartisan before you sneaked in the exemption that would allow companies to bribe governments and pay under the table and create chaos in other countries. It was a bipartisan agreement.

I keep hearing reference to this having the support of the administration. Let me be clear. This bill, in this form, does not have the support of the administration. It did have before you sneaked in the exemption.

Dodd-Frank made it very clear. It is the law. We worked very hard. Both

sides of the aisle, in the conference committee, worked on this part of the bill. And now we have you coming in the dark of the night, one more time trying to undo Dodd-Frank. And this is awful. It is really, really awful because we have the opportunity to have an agreement with Mexico where we could both benefit from the drilling, and we all support that.

But, no, you have decided to undermine the work of both sides of the aisle by putting this exemption in this bill, and so it does not have the support of the administration. It is no longer bipartisan. We no longer support it. And you have the possibility of a veto on your hands.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. May I ask the Chair, how much time remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 13½ minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Okay. Does the gentleman have more speakers or would he be closing?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, what we've heard here today is that by modifying this agreement, by preventing disclosure of payments by big oil companies to foreign governments which could essentially constitute under-the-table agreements, bribes, however you have it, will somehow lower gas prices for the American people.

Now, I think if you went out and asked the American people, ''Do you think allowing ExxonMobil or any of the other big companies to enter into secret agreements with foreign governments to exploit jointly held resources is going to benefit you at the pump?'' I think they'd kind of laugh at you. I mean, no offense, but they would.

The bottom line is there's also a further assertion that somehow this possible future development of this area will lower the price at the pump. It won't and it hasn't, and today the prices are excessive.

Why are they excessive?

Well, there's this funny little thing that happens just around Memorial Day every year. The refiners—and the refinery industry has been dramatically consolidated over the last few years because there's been buyouts and closures and everything else—they decide that they've got to do periodic maintenance.

It's got to happen at the beginning of the driving season; and, of course, they all schedule it at the same time and they limit refinery capacity, and then they say there's a shortage and the price jumps up 50 cents a gallon, like it did in Oregon just a month ago—50 cents a gallon in a week.

Whoa, what happened? Did you see anybody waving red flags saying, We don't have any gas, or yellow flags?

Anybody remember the seventies? No. Everybody had gas. They just jacked up the price, because that's the way that the oil companies celebrate the beginning of the summer vacation season for the American people, by increasing their profits with extraordinary and unwarranted increases in the price claiming there's somehow a shortage because somehow they're cleaning their refineries, or one of them had a problem. They are actually exporting gasoline from the west coast.

What does that mean?

There's actually a glut of oil in the gulf region right now that they can't refine. We've got refineries closed in California with oil sitting in storage tanks that can't be refined. And somehow, if we just had more oil to add to the glut, to add to the full storage tanks because the refineries are shut down to drive up the price—or maybe they're not shut down. There was actually an investigation last year. When they claimed they were shut down, they weren't. So we don't really know.

But to say, well, gee, we trust the oil companies. Let's let them negotiate secret agreements with the Government of Mexico, with Canada, with—ultimately, perhaps with Russia and that will benefit the consumers at the pump, it does not meet the laugh test.

Ms. WATERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to, if I can, engage you in a little colloquy here.

What reason would the Members of Congress try and protect the oil companies from simply sharing how much they're paying to governments? What reason would they have for doing that?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, we heard earlier the assertion that that would protect American workers. I'm not quite certain how that's going to work out. And probably it doesn't even help stockholders, because they might really want to know what's going on. I'm not sure.

Ms. WATERS. Well, I just want to make clear what this exemption is they're trying to do. It's a very simple request that's in law that says just tell us what you're paying. And we have now included in this bill, where there is an agreement, an exemption that will not allow them or keep them from being able to share that information.

As you said, they would now, if this passed, they would be able to make payments in secret. They would be able to make bribes. They would be able to maybe even be disruptive to countries that they are paying bribes to when they get into these conflicts in other countries.

So why would they want to do this? I don't understand it. I thought maybe you may have some additional information that I don't have. But to mess up an agreement simply because you want to protect the oil companies from saying how much they're paying is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlelady.

The bottom line here is it's simple. If we pass this bill in this form, the President would veto it if it came out of the Senate. It will not come out of the Senate.

They are actually acting in a true bipartisan way in the Senate, and they have a bill which could receive probably unanimous consent that does not contain this provision, that does not provide this waiver of the Dodd-Frank Act in favor of the big oil companies.

It's simple. I can see, you know, and I can count, and in all probability the Republican side will prevail here, but they are not furthering the cause of expediting the signing of this agreement and the execution of this agreement between Mexico and the United States by sending a bill to the Senate that the Senate will not pass.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 14½ minutes.

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

Let me clarify just a few major points here. First of all, the President did not say he would veto it. He said he had a concern. I accept that. But the President did not say he would veto this legislation. After all, it was his Secretary of State that negotiated the agreement. Why would he veto an agreement negotiated by his Secretary of State?

Secondly, if this could pass so easily out of the Senate, as my friend from Oregon asserts, why hasn't the Senate passed it?

We always ask that question over here. In fact, sometimes we get ourselves in a gridlock because we're so, maybe, frightened of what the Senate may or may not do.

Listen, if the Senate wants to pass this agreement without this provision, do it. Nobody is preventing them from doing it. Nobody.

Now, let me make another observation here that I think is probably more important in this debate than anything else that has been said, and that is, as was pointed out several times—I mentioned it in my opening remarks; Mr. DUNCAN mentioned it; Mr. SALMON mentioned it—in 2012, this agreement was signed. None of the information was given to us because we had to implement it. Now, I wonder why. Could it possibly be that the mindset of this administration, which, by the way, has consistently been nonresponsive to more exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf offshore—if I may, Mr. Speaker, go back just a bit.

When this administration took office, there was no moratoria on the Pacific or Atlantic coasts. One of the first actions of this President was to lock up 85 percent of those potential resources. So maybe they do have a bit of a bias against offshore drilling.

So here's an amendment, here's an agreement that was signed over a year

ago. It took over a year for it to come here. Because of no action on their part, it was going nowhere legislatively until Mr. DUNCAN said, Listen, this is something we ought to do.

So perhaps, Mr. Speaker, perhaps, is the reason why they're taking this one element—and I'll talk about that in a moment—as a reason to oppose this legislation really because they're trying to cover up the fact they don't like any offshore drilling?

□ 1340

I'll let somebody draw whatever conclusions they want. I simply ask the rhetorical question.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will be more than happy to yield to my friend on that point. I assume he wants to talk about that, and I'm more than happy to engage in that debate.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding.

I believe Ms. WATERS stated very clearly that there is substantial, if not unanimous, support on this side for this agreement without this provision, which would ultimately lead to the development of these resources.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, I think if you go back and look at the bills that have come in front of this body before in the last Congress—in fact, later on today—you will find that the overwhelming opposition to that legislation, if it's going to mirror what happened in the last Congress, was to oppose offshore development. So I'll just make that observation. Others can draw the conclusion.

But here is something that is very curious about this debate on why we should defeat this legislation because of this provision dealing in disclosure.

Anybody could have offered an amendment to take that provision out of the bill. It would have been perfectly in order. There's no parliamentary problem with striking from a bill. And there was an amendment, by the way, that was offered by a Member from the other body but was withdrawn. Both of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that are arguing against this because of this provision, they could have offered the amendment. It would have been made in order, and we could have debated it. But the amendment wasn't offered. I don't know why.

Ms. WATERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will be more than happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Just as you have come to some conclusion that maybe we are opposing this bill because we're opposed to offshore drilling, which is not true——

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, I simply said that there is a pattern in this administration and with my friends on the other side that they oppose that. I'll let others draw that conclusion.

I will be glad to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much.

When you raised the question about why didn't we offer an amendment and the Senate can offer an amendment, I have drawn a conclusion. Why are you trying to get credit for putting this in the bill with the oil companies?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, we believe that this provision in Dodd-Frank is contrary to the agreement because the only moneys—and I'll get to this point. I was going to get to it later, but I'll get to it right now. The only moneys that go to Mexico are what the Obama administration agreed to for these royalties or leases. That is the only money that goes to Mexico. So we believe that there's no reason to have this particular requirement in the bill, and that's why we did it.

Now you can disagree with that, of course. You have every right to do it. But if you really believe that this bill should be defeated because of that provision, why didn't you offer an amendment? Wait, there was an amendment that was offered and then withdrawn. Curious? I don't know what their reasons are.

So all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a good piece of legislation. It deserves bipartisan support. And if the Senate, to conclude, has a different view, let them pass their different view and we'll work it out. Isn't that the reason our Founding Fathers had two bodies? So we can work out the differences?

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: On May 15, 2013, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, as amended, to be reported favorably to the House. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1613, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1613, as amended, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and/or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2013.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on May 15, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Financial Services will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1613 at this time, the Committee on Financial Services does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Financial Services represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: Thank you for sharing the amended text of H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, as marked up by your Committee.

Based on the portions of that text within Foreign Affairs jurisdiction, I am writing to confirm the agreement of the Foreign Affairs Committee to be discharged from consideration of H.R. 1613 in order to expedite its consideration on the House floor. In agreeing to waive consideration of that bill, this Committee does not waive any jurisdiction that it has over provisions in that bill or any other matter. This also does not constitute a waiver of the participation of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in any conference on this bill. I ask that you include a copy of this letter and your response in any Committee report on H.R. 1613, and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill.

Thank you again for your consideration and collegiality in this matter.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2013.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon

Agreements Authorization Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on May 15, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1613 at this time, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Foreign Affairs represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ___— MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ___. STATE RIGHTS AND AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED.

Nothing in this Act and the amendments made by this Act affects the right and power of each State to prohibit management, leasing, developing, and use of lands beneath navigable waters, and the natural resources within such lands, within its boundaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. I want to thank the Rules Committee for ruling that this amendment is in order. I want to also thank the committee chair for giving me the opportunity to discuss this with him briefly before this matter came up before the House.

This amendment should not be controversial. It reads as follows:

Nothing in this Act and the amendments made by this Act affects the right and power of each State to prohibit management, leasing, developing, and use of lands beneath navigable waters, and the natural resources within such lands, within its boundaries.

This language may sound familiar to those who are familiar with the current division of authority between, on the one hand, the Federal Government and, on the other hand, the States. It's a reaffirmation of 434 U.S.C. 1311(a), and 43 U.S.C. 1311 has a very notable title. It's called, ''The Rights of the States.'' That is the guarantee and purpose of the amendment before us today: to make sure and to reaffirm the rights of the States.

The concept is simple. If land, or resources within those lands, falls within a State's boundaries, that State should have the right to manage that land and those resources in a manner that it sees fit. This is a principle that we in Florida hold dear, and it's an important principle in every State, and, in fact, an important principle to federalism itself.

This principle has been enshrined in law since 1953, when the House passed H.R. 5134 to amend the Submerged Lands Act. A majority of Democrats supported that bill, as did an overwhelming majority of the Republicans. The final vote within the Republican caucus that year was 191 in favor and only 12 opposed. It's my hope that we'll see similar bipartisan support—in fact, overwhelming support—today for this amendment to simply reaffirm that principle.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I support transboundary agreements in general, and I hope that any dispute between the United States and any adjoining neighboring nation can be settled peacefully.

This bill could be misconstrued without our amendment as potentially disturbing states' rights under the status quo. It calls for the ''expeditious . . . development . . . of domestic mineral resources,'' on page 3, and limiting the ''authority to stop work on any installation . . . attached to the seabed of the United States,'' including those erected ''for the purpose of resource exploration, development, or production activities'' to ''inspection staff'' at the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, which is on page 6 of the bill. Without our amendment, a future court that is unfamiliar with this subject might wrongly conclude that this statute has, in fact, curtailed State prerogatives.

I don't believe that it was ever the intention of the Natural Resources Committee to make such a dramatic change to the status quo, to the detriment of the States and to states' rights. Therefore, this amendment today should not be controversial. It's merely a reaffirmation of existing law—a section of the United States law entitled, ''Rights of States''—and it's an effort to ensure that the States can choose to do within their own boundaries, and that that which they choose to do is that which will happen.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I find this amendment offered on this bill to be rather strange because the amendment usurps itself as an effort to protect states' rights. Well, the underlying bill is about an international agreement between the United States and Mexico, and that boundary is about 200 miles from the nearest shoreline. There is no jurisdiction of any State that goes that far out, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico. So I can assure the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that would change any existing laws as it relates to states' rights and their waters.

But this amendment isn't necessary. It's simply restating the status quo. The sponsor of the amendment and all those concerned with upholding states' rights can be assured that the existing rights of the individual 50 States are fully respected and in no way undermined by this bill, as I just mentioned. However, adopting this amendment could impact international relations with foreign states. And the reason why is because in foreign law, as I understand it, the term ''state'' means foreign government. There's no explanation in the amendment about states, so that raises a concern.

□ 1350

So by adopting this amendment, you could potentially destroy the agreement that we have in place. And what will that do? Well, it would delay American energy production, and it would delay the creation of American jobs.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. I appreciate the comments of the committee chair, but I must respectfully disagree with him on the merits.

First, with regard to the Gulf of Mexico, the restrictions on current development stretch 100 miles off the shores of Florida, a matter that is of great import in my State. Furthermore, the fact is that we cannot specifically restrain a future court from deciding contrary to the gentleman's opinion unless we do so in this bill.

Now, we've already had the experience this week that, on Tuesday, a certain number of Members of this body were disappointed by a Supreme Court decision; and on Wednesday, other Members were disappointed by a Supreme Court decision. Both of those decisions had to do with federalism; both those decisions had to do with the construction of legislation. If we want to ascertain and commit to the fact that we're not changing current law, the only way to do that is to say that we are not changing current law. By not doing so, we would be giving, in effect, a hostage to future courts for the end of time.

It's in the nature of the supremacy clause that unless we say we are not taking away states' rights, we might do so inadvertently. And that's exactly what this amendment would prevent.

Now, with regard to the second point, I don't know what foreign law may provide with regard to States, but I do know what American law provides. In fact, not only in this title, not only in this chapter, but in this subchapter there's a definition of ''state,'' and that

definition is as following—this is 43 U.S.C. 1301, under the heading Definitions, and that says, G: ''The term 'state' means any state of the union.''

Now, while I respect the gentleman's opinion, it's clear—from a clear and plain reading of the statute that we are amending—that in fact his position has no merit. Therefore, I urge the adoption of this amendment so that we can protect states' right, and in particular the rights of coastal States.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Let's just be clear, America, what we're talking about and where we're talking about.

This chart shows the Western Gap, the only area covered under the transboundary hydrocarbons agreement—the agreement negotiated by the Obama administration—to open up this area; 1.5 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico that's so far away from the shore of Florida that really makes this amendment not applicable.

This is the area we're talking about, this 1.5 million acres that would produce American jobs and American energy resources.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just simply to close, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This amendment is really unnecessary, and I think that chart points that out. You're talking hundreds of miles offshore, and yet the amendment asserts itself to protect states' rights. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot connect the dots on that.

I urge defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON), as modified.

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON), as modified.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1613 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1409

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1613 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the House recessed, the Chair had declared that the noes prevailed on the Grayson amendment, as modified.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of a motion to recommit H.R. 1613, if ordered; passage of H.R. 1613, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1864.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 213, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—213

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

NAYS—213

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Fincher
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Payne
Smith (WA)
Waxman
Young (FL)

□ 1438

Messrs. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, KINGSTON, FORTENBERRY, CONAWAY, COLLINS of Georgia, and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CHU, Messrs. NUGENT, CROWLEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. LOEBSACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker. During rollcall vote No. 291 on Grayson Amendment, H.R. 1613, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1440

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. GARCIA. I am opposed to the bill in the current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____ — MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. __01. AVOIDING ANOTHER BP DISASTER.

(a) SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.—In implementing a transboundary agreement implemented or approved under this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall require that drilling operations conducted pursuant to such an agreement meet requirements for—

(1) third-party certification of safety systems related to well control, such as blowout preventers;

(2) performance of blowout preventers, including quantitative risk assessment standards, subsea testing, and secondary activation methods;

(3) independent third-party certification of well casing and cementing programs and procedures;

(4) mandatory safety and environmental management systems by operators on the outer Continental Shelf;

(5) procedures and technologies to be used during drilling operations to minimize the risk of ignition and explosion of hydrocarbons; and

(6) procedures and technologies to protect the health and safety of workers.

(b) INCREASED LIABILITY FOR SPILL CLEANUP.—As a condition of any lease issued pursuant to any such agreement, the Secretary may require increased liability for any damages related to an oil spill occurring as a result of activities under such a lease, for activities in water depths of 1000 feet or deeper.

(c) CIVIL PENALTIES TO ENSURE POLLUTERS PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) PENALTY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any person who fails to comply with any provision of law with respect to any action under any term of such a lease or a license or permit issued under such a lease, or any regulation or order issued under this Act, shall be liable for a civil administrative penalty of not more than $80,000 for each day of the continuance of such failure

(B) THREAT OF HARM OR DAMAGE.—If a failure described in subparagraph (A) constitutes or constituted a threat of harm or damage to life, property, or the marine, coastal, or human environment, a civil penalty of not more than $150,000 shall be assessed for each day of the continuance of the failure.

(C) ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.—The Secretary of the Interior may assess and collect any such penalty.

(D) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The Secretary of the Interior may increase the maximum amount of any penalty established pursuant to this subsection.

(2) REVIEW OF MAXIMUM PENALTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall review the maximum amount of each penalty established pursuant to this subsection, including any amount increased under paragraph (1)(D), every 5 years and determine if such maximum amount is appropriate.

(B) NOTICE OF INCREASES.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress notice of the reasons for each increase by not later than 60 days after the increase takes effect.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill. This will not delay or kill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

Just over 3 years ago, the Deepwater Horizon drilling rig exploded, killing 11 workers and spilling 200 million gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. Our Nation was gripped with images like this and this, of oil gushing into the gulf, washing up on to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, this was the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history, with economic costs of over $40 billion.

While other Gulf States suffered more, Florida's tourism and fishing were hurt. Mr. Speaker, it could even be worse, more damaging next time. That's why my amendment that I am offering today is so important. The amendment will prevent another BP oil spill by imposing safety standards for drilling based on what we learned from this terrible accident. If such a disaster is to occur again, this amendment will also make sure that the polluter pays for the cleanup.

As the BP oil accident shows, something happening hundreds of miles away affected Florida's coast and can easily bring oil to our State's shores. In south Florida, we know that these spills are not just a threat to the environment; they are a threat to our economy.

An oil disaster off Florida would affect the lives of millions, including local fishermen, hotels, restaurant owners, small businesses, and families that depend on these businesses for their jobs and livelihoods.

With approximately 90 million visitors per year, Florida is one of the top destinations of the world. Our tourism industry generates nearly $70 billion annually, supporting over 1 million jobs throughout the State. People from all over the country, in fact, all over the world, travel to Florida to enjoy our incredible beaches, our unparalleled sport fishing, and our State's unique natural treasures.

Anglers from all over the world come to my district, to the village of Islamorada, the sports fishing capital of the world, to enjoy sports fishing that cannot be matched anywhere else in the world. My district also includes the Florida Everglades, the largest wetland in America and a jewel in our National Park System.

In south Florida, we know our economic future depends on preserving our environment. This is why protecting Florida's coast from the dangers of offshore drilling has always drawn support from both sides. This is not a Democratic issue. This is not a Republican issue. It's a Florida issue, and, in fact, it's a national issue.

At a time when we face so many important issues, we here in Congress need to work together to do what's right. While I am new to the ways of Washington, I hope and believe that we can put party pressures aside and put America's people first.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to ensure that we can protect our environment, our economy, our Nation from another disaster like the BP oil spill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I urge opposition to this motion, Mr. Speaker.

What we have here in this motion to recommit is just the latest attempt by a few on the other side of the aisle to cater to special interests instead of the needs of the American people.

Behind me, I have a copy of the transboundary area that we're talking about, the Western Gap. You'll notice in that map you don't even see the State of Florida.

This bill enacts an agreement between the United States Government and Mexico to open up a million and a half acres to offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, an agreement negotiated by and signed by the Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, in February 2012.

We want to make sure this agreement will help create American jobs. We want to make sure that we're developing our resources in a safe and responsible way. We want to make sure that this bill puts us on the path toward North American energy independence.

This bill does all of those things, yet the gentleman that offers the motion says he is against the bill. Actually, he said he's for it, but for a lot of different reasons. But this is an attempt to delay the fact that we need to make changes.

The time for delay is over. The time to come together in a bipartisan way to create jobs through energy is at

hand. We want to develop these resources to achieve North American energy independence and end our dependence on Middle Eastern sources of energy, and we want to reduce the cost of fuel for all Americans.

□ 1450

We want this bill to be part of an all-of-the-above, all-American energy strategy. We want to provide the regulatory clarity and the certainty that energy producers need to explore the area, create the jobs, and produce the energy that we need. And for all of you still on the fence about whether or not to support this bill, let us remember that this is the administration's agreement, and we actually want to get it enacted.

So let's get to work creating American jobs while producing American energy. Let's defeat this motion and let's pass this bill to put Americans back to work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—194

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Ellison
Fincher
Lamborn
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Smith (WA)
Young (FL)

□ 1457

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 171, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—256

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem

Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—171

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Fincher
Gutiérrez
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Smith (WA)
Young (FL)

□ 1504

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NEAL was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRATULATING THE HONORABLE ED MARKEY ON ELECTION TO SENATE

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25, our colleague, ED MARKEY, was elected to the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, from the Adams family to the Kennedy family, Massachusetts has sent great talent to the United States Senate, and always a reminder that John Kennedy served in this House and thought it was a privilege before he went to the United States Senate.

I also will just say a couple of personal things about our colleague. Nobody ever walked away from ED MARKEY and said he didn't know what he was talking about or that he was uninformed. He engages the debate fully. And I must tell you, having known him for more than three decades, he is fulfilling a personal ambition—in addition to which he has promised me that he will take the humility of this institution and bring it to the United States Senate.

The last point that I think is very important and a reminder to all of us, in the polling data that led up to Ed's victory, by 15 points the people said they thought it was his experience that would serve him well. That was the deciding factor in why they sent him to the United States Senate.

A round of applause for our friend, ED MARKEY.

INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS OF RETALIATORY PERSONNEL ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO MAKING PROTECTED COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1864) to amend title 10, United States Code, to require an Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—423

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)

Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Broun (GA)
Campbell
Connolly
Conyers
Fincher
Lamborn
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McMorris Rodgers
Smith (WA)
Young (FL)

□ 1515

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2231.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274 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. 2231.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1518

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. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARDNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act.

Unlike the President's plan that we heard from this week, which is to impose new energy taxes and Federal red tape that will increase energy prices and cost American jobs, this Republican plan will expand access to our own U.S. energy resources in order to lower energy prices and increase American jobs.

□ 1520

Gas prices have nearly doubled since President Obama took office. The national average today remains above $3.50 per gallon compared to the $1.89 it was when he took office. We shouldn't have to accept potentially $4-a-gallon gas prices, especially when we have the resources right here at home. Higher gas prices mean we are making tough budget choices. For small businesses, it may mean the difference between hiring more workers or having to let some go. For families, it may be the difference between replacing the worn-out household appliance or making due with makeshift repairs. This is why access to affordable energy is so vital.

For decades, most of our Nation's offshore areas were under a moratorium, preventing any offshore development. All of that, Mr. Chairman, changed in the summer of 2008 when outrageously high gas prices made our Nation's energy struggles a regular topic of conversation around the dinner table for American families. Later that year, Congress and then-President Bush lifted those moratoria with the hopes of fostering an era of increased energy production.

President Obama then came into office with a tremendous opportunity. For the first time in more than a generation, he had the ability to open new offshore areas to oil and natural gas production. Sadly, instead, he went out of his way to shut down this opportunity by putting forth a new 5-year offshore leasing plan that locks up 85 percent of our offshore areas. The plan includes no new drilling, which results in no new American jobs. In fact, it includes the lowest number of lease sales ever offered in an offshore lease plan. Mr. Chairman, that's the worst record since President Jimmy Carter's.

We must do better. That's why we are here today to consider the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. This legislation puts us back on the right path: one that will open new areas to drilling, one that will create 1.2 million American jobs, one that will lower energy prices, and one that will generate $1.5 billion in new revenue to the Federal Government. But it's not only energy jobs that will be created; it's associated industries like manufacturing, boating, transportation, and service industries like hotels and restaurants. They, too, will also benefit.

This legislation requires the administration to implement a new 5-year leasing plan that includes areas with the most oil and natural gas, such as the mid-Atlantic and Alaska and off southern California. It's not a ''drill everywhere'' plan but, rather, a ''drill smart'' plan that focuses on those areas where the greatest potential lies. It would also require specific lease sales to be held off the coasts of South Carolina and Virginia, the latter of which was originally scheduled to take place in 2011 but was cancelled by the Obama administration. There is bipartisan support in favor of the Virginia lease sale, but, again, this administration canceled it and punted any future sales until after 2017.

The bill also establishes a fair and equitable revenue sharing program with all coastal States that have drilling off their coasts, much like what the Gulf States currently enjoy. Revenue sharing will create new incentives for opening offshore areas to drilling. Again, more American energy production equates to more jobs and a stronger economy.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the bill includes reforms to further enhance the accountability, efficiency, safety, and ethical standards of offshore energy operations. These reforms will allow for the robust production of our Nation's offshore energy resources while ensuring that all activity is conducted with proper oversight.

Offshore energy production has steadily declined under this administration, and, frankly, Mr. Chairman, it's time to reverse that trend. H.R. 2231 will remove government barriers that are currently blocking access to our American energy resources. It will safely and responsibly unlock our energy and allow us to create over a million new American jobs. I urge my colleagues to support the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Here we are again. It's kind of a Groundhog Day moment for Congress. This bill, or individual parts of this bill, passed in the last Congress five times and never went anywhere in the Senate, and it will meet the same fate again.

Now, the premise here is that if we had mandatory offshore oil leasing in the more sensitive areas of the coast—remember, 75 percent of the known recoverable resources are available currently under lease. Currently, there are 5,484 leases on the Outer Continental Shelf that aren't producing. Those leases cover 30 million acres—85 percent of the total acreage currently under lease. We estimate there are 18 billion barrels of oil under these leases and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. When I asked the gentleman from the American Petroleum Institute why they needed to put more acreage under lease when they're sitting on all of this, his answer was, Well, you know, these things take a long time.

If they take a long time, let's encourage them to develop what they've already leased, to go after these 18 billion barrels of oil and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. When they're making progress there, then they might come back and petition for more, and we'll make a decision at that point given the needs of the country; but the premise that somehow by putting more leases out there—with no requirement for them to perform—the price of gas will drop is absolutely untrue. We all know that's untrue. The American consumers know it's untrue.

The principal reason that underlies the 50-cent-a-gallon, one-week run-up in May, which we're still paying, is refineries. Our refineries need to be cleaned and maintained and have periodic maintenance, and, oh, a couple of them have broken down. We have seen incredible consolidation in the refinery industry, and it's always the excuse for jacking up the price on Memorial Day and on the July Fourth weekend and sticking it to the American consumers. Last year, they claimed that all of the refineries were shut down. An investigative reporter went in and got the air pollution records—no. Actually, they were operating, and they were exporting gasoline from the United States to overseas and were claiming there was a shortage here.

Now, we're in a world market. There's not much we can do about that. So the world price is what we pay for oil and gas, and it's a manipulated market; it's a collusive market. If we really wanted to do something, Members on the other side would join me in getting the administration to file a complaint against OPEC for manipulating the markets and for violating the World Trade Organization. You would join in investigating these suspicious refinery shutdowns, which I've asked the Obama administration Energy Task Force to do. You would also join us, instead of giving more latitude to speculators in the oil companies, in actually reining in the speculators. Hey, the head of ExxonMobil says, Don't blame me for high prices as 75 cents a gallon is due to excess speculation on Wall Street.

So there are some real things we could do that would bring relief very quickly to American families, but those are not giving the oil industry, which is sitting on 5,484 leases, covering 30 million acres and 18 billion barrels of oil and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, more acreage to put under lease, particularly with mandatory leasing in sensitive areas.

That's what this bill would do. We've passed it before. Well, not ''we.'' Collectively, the House has passed it before. I expect, as I said, we will see that happen again today, but nothing will happen with these bills in the United States Senate.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this legislation, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. While the U.S. is blessed with an abundance of energy resources, we are also saddled with an administration that is throwing up barriers to our energy security and economic prosperity.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. It passed out of the subcommittee I chair on Energy and Mineral Resources.

The bill requires the President to implement a new 5-year plan that includes the areas offshore containing the greatest known oil and natural gas resources. This is a targeted approach that focuses on specific areas in which we know the most energy resources are located. The bill requires lease sales to be held off of Virginia, which were originally scheduled to take place in 2011, and South Carolina.

□ 1530

In both States, there is strong, bipartisan support from the public, the congressional delegations and the Governors for drilling off their coasts.

Finally, the bill implements important reforms to strengthen the safety, accountability and efficiency of the Federal Government's offshore agencies. It establishes a fair revenue-sharing program for all coastal States.

Both provisions would further encourage the safe, expanded production of offshore energy.

Mr. Chairman, high gas prices hurt all of us, and the impacts are felt every day. Families are forced to make tough decisions in their budgets, schools run fewer buses and the costs of businesses go up, forcing companies to hire fewer workers. But the concerns of America's energy consumers, the Nation's small businesses and families have largely been ignored by this administration.

When President Obama took office, nearly all of the offshore areas were open to energy production. The administration had the tremendous opportunity for the first time in more than a generation to open new areas of the OCS for oil and gas drilling. Available to them for the first time since 1982 was the opportunity to access billions of barrels of oil that have been held closed under lock and key for decades.

Instead of jumping on the opportunity to increase our energy security, President Obama discarded a plan to develop these new areas, canceled lease sales and closed off 85 percent of our Outer Continental Shelf. This crushed the hopes and economic opportunity for the people in States like Virginia. In fact, the Obama plan put forward the lowest number of lease sales since the Jimmy Carter administration.

Nearly one year later, we are here again today to attempt to change the wrong course upon which this administration has set our Nation and our energy future. Recently, the Energy Information Administration issued their report for energy production on Federal lands for fiscal year 2012. It should be no surprise that the sale of crude on Federal lands decreased 5 percent in 2012, with an 8 percent decrease in Federal offshore volumes.

While this administration seems content with the status quo, this legislation is about making the right choices now to foster new access and new energy for the future. H.R. 2231 makes it clear that waiting until 2017, 5 more years, is too long for new energy production.

Increased American energy production is one of the best ways to create new American jobs, strengthen the economy and generate new revenue to help tackle the national debt. We cannot keep ignoring the vast resources potential of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf. I applaud Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership on this issue, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the ranking member of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Oregon.

Each summer as Americans rush to our beaches for fun and relaxation, the majority of the Republicans here in the House rush forward with ill-conceived legislation to open up those same beaches and coastlines to unsafe drilling. Today we have a bill that has been accelerated through the legislative process and has been drafted in a way that limits the opportunity for Members representing coastal States to protect shorelines and coastal economies.

The bill we're considering would allow Big Oil to put drilling rigs off the Atlantic, Pacific and Alaskan coasts

without enacting key drilling safety reforms that we know should be there following the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster. This is bad policy through a bad process, all so this bill can enjoy the same fate that so many irresponsible drilling bills that the majority has rammed through have experienced.

They put these bills forward in apparent ignorance that a law requires passage by both houses and signature by the President. The administration was never given an opportunity to testify on this legislation, and now the President has suggested that he would veto this bill if it ever made it to his desk.

In committee markup, I offered an amendment to protect the Atlantic coastal communities, including my home State of New Jersey, which is strongly opposed to drilling off the Atlantic coast. The amendment was rejected on a party-line vote.

Need I remind my colleagues that about 70 million people live in Atlantic coastal regions. And according to NOAA data, Atlantic commercial fisheries were valued at $1.8 billion in 2011, and the New Jersey Travel Industry Association says New Jersey's travel and tourism is worth about $38 billion a year, supporting more than 500,000 jobs. All this depends on the pristine conditions of our beaches and shoreline.

But this isn't just about what New Jersey wants. Energy development of the OCS is a Federal issue. And as we learned during the debate on my amendment, any oil spill off the coast of, let's say, Virginia, will drift quickly to the coast of New Jersey and other northeastern States.

I submitted an amendment this week, but it was ruled not in order. The Rules Committee seems to think it's strange to want to collect fees—rent on drilling plots that belong to the public. Fees should be collected on all leases, producing or not. I think it's worth noting that according to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, as of June of this year, there were more than 30 million acres of non-producing leases, five times more than the 5.6 million leased acres where oil production is currently occurring. Oil and gas doesn't need more acreage to drill on. They need to drill on the leases they currently hold.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOLT. In addition to these leases, we're considering this bill on the heels of the President's speech announcing his plan to reduce carbon pollution and to mitigate the threats of global climate change.

I realize the authors of this bill don't put much stock in what the President had to say the other day. But as elected representatives, we have a moral obligation to act. As the climate changes, there will be stronger superstorms, worse floods, more withering droughts, more intense wildfires. The science is overwhelming, but many of my colleagues in Congress would prefer to deepen our dependence on fossil fuels.

We're considering this bill at the wrong time, in the wrong way, and it's the wrong bill. The crisis is not waning. The crisis of climate change is real. President Obama is doing all he can administratively while Congress fiddles. It is no coincidence that as Democrats work to address climate change, Republicans in the House recklessly pursue a ''drill, baby, drill'' agenda.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this is a jobs bill. It creates American jobs, producing American energy. So it's an energy security bill, as well. And there can be no national security without energy security. So this is a national security bill, as well.

Virginians get it, South Carolinians get it and Americans get it. The first domino is the jobs that are created on the offshore rigs. But if you ride on Highway 90 from Lafayette, Louisiana, down toward New Iberia and Houma, Louisiana, you're going to see on both sides of the road business after business after business that is supporting the offshore industries. These are pipe welders, pipefitters, mechanics and the service industry.

You know what? Those guys contribute to the Chamber of Commerce and the United Way, and they go to church, they tithe and they eat at the local restaurants. This is a true job creator, and the first domino is the domino of putting Americans to work offshore, and that's what this bill does by opening up more areas on the Outer Continental Shelf. And with the trickle down, all the other dominos fall that provide money to the economies that desperately need it in this country in all the offshore areas.

We want it in South Carolina. They want it in Virginia. And Americans want us to meet our energy needs with their own resources. That's why I urge the passage of this legislation, and I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 4 minutes to an outstanding new member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

□ 1540

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a messy conglomeration of retread ideas that wastes this Chamber's time. The various titles in this bill have been rejected by the Senate, by many of the affected States, and have a zero chance of being signed by the President.

Even when some of the ideas in this bill have merit, such as codifying the reorganization of the former Minerals Management Service, or addressing the temporary nature of Interior's authority to collect inspection fees, these ideas are cobbled together with provisions that are a mess of ''drill-baby-drill'' slogan-over-substance dead ends. So I get it; this is a message bill.

Well, here's where I think the message is wrong: Americans have a right to weigh in on government actions in their backyard. This bill eliminates that opportunity by mandating lease sales and gagging the National Environmental Policy Act.

Americans should all be able to share in the value of their public lands. This bill, however, takes the sale of a public asset and sends much of the revenue to only a few States, instead of either paying down the deficit or spending it on programs of national benefit to all Americans.

Again, Americans should be told the truth about the nonexistent effect on gas prices of expanded U.S. drilling. As my colleague from Oregon explained so well, the price of crude is set in a global market, one where the countries with the greatest reserves have formed a cartel, which decreases supply to the world when we increase production in order for them to keep the prices propped up. So, unfortunately, we are actually not keeping gas prices down by increasing U.S. production.

I am also very disappointed that an amendment that I filed was not made in order. My amendment would have prevented the Interior Department from doing business with companies that did not have a formal policy preventing discrimination based upon sexual orientation and gender identity. This amendment would have required oil companies that are not in compliance to certify that they would only hire individuals based on merit and not sexual orientation or gender identity, and they would prevent other discriminations and harassments if they want to purchase oil or gas leases.

These policies are not unusual that I'm asking: 88 percent of Fortune 500 companies have formal nondiscrimination policies prohibiting harassment and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. In fact, all of the major integrated oil companies have sexual orientation nondiscrimination policies except one, ExxonMobil. In the past, ExxonMobil has explained that they're not in violation of State and local nondiscrimination laws because of the Federal Defense of Marriage Act, and that trumped local statutes. Well, that argument has been vitiated since the Supreme Court struck down DOMA as unconstitutional.

There is also extensive precedent of the Federal Government requiring contractors to have nondiscrimination policies based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. Our government dollars and resources should only be used when we are assured that the most qualified individuals are all equally considered.

Now is the time for ExxonMobil to respect the Constitution and enact a formal policy preventing discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. We Americans should not accept discrimination in any form.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. I applaud Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership on this bill that I believe will lower energy prices through the increased production of offshore resources.

This is not only a jobs bill but a path to energy independence and relief to the American consumer's pocketbook—a concept this administration claims they support, but fails to follow through with.

Just this week, the President directed EPA to put more regulations on the energy sector. These regulations will increase costs, which will be passed on to all American consumers and stifle domestic energy production, taking us further off the path to energy independence.

I know my constituents do not believe that this heavy-handed approach to regulations and increasing costs to millions of families across the country is the answer to our problem.

Oklahomans want leadership on energy policy, not hollow promises meant to appease a political party. I believe this bill is just one step of many that can be taken to get America to energy independence.

Mr. Chairman, I stand with my constituents who believe that this path to energy independence begins here at home. I encourage my fellow Members to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, just to inject a few facts into the debate, although we often ignore those around here: oil production from Federal lands is higher now than it was at the end of the Bush administration. We have produced 596 million barrels of oil from Federal lands last year, compared with 565 in 2008; and the Energy Information Administration found that oil production is higher on public lands offshore now than it was at the end of the Bush administration. We have produced 474 million barrels of oil last year, compared to 462 in 2008, but sometimes facts are inconvenient things.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), an esteemed member of the Ways and Means and Budget Committees.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for Chairman HASTINGS. He's a fair, civil individual. But this bill is off the charts. At least the last one that we voted on had some redeeming qualities—some redeeming qualities.

We know there's more oil been produced in the last 3½ years. The increase is greater than the previous 20 years. So you're trying to target the administration, and the administration can speak for itself and defend itself, but this is not right. This is not right. This is not right.

So let's talk about this. I am opposed to this legislation. This bill would completely rewrite the administration's plan for offshore leasing in a reckless and irresponsible manner. For example, this bill would force the Secretary of the Interior to conduct lease sale 220, located off the shore of Virginia, 70 miles from the beaches of my home State of New Jersey.

Now, look, a lot of the folks that are going to vote for this bill voted against even helping those people in New Jersey respond to the Sandy storm. You know it, and I know it. And here we are on the floor perpetrating untruths about why this is needed now. Look, it's not the amount of land that we've set aside on water or on land for oil exploration and production. We've got plenty of oil coming out of the ground. We don't have any refineries, and this is the same debate we had 25 years ago. How dare anybody stand in this astute body and then claim we don't care if gas prices go up. The fact of the matter is this is an oil Congress and this is an oil economy, and you don't want to bring in—I want to talk about the special interests of the people who are hurting out there.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. I want to talk about the special interests—not oil companies—us. Let's talk about us and what we get out of this.

In fact, if I'm not mistaken, correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Chairman, the administration is committed to ensuring that American taxpayers receive a fair return from the sale of public resources, public land. As drafted, as this bill is before us right now, the revenue-sharing provisions of H.R. 2231 would ultimately reduce the net return to the taxpayers from development of Federal resources directed to be leased under this bill.

So, with summer upon us, tourism at the Jersey shore is one of our State's greatest economic drivers. These jobs that are committed, these jobs depend upon the responsible stewardship of our waters and coasts, and the legislation before us now puts those jobs at risk. For communities across the State still working to rebuild from Sandy, this is not a risk they are willing to take.

Instead of bending over backwards for Big Oil, we need to bend over and help as best we can the average citizen. I ask for a ''no'' vote on this.

□ 1550

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my colleague from Virginia, I'd just point out that the CBO estimates that there will be revenue coming into the Federal Government of approximately $1.5 billion.

At this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, a bill that will create thousands of new jobs in Virginia while lowering the cost of energy for all Americans.

Last month I traveled throughout my district, visiting local communities to discuss the impact of high energy prices. At each stop the same message rang clear: the cost of energy continues to have a significant negative impact on our small businesses, our farmers and our families.

Not only do we see higher prices at the gas pump, but high fuel prices have triggered higher prices across the board. People are paying more for groceries and are witnessing their utility costs rise at a time when they can least afford it. There is no question Americans continue to suffer from Washington's failure to adopt a sensible energy policy.

The President's consistently failed to lead on this issue. The administration continues to restrict leasing permits for oil and gas exploration off the coast of the Commonwealth, preventing Virginians from utilizing our natural resources.

Reopening the lease sales off our coast enjoys broad bipartisan support in Virginia, yet Washington continues to insist that it knows best what is best for the Commonwealth.

At a time when too many people in my district and across the country are out of work, it is critical that we, in the House, do everything we can to encourage creation of new jobs and reduce the burden on our hardworking families, our farmers and our small businesses.

If adopted, this act will lead to the creation of over a million new American jobs. In addition, this legislation will lead to lower energy prices, economic growth and strengthened national security.

As the House continues to lead on creating a sensible domestic energy policy, it is my hope that the Senate and the President will join us.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation. And I thank Chairman HASTINGS for his leadership and his committee for its leadership on this important issue.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER), another esteemed member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this poorly conceived and deeply irresponsible legislation. This bill is a clear giveaway to oil companies that are already posting record profits, and it's a dramatic departure from the regionally-targeted offshore drilling strategy that has led to domestic oil production rising to an

all-time high. In fact, it's even possible that America will be the world's largest oil exporter within the next 7 years.

To most people, this would indicate that our current policies are working, but apparently, not to the supporters of this bill. Instead, they think taxpayers should give giant subsidies to Big Oil at the likely expense of the economically critical tourism and fishing industries in many States, including my own.

What we should be doing, 3 years after the awful BP spill in the Gulf, is passing legislation that would protect workers, coastal communities, and the environment from devastating spills. In the 3 years since that tragedy, Congress has yet to pass legislative reform to improve the safety of offshore drilling.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will vote down this unnecessary giveaway to oil companies and, instead, take up legislation to respond to the BP oil spill and protect our coastal communities and workers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), a leader in the House here on energy development.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Let me make this simple. We need 20 million barrels of oil each day. We need this for oil and natural gas to make plastics, fertilizer, for transportation, and other feedstock.

Almost 20 percent of our oil comes from OPEC. Our 10-year trade deficit with OPEC is over $1 trillion. We can buy their oil or we develop our own. Ours or theirs.

OPEC money funds the Taliban, al Qaeda, and terrorism, and thousands of servicemen have been killed and tens of thousands have been wounded by them.

We have vast supplies, more than 86 billion barrels offshore. We can develop our own safely and responsibly, or we can rely on OPEC.

So the real question is this: Where do you want our men and women to work?

Do you want them to wear helmets or hard hats?

Do we want them carrying rifles or wrenches, driving tanks or trucks?

Do you want them to be protecting foreign wells and fighting terrorists paid off with OPEC oil money?

Or do we want our men and women working here in America for American energy?

In my work in the Navy, I have seen too many of our American servicemen and -women wounded. And so now the choice is simple. What do you choose?

I choose American energy.

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

I'd just like to respond to the gentleman who preceded me.

The statistic he used was accurate in 2005, the 20 million barrels a day imported. And that was, of course, when George Bush was President of the United States with the Bush-Cheney energy policy. And that was 57 percent, you know, of the oil we consumed.

Now, due to changes with fleet fuel economy standards and biofuels and other steps taken by the Obama administration, actually, our daily consumption is down to 18.5 million barrels. That's not bad. That's almost an 8 percent decrease in a mere 7 years, with the President only in office for 4½. And we are now only 36 percent dependent on foreign oil.

That trend continues, of course, as I spoke earlier, about the increase in production on Federal lands and Federal offshore lands between the Obama administration and the Bush administration. So actually, we are making significant progress with the new policies that are designed to create less oil dependence, as opposed to the Bush-Cheney energy policy, which was actually designed to increase our dependence on fossil fuels.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. For too long, our economy has remained stagnant and the unemployment rate high. And for too long, hardworking American families have been suffering the consequences. These tough economic times are, in part, a direct result of our current energy policies.

Over the past several years, the Obama administration has been leading this country in the wrong direction with regard to our domestic energy production by enacting a plan that keeps 85 percent of America's coastal areas off limits to energy exploration. These Federal barriers have cost Americans jobs, surrendered much-needed revenue streams that would benefit the States, and decreased access to drilling areas that would allow us to become less dependent on foreign oil.

This administration has consistently been hostile to affordable domestic energy. Just this week, a senior advisor to the President said:

> The one thing the President really needs to do now is to begin the process of shutting down the conventional coal plants. A war on coal is exactly what's needed.

This should not come as a surprise, since President Obama also has said in the past, ''Under my plan of a cap and trade system electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.''

So, Mr. Chairman, we must harness our resources, contrary to these statements, not close them off. This bill reforms our current policy by requiring the administration to submit a 5-year leasing plan by 2015 that contains new offshore areas with the greatest known oil and gas reserves. Some of these areas have been estimated at 2.5 billion barrels of oil, or up to 7.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. There's simply no reason not to explore these areas with so much potential.

This legislation also establishes a fair revenue-sharing system among coastal States where energy resources are explored. Whether it's off the coast of California, along the Gulf of Mexico, or the coast of my home State of Virginia, each State will share a percentage of revenue from energy production off their shores.

This bill also ensures environmental protections remain a priority by reorganizing the Interior Department to include the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, charged with overseeing environmental safety.

Now, studies have indicated that energy production offshore, in my home State of Virginia, if this legislation is put into law, could create almost 2,000 new jobs in Virginia alone and produce 750 million barrels of oil and over 6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Mr. Chairman, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act will lower gas prices for working families. It will strengthen our national security, and help create up to a million new jobs across America in the long term. The people of this country deserve a government focused on restoring the faith in our economy, and this bill is a step in the right direction.

□ 1600

Again, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for his hard work on this measure, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Does the gentleman have any additional speakers?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman is prepared to close, I am prepared to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I my consume.

The majority leader just put out some very impressive statistics on the possible potential off of the east and west coasts if we opened up these sensitive areas to mandatory leasing; but it's actually smaller than the known reserves under the leases the Federal Government has already let to oil companies, which they have thus far refused to develop: 5,484 leases, 30 million acres, 18 billion barrels of oil—his number was smaller than that—and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. His number was smaller than that.

So it's the premise that by mandatory leasing of these sensitive areas we're going to somehow have some sort of a boon to production as opposed to somehow incentivizing these oil companies not to sit on these leases forever. We have offered legislation previously from our side to require development of leases within a certain period of time, with escalating costs over time, and with the potential of turning those back and letting them be released to companies that actually want to do the work.

People say, Well, these oil companies won't just sit on it. Yeah, they'll sit on it. It's worth more every day. And they don't pay hardly anything to sit on it. Does anybody think the price of oil is going to be cheaper 5 years from now than it is today? So if they sit on a Federal lease—and, oh, maybe we can get some more to sit on for the future—then that resource which they paid for in 1999 when oil was much cheaper is a phenomenally profitable resource.

So to say we must open up these sensitive areas now is disingenuous at best as opposed to incentivizing the industry to use those which are already leased and which have known resources that exceed the speculative resources under these in sensitive areas off California, off the east coast of the U.S., and in Bristol Bay, where there's a $2 billion a year totally sustainable fishing industry. It's not worth those risks.

The majority leader went on to castigate the administration. I know that many people's speeches are written in advance by their staff and they may not have been listening to the earlier debate and some of the facts I put out, or whatever happened. As I pointed out, during the Bush administration we were importing 20 million barrels of oil a day. That was 2005. And that was 57 percent of our consumption. Under the new policies of the Obama administration, which have led to conservation, more fuel-efficient cars, and biofuels, we are importing only 18.5 million barrels a day. That is 36 percent.

So we have made progress, and we should continue down that path. To lease more fossil fuel resources offshore is not a particularly creative 21st century solution. It may be a grand mid-20th century solution, which was much reflected in the Bush-Cheney energy policy. Actually, at the time when it passed, I said it would have been embarrassing policy for the 1950s, and it was tragic for the 21st century in terms of the potential we have with conservation, alternate fuels, and other measures we can take.

To rush this bill forward—and it will be rushed forward—to die in the Senate is not going to lower the price at the pump for any American. Again, the majority leader referenced that. And I made a statement on that earlier.

We're experiencing, not an oil shortage, but an artificial refinery shortage in the United States of America, which is used as an excuse to jack up prices and stick it to the American driving public every year in May and June and July when our families want to go on vacation. It's stretching their wallets.

If we took steps against the collusive shutdown of refineries, if we took steps against the collusive behavior of OPEC and other countries through the World Trade Organization, and if we took steps to crack down on the speculation on Wall Street, which even the head of ExxonMobil says, Don't blame me for those sky-high prices; blame Wall Street—75 cents a gallon is due to the Enron loophole created by a former Republican Congress to allow wild speculation in energy futures by Wall Street as opposed to producers and consumers coming together in a regular commodities market. So if we wanted to provide relief today, we'd crack down on speculation.

If we wanted to provide relief in the slightly longer term, we would deal with the issues of collusion and OPEC and refineries. And if we wanted to enhance the oil supply further, even though we're producing near-record amounts today here in the United States of America, we would encourage, incentivize, or disincentivize these oil companies who are sitting on these many, many billion barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas and refusing to develop their existing leases while pandering for more.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 13 minutes remaining

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting debate and I think it's a good debate, because what's at stake here in the long-run, not only for today but maybe potentially for generations ahead, is the potential energy independence for our country. And I think that's a worthy thing to have a debate about on the floor of the House.

Let me address a few of the issues that were brought up by my friend on the other side of the aisle, and let me focus first on leases.

The argument on the other side leaves one to believe that leases are just given out to anybody that wants them and then they just sit on them. Nothing could be further from the truth. A lease is given out on a potential area where there may be oil or natural gas. Those leases cost money and have certain conditions of a time in which whoever buys the lease has to develop that lease, and that can range anywhere from 5 to 10 years, depending on the depth of the water.

So the fact of the matter is these lease sales cost whoever purchases the lease. Now if it costs, where does the money go? It comes to the Federal Government. This is a source of income for the Federal Government just on the lease sales.

Now, why would any business want to spend money and not try to get a return on it? Many times, these leases then are reverted back to the Federal Government. In fact, the average, depending where you are and the depth, can be as high as 20 percent. It can be as low as 10 percent. On average, it's around 15 percent. So these lease blocks come back to the Federal Government. And guess what. They can be relet again. In fact, in some cases, over 40 percent are relet. What does that mean? That means the Federal Government gets another chance—and still without any energy production, I might add—just on the lease sales.

And then you have a truism, I suppose, and maybe not what is understood by a lot of people, but I've heard this over and over, that when you have a lease, you really don't know if there's oil there until you go through all the technology to find it. But the ultimate last step is to drill. And if you're lucky, then you'll get something that you can develop; but if not, all of that money is spent and you get no return back.

This is a fact from the standpoint of how leases work. Nobody is going to sit on leases unless they felt that there is a potential there. If not, the terms of the lease sale means it goes back to the Federal Government, and that is something that I think we need to probably understand more than we do now.

And then there's the issue of cartels. I think that was mentioned. I think history shows that whenever there is a cartel, I don't care what the commodity is, the very best way to beat the cartel is to outsupply the cartel. And that's precisely what this bill is about, and it's precisely because of the new technology that has been developed by the oil and gas industry to drill smart, which is what this bill does.

The potential resources offshore in this country are huge, enough so, that some people say we could be the premier supplier of crude in the next 20 years—and that includes comparing ourselves to the Middle East.

□ 1610

Now, it has also been stated that since this administration took office, oil and gas production is up. That's true, it is up; but it's not up on Federal lands. And this is precisely what this bill addresses, oil and gas leasing on Federal lands.

Most of that is on private lands and most of it, frankly, is in North Dakota and in west Texas. But if you look at what the results are of this administration as it relates to what their jurisdiction is—which of course is Federal lands and offshore—the Congressional Research Service, a part of Congress, has noted that the recent increase in U.S. oil and natural gas can be attributed to State and private lands, and not Federal. Now, that's what the CRS said, but I can go a step further.

There is a Federal agency within the Department of Energy, the Energy Information Agency. Now, this is an agency within the Obama administration, I might add, Mr. Chairman. They say that total Federal offshore production dropped 8 percent last year and natural gas dropped 19 percent last year. This is on Federal offshore. But it goes even further.

Since the President took office in 2009, Federal offshore production is down 12 percent and natural gas production is down 40 percent. Now, Mr.

Chairman, I'm going to repeat, this is information that comes from the Department of Energy, the Energy Information Agency. That is an agency within the Obama administration. So while we have increased oil and gas production in this country, it is, in fact, in spite of this administration, not because of.

The reason why this legislation is so important—again, it's not done for a day; it's done for future generations—it is in our best interests. A growing economy needs a certainty of energy. This bill provides a certainty of energy because we are drilling on Federal offshore areas.

And it has a national security aspect to it all, Mr. Chairman. You know, every day we hear news about the Middle East and the volatility in the Middle East, and yet we talk—OPEC is principally positioned in the Middle East, not wholly, but principally in the Middle East. Is it not in our best interest, therefore, when we know we have these resources, to utilize them from a national security standpoint?

Finally, of course, it's been said over and over—and it's so true—energy jobs are good jobs; they're good-paying jobs. Why don't we want to make sure that we can create more American jobs with American energy for national security purposes? Mr. Chairman, that's precisely what this legislation does, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2231, The Offshore Energy and Jobs Act and H.R. 1613, The Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act.

H.R. 2231 directs the Interior Department to develop a new five-year offshore leasing plan that makes available for oil and gas exploration and development at least 50% of the unleased coastal areas with the most potential for energy production, and it creates a nationwide revenue sharing system so coastal states will receive a share of the federal royalties. It also requires that drilling be allowed off the coasts of California, South Carolina and Virginia and statutorily reorganizes the Interior Department agencies that oversee offshore leasing and permitting, safety inspections and revenue collection.

While I do not agree with some of the environmental provisions in this bill, I support it because it is a message bill about the importance of accessing our offshore resources. While leasing and permitting has come back some since the Deepwater Horizon accident, it is not back to the level it was before the spill. Additionally with the President reneging on certain areas originally contained in his 2012–2017 Five Year Offshore Leasing Plan, our future access over the next decade is extremely limited. We need to open new offshore areas up for production instead of producing on the same lands we have for decades.

H.R. 1613 would approve the February 2012 agreement between the United States and Mexico concerning transboundary oil and gas reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico. It also provides guidelines that the administration must follow in implementing all future transboundary hydrocarbon agreements.

H.R. 1613 is different than H.R. 2231 in that it is not a message bill. It gives the State Department the authority it needs to move forward on an important negotiated agreement with Mexico so that our respective countries can jointly develop in the Gulf of Mexico. I am hopeful we can get this bill to the President's desk for his signature soon.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. By requiring offshore oil and gas drilling in the Atlantic Ocean, this bill threatens New Jersey's coastal environment, fishing, tourism and the associated jobs and economic activity. This bill is the same old failed attempt by the Republican majority to give away public resources to wealthy, multi-national corporations at the cost of American taxpayers and our environment.

In New Jersey, tourism is a top industry, and we rely on our beaches, fisheries and clean ocean to attract that tourism. In 2011, the commercial fishing industry in New Jersey generated $6.6 billion in sales and contributed $2.4 billion to gross state product, while supporting 44,000 jobs. At the same time, New Jersey's recreational fisheries generated $1.7 billion in sales and contributed $871 million to gross state product, while supporting 10,000 jobs.

I made an effort to give a voice to those Americans living on the Atlantic Coast who want to protect their livelihoods, who want to preserve a clean ocean and who want to ensure the health of marine life. I proposed an amendment to the bill which would have given the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on whether we should force drilling in the Atlantic Ocean. However, my amendment was not allowed to even come to a full vote because of Republican opposition.

At a time when domestic energy production is booming under President Obama, this rushed expansion of unsafe drilling into environmentally sensitive areas is completely unwarranted. This legislation unnecessarily rewards wealthy, multi-national who are sitting on 30 million acres worth of approved leases, waiting to drill until prices are even higher.

Energy independence is a matter of smart economic progress and national security and the American people deserve real proposals that will move our country forward. The American people deserve better than this same old bill that is sure to go nowhere once again.

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, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 113–16. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2231

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Offshore Energy and Jobs Act''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS

Sec. 101. Outer Continental Shelf leasing program reforms.
Sec. 102. Domestic oil and natural gas production goal.
Sec. 103. Development and submittal of new 5-year oil and gas leasing program.

TITLE II—DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT TO CONDUCT NEW OCS SALES IN VIRGINIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND CALIFORNIA

Sec. 201. Requirement to conduct proposed oil and gas Lease Sale 220 on the Outer Continental Shelf offshore Virginia.
Sec. 202. South Carolina lease sale.
Sec. 203. Southern California existing infrastructure lease sale.
Sec. 204. Environmental impact statement requirement.
Sec. 205. National defense.
Sec. 206. Eastern Gulf of Mexico not included.

TITLE III—EQUITABLE SHARING OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES

Sec. 301. Disposition of Outer Continental Shelf revenues to coastal States.

TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF MINERALS MANAGEMENT AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sec. 401. Establishment of Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals and Assistant Secretary of Ocean Energy and Safety.
Sec. 402. Bureau of Ocean Energy.
Sec. 403. Ocean Energy Safety Service.
Sec. 404. Office of Natural Resources revenue.
Sec. 405. Ethics and drug testing.
Sec. 406. Abolishment of Minerals Management Service.
Sec. 407. Conforming amendments to Executive Schedule pay rates.
Sec. 408. Outer Continental Shelf Energy Safety Advisory Board.
Sec. 409. Outer Continental Shelf inspection fees.

TITLE V—UNITED STATES TERRITORIES

Sec. 501. Application of Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act with respect to territories of the United States.

TITLE I—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS

SEC. 101. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS.

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 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.

''(B) The Secretary shall include in each proposed oil and gas leasing program under this section 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. The Secretary may not remove such a subdivision from the program until publication of the final program.

''(C) 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 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. 102. 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) PROGRAM GOAL.—For purposes of the 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the production goal referred to in paragraph (1) shall be an increase by 2032 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.''.

SEC. 103. DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMITTAL OF NEW 5-YEAR OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) by not later than July 15, 2014, publish and submit to Congress a new proposed oil and gas leasing program under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) for the 5-year period beginning on such date and ending July 15, 2020; and

(2) by not later than July 15, 2015, approve a final oil and gas leasing program under such section for such period.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF ALL AREAS.—In preparing such program the Secretary shall include consideration of areas of the Continental Shelf off the coasts of all States (as such term is defined in section 2 of that Act, as amended by this Act), that are subject to leasing under this Act.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 18(d)(3) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(d)(3)) is amended by striking ''or after eighteen months following the date of enactment of this section, whichever first occurs,''.

TITLE II—DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT TO CONDUCT NEW OCS SALES IN VIRGINIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND CALIFORNIA

SEC. 201. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 220 ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFFSHORE VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the exclusion of Lease Sale 220 in the Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017, the Secretary of the Interior 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.—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 section 205(b), 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 one other lease block in the Virginia lease sale planning area that is acceptable for oil and gas exploration and production in order to mitigate conflict.

(c) BALANCING MILITARY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION 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:

(1) 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.

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

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LEASE SALE 220.—The term ''Lease Sale 220'' means such lease sale referred to in the Request for Comments on the Draft Proposed 5-Year Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 2010–2015 and Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Proposed 5-Year Program published January 21, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 3631).

(2) VIRGINIA LEASE SALE PLANNING AREA.—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.

SEC. 202. SOUTH CAROLINA LEASE SALE.

Notwithstanding inclusion of the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area in the Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017, the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a lease sale not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act for areas off the coast of South Carolina determined by the Secretary to have the most geologically promising hydrocarbon resources and constituting not less than 25 percent of the leasable area within the South Carolina offshore administrative boundaries depicted in the notice entitled ''Federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Administrative Boundaries Extending from the Submerged Lands Act Boundary seaward to the Limit of the United States Outer Continental Shelf'', published January 3, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 127).

SEC. 203. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE LEASE SALE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall offer for sale leases of tracts in the Santa Maria and Santa Barbara/Ventura Basins of the Southern California OCS Planning Area as soon as practicable, but not later than December 31, 2014.

(b) USE OF EXISTING STRUCTURES OR ONSHORE-BASED DRILLING.—The Secretary of the Interior shall include in leases offered for sale under this lease sale such terms and conditions as are necessary to require that development and production may occur only from offshore infrastructure in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act or from onshore-based, extended-reach drilling.

SEC. 204. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a multisale environmental impact statement under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) for all lease sales required under this title.

(b) ACTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED.—Notwithstanding section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332), in such statement—

(1) 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

(2) the Secretary shall only—

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

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

SEC. 205. NATIONAL DEFENSE.

(a) NATIONAL DEFENSE AREAS.—This Act does not affect the existing authority of the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, to designate 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)).

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.—No person may engage in any exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf under a lease issued under this Act 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. 206. EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO NOT INCLUDED.

Nothing in this Act affects restrictions on oil and gas leasing under 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).

TITLE III—EQUITABLE SHARING OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES

SEC. 301. 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 Offshore Energy and 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 new areas of the outer Continental Shelf that are authorized to be made available for leasing as a result of enactment of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act and leasing under that 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 enactment of the Offshore Energy and 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.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1) shall be applied—

''(i) 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 Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, by substituting '12.5 percent' for '37.5 percent'; and

''(ii) 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 Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, by substituting '25 percent' for '37.5 percent'.

''(B) EXEMPTED LEASE SALES.—This paragraph shall not apply with respect to any lease issued under title II of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act.

''(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;

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

''(D) shall be distributed in the fiscal year following receipt.

''(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.

TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF MINERALS MANAGEMENT AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 401. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNDER SECRETARY FOR ENERGY, LANDS, AND MINERALS AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF OCEAN ENERGY AND SAFETY.

There shall be in the Department of the Interior—

(1) an Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals, who shall—

(A) be appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate;

(B) report to the Secretary of the Interior or, if directed by the Secretary, to the Deputy Secretary of the Interior;

(C) be paid at the rate payable for level III of the Executive Schedule; and

(D) be responsible for—

(i) the safe and responsible development of our energy and mineral resources on Federal lands in appropriate accordance with United States energy demands; and

(ii) ensuring multiple-use missions of the Department of the Interior that promote the safe and sustained development of energy and minerals resources on public lands (as that term is defined in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

(2) an Assistant Secretary of Ocean Energy and Safety, who shall—

(A) be appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate;

(B) report to the Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals;

(C) be paid at the rate payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule; and

(D) be responsible for ensuring safe and efficient development of energy and minerals on the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States; and

(3) an Assistant Secretary of Land and Minerals Management, who shall—

(A) be appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate;

(B) report to the Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals;

(C) be paid at the rate payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule; and

(D) be responsible for ensuring safe and efficient development of energy and minerals on public lands and other Federal onshore lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including implementation of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) and the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) and administration of the Office of Surface Mining.

SEC. 402. BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Ocean Energy (referred to in this section as the ''Bureau''), which shall—

(1) be headed by a Director of Ocean Energy (referred to in this section as the ''Director''); and

(2) be administered under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of Ocean Energy and Safety.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out through the Bureau all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary relating to the administration of a comprehensive program of offshore mineral and renewable energy resources management.

(2) SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.—The Director shall promulgate and implement regulations—

(A) for the proper issuance of leases for the exploration, development, and production of nonrenewable and renewable energy and mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf;

(B) relating to resource identification, access, evaluation, and utilization;

(C) for development of leasing plans, lease sales, and issuance of leases for such resources; and

(D) regarding issuance of environmental impact statements related to leasing and post leasing activities including exploration, development, and production, and the use of third party contracting for necessary environmental analysis for the development of such resources.

(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not carry out through the Bureau any function, power, or duty that is—

(A) required by section 403 to be carried out through the Ocean Energy Safety Service; or

(B) required by section 404 to be carried out through the Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

(d) RESPONSIBILITIES OF LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES.—Nothing in this section shall affect the authorities of the Bureau of Land Management under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or of the Forest Service under the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–588).

SEC. 403. OCEAN ENERGY SAFETY SERVICE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Interior an Ocean Energy Safety Service (referred to in this section as the ''Service''), which shall—

(1) be headed by a Director of Energy Safety (referred to in this section as the ''Director''); and

(2) be administered under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of Ocean Energy and Safety.

(b) DIRECTOR.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out through the Service all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary relating to the administration of safety and environmental enforcement activities related to offshore mineral and renewable energy resources on the Outer Continental Shelf pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) including the authority to develop, promulgate, and enforce regulations to ensure the safe and sound exploration, development, and production of mineral and renewable energy resources on the Outer Continental Shelf in a timely fashion.

(2) SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.—The Director shall be responsible for all safety activities related to exploration and development of renewable and mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf, including—

(A) exploration, development, production, and ongoing inspections of infrastructure;

(B) the suspending or prohibiting, on a temporary basis, any operation or activity, including production under leases held on the Outer Continental Shelf, in accordance with section 5(a)(1) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1334(a)(1));

(C) cancelling any lease, permit, or right-of-way on the Outer Continental Shelf, in accordance with section 5(a)(2) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1334(a)(2));

(D) compelling compliance with applicable Federal laws and regulations relating to worker safety and other matters;

(E) requiring comprehensive safety and environmental management programs for persons engaged in activities connected with the exploration, development, and production of mineral or renewable energy resources;

(F) developing and implementing regulations for Federal employees to carry out any inspection or investigation to ascertain compliance with applicable regulations, including health, safety, or environmental regulations;

(G) implementing the Offshore Technology Research and Risk Assessment Program under section 21 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1347);

(H) summoning witnesses and directing the production of evidence;

(I) levying fines and penalties and disqualifying operators;

(J) carrying out any safety, response, and removal preparedness functions; and

(K) the processing of permits, exploration plans, development plans.

(d) EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the inspection force of the Bureau consists of qualified, trained employees who meet qualification requirements and adhere to the highest professional and ethical standards.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The qualification requirements referred to in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be determined by the Secretary, subject to subparagraph (B); and

(B) shall include—

(i) three years of practical experience in oil and gas exploration, development, or production; or

(ii) a degree in an appropriate field of engineering from an accredited institution of higher learning.

(3) ASSIGNMENT.—In assigning oil and gas inspectors to the inspection and investigation of individual operations, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the extent possible to their previous experience in the particular type of oil and gas operation in which such inspections are to be made.

(4) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Director shall require that an individual to be hired as an inspection officer undergo an employment investigation (including a criminal history record check).

(5) LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS.—Individuals hired as inspectors must be able to read, speak, and write English well enough to—

(A) carry out written and oral instructions regarding the proper performance of inspection duties; and

(B) write inspection reports and statements and log entries in the English language.

(6) VETERANS PREFERENCE.—The Director shall provide a preference for the hiring of an individual as a inspection officer if the individual is a member or former member of the Armed Forces and is entitled, under statute, to retired, retirement, or retainer pay on account of service as a member of the Armed Forces.

(7) ANNUAL PROFICIENCY REVIEW.—

(A) ANNUAL PROFICIENCY REVIEW.—The Director shall provide that an annual evaluation of each individual assigned inspection duties is conducted and documented.

(B) CONTINUATION OF EMPLOYMENT.—An individual employed as an inspector may not continue to be employed in that capacity unless the evaluation demonstrates that the individual—

(i) continues to meet all qualifications and standards;

(ii) has a satisfactory record of performance and attention to duty based on the standards and requirements in the inspection program; and

(iii) demonstrates the current knowledge and skills necessary to courteously, vigilantly, and effectively perform inspection functions.

(8) LIMITATION ON RIGHT TO STRIKE.—Any individual that conducts permitting or inspections under this section may not participate in a strike, or assert the right to strike.

(9) PERSONNEL AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director may employ, appoint, discipline and terminate for cause, and fix the compensation, terms, and conditions of employment of Federal service for individuals as the employees of the Service in order to restore and maintain the trust of the people of the United States in the accountability of the management of our Nation's energy safety program.

(10) TRAINING ACADEMY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a National Offshore Energy Safety Academy (referred to in this paragraph as the ''Academy'') as an agency of the Ocean Energy Safety Service.

(B) FUNCTIONS OF ACADEMY.—The Secretary, through the Academy, shall be responsible for—

(i) the initial and continued training of both newly hired and experienced offshore oil and gas inspectors in all aspects of health, safety, environmental, and operational inspections;

(ii) the training of technical support personnel of the Bureau;

(iii) any other training programs for offshore oil and gas inspectors, Bureau personnel, Department personnel, or other persons as the Secretary shall designate; and

(iv) certification of the successful completion of training programs for newly hired and experienced offshore oil and gas inspectors.

(C) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In performing functions under this paragraph, and subject to clause (ii), the Secretary may enter into cooperative educational and training agreements with educational institutions, related Federal academies, other Federal agencies, State governments, safety training firms, and oil and gas operators and related industries.

(ii) TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—Such training shall be conducted by the Academy in accordance with curriculum needs and assignment of instructional personnel established by the Secretary.

(11) USE OF DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL.—In performing functions under this subsection, the Secretary shall use, to the extent practicable, the facilities and personnel of the Department of the Interior. The Secretary may appoint or assign to the Academy such officers and employees as the Secretary considers necessary for the performance of the duties and functions of the Academy.

(12) ADDITIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall work with appropriate educational institutions, operators, and representatives of oil and gas workers to develop and maintain adequate programs with educational institutions and oil and gas operators that are designed—

(i) to enable persons to qualify for positions in the administration of this Act; and

(ii) to provide for the continuing education of inspectors or other appropriate Department of the Interior personnel.

(B) FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide financial and technical assistance to educational institutions in carrying out this paragraph.

(e) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not carry out through the Service any function, power, or duty that is—

(1) required by section 402 to be carried out through Bureau of Ocean Energy; or

(2) required by section 404 to be carried out through the Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

SEC. 404. OFFICE OF NATURAL RESOURCES REVENUE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Interior an Office of Natural Resources Revenue (referred to in this section as the ''Office'') to be headed by a Director of Natural Resources Revenue (referred to in this section as the ''Director'').

(b) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at the rate provided for Level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out, through the Office, all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary and relating to the administration of offshore royalty and revenue management functions.

(2) SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary shall carry out, through the Office, all functions, powers, and duties previously assigned to the Minerals Management Service (including the authority to develop, promulgate, and enforce regulations) regarding offshore royalty and revenue collection; royalty and revenue distribution; auditing and compliance; investigation and enforcement of royalty and revenue regulations; and asset management for onshore and offshore activities.

(d) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not carry out through the Office any function, power, or duty that is—

(1) required by section 402 to be carried out through Bureau of Ocean Energy; or

(2) required by section 403 to be carried out through the Ocean Energy Safety Service.

SEC. 405. ETHICS AND DRUG TESTING.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall certify annually that all Department of the Interior officers and employees having regular, direct contact with lessees, contractors, concessionaires, and other businesses interested before the Government as a function of their official duties, or conducting investigations, issuing permits, or responsible for oversight of energy programs, are in full compliance with all Federal employee ethics laws and regulations under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) and part 2635 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, and all guidance issued under subsection (c).

(b) DRUG TESTING.—The Secretary shall conduct a random drug testing program of all Department of the Interior personnel referred to in subsection (a).

(c) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue supplementary ethics and drug testing guidance for the employees for which certification is required under subsection (a). The Secretary shall update the supplementary ethics

guidance not less than once every 3 years thereafter.

SEC. 406. ABOLISHMENT OF MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE.

(a) ABOLISHMENT.—The Minerals Management Service is abolished.

(b) COMPLETED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Completed administrative actions of the Minerals Management Service shall not be affected by the enactment of this Act, but shall continue in effect according to their terms until amended, modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by an officer of the United States or a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(2) COMPLETED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ''completed administrative action'' includes orders, determinations, memoranda of understanding, memoranda of agreements, rules, regulations, personnel actions, permits, agreements, grants, contracts, certificates, licenses, registrations, and privileges.

(c) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—Subject to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the officers of the Department of the Interior under this Act—

(1) pending proceedings in the Minerals Management Service, including notices of proposed rulemaking, and applications for licenses, permits, certificates, grants, and financial assistance, shall continue, notwithstanding the enactment of this Act or the vesting of functions of the Service in another agency, unless discontinued or modified under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such discontinuance or modification could have occurred if this Act had not been enacted; and

(2) orders issued in such proceedings, and appeals therefrom, and payments made pursuant to such orders, shall issue in the same manner and on the same terms as if this Act had not been enacted, and any such orders shall continue in effect until amended, modified, superseded, terminated, set aside, or revoked by an officer of the United States or a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(d) PENDING CIVIL ACTIONS.—Subject to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior or any officer of the Department of the Interior under this Act, pending civil actions shall continue notwithstanding the enactment of this Act, and in such civil actions, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered and enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if such enactment had not occurred.

(e) REFERENCES.—References relating to the Minerals Management Service in statutes, Executive orders, rules, regulations, directives, or delegations of authority that precede the effective date of this Act are deemed to refer, as appropriate, to the Department, to its officers, employees, or agents, or to its corresponding organizational units or functions. Statutory reporting requirements that applied in relation to the Minerals Management Service immediately before the effective date of this Act shall continue to apply.

SEC. 407. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE PAY RATES.

(a) UNDER SECRETARY FOR ENERGY, LANDS, AND MINERALS.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to ''Under Secretaries of the Treasury (3).'' the following:

''Under Secretary for Energy, Lands, and Minerals, Department of the Interior.''.

(b) ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (6).'' and inserting the following:

''Assistant Secretaries, Department of the Interior (7).''.

(c) DIRECTORS.—Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.'' and inserting the following new items:

''Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy, Department of the Interior.

''Director, Ocean Energy Safety Service, Department of the Interior.

''Director, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior.''.

SEC. 408. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF ENERGY SAFETY ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish, under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, an Outer Continental Shelf Energy Safety Advisory Board (referred to in this section as the ''Board'')—

(1) to provide the Secretary and the Directors established by this Act with independent scientific and technical advice on safe, responsible, and timely mineral and renewable energy exploration, development, and production activities; and

(2) to review operations of the National Offshore Energy Health and Safety Academy established under section 403(d), including submitting to the Secretary recommendations of curriculum to ensure training scientific and technical advancements.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) SIZE.—The Board shall consist of not more than 11 members, who—

(A) shall be appointed by the Secretary based on their expertise in oil and gas drilling, well design, operations, well containment and oil spill response; and

(B) must have significant scientific, engineering, management, and other credentials and a history of working in the field related to safe energy exploration, development, and production activities.

(2) CONSULTATION AND NOMINATIONS.—The Secretary shall consult with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering to identify potential candidates for the Board and shall take nominations from the public.

(3) TERM.—The Secretary shall appoint Board members to staggered terms of not more than 4 years, and shall not appoint a member for more than 2 consecutive terms.

(4) BALANCE.—In appointing members to the Board, the Secretary shall ensure a balanced representation of industry and research interests.

(c) CHAIR.—The Secretary shall appoint the Chair for the Board from among its members.

(d) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet not less than 3 times per year and shall host, at least once per year, a public forum to review and assess the overall energy safety performance of Outer Continental Shelf mineral and renewable energy resource activities.

(e) OFFSHORE DRILLING SAFETY ASSESSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—As part of its duties under this section, the Board shall, by not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section and every 5 years thereafter, submit to the Secretary a report that—

(1) assesses offshore oil and gas well control technologies, practices, voluntary standards, and regulations in the United States and elsewhere; and

(2) as appropriate, recommends modifications to the regulations issued under this Act to ensure adequate protection of safety and the environment, including recommendations on how to reduce regulations and administrative actions that are duplicative or unnecessary.

(f) REPORTS.—Reports of the Board shall be submitted by the Board to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House or Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and made available to the public in electronically accessible form.

(g) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Members of the Board, other than full-time employees of the Federal Government, while attending meeting of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary or the Director while serving away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government serving without pay.

SEC. 409. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF INSPECTION FEES.

Section 22 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1348) is amended by adding at the end of the section the following:

''(g) INSPECTION FEES.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall collect from the operators of facilities subject to inspection under subsection (c) non-refundable fees for such inspections—

''(A) at an aggregate level equal to the amount necessary to offset the annual expenses of inspections of outer Continental Shelf facilities (including mobile offshore drilling units) by the Department of the Interior; and

''(B) using a schedule that reflects the differences in complexity among the classes of facilities to be inspected.

''(2) OCEAN ENERGY SAFETY FUND.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the 'Ocean Energy Enforcement Fund' (referred to in this subsection as the 'Fund'), into which shall be deposited all amounts collected as fees under paragraph (1) and which shall be available as provided under paragraph (3).

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, all amounts deposited in the Fund—

''(i) shall be credited as offsetting collections;

''(ii) shall be available for expenditure for purposes of carrying out inspections of outer Continental Shelf facilities (including mobile offshore drilling units) and the administration of the inspection program under this section;

''(iii) shall be available only to the extent provided for in advance in an appropriations Act; and

''(iv) shall remain available until expended.

''(B) USE FOR FIELD OFFICES.—Not less than 75 percent of amounts in the Fund may be appropriated for use only for the respective Department of the Interior field offices where the amounts were originally assessed as fees.

''(4) INITIAL FEES.—Fees shall be established under this subsection for the fiscal year in which this subsection takes effect and the subsequent 10 years, and shall not be raised without advise and consent of the Congress, except as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate as an adjustment equal to the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index for the month of June of the calendar year preceding the adjustment exceeds the Consumer Price Index for the month of June of the calendar year in which the claim was determined or last adjusted.

''(5) ANNUAL FEES.—Annual fees shall be collected under this subsection for facilities that are above the waterline, excluding drilling rigs, and are in place at the start of the fiscal year. Fees for fiscal year 2013 shall be—

''(A) $10,500 for facilities with no wells, but with processing equipment or gathering lines;

''(B) $17,000 for facilities with 1 to 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells; and

''(C) $31,500 for facilities with more than 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells.

''(6) FEES FOR DRILLING RIGS.—Fees for drilling rigs shall be assessed under this subsection for all inspections completed in fiscal years 2013 through 2022. Fees for fiscal year 2013 shall be—

''(A) $30,500 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of 1,000 feet or more; and

''(B) $16,700 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of less than 1,000 feet.

''(7) BILLING.—The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (5) within 60 days after the date of the inspection, with payment required within 30 days of billing. The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (6) within 30 days of the end of the month in which the inspection occurred, with payment required within 30 days after billing.

''(8) SUNSET.—No fee may be collected under this subsection for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2022.

''(9) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 2013, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the operation of the Fund during the fiscal year.

''(B) CONTENTS.—Each report shall include, for the fiscal year covered by the report, the following:

''(i) A statement of the amounts deposited into the Fund.

''(ii) A description of the expenditures made from the Fund for the fiscal year, including the purpose of the expenditures and the additional hiring of personnel.

''(iii) A statement of the balance remaining in the Fund at the end of the fiscal year.

''(iv) An accounting of pace of permit approvals.

''(v) If fee increases are proposed after the initial 10-year period referred to in paragraph (5), a proper accounting of the potential adverse economic impacts such fee increases will have on offshore economic activity and overall production, conducted by the Secretary.

''(vi) Recommendations to increase the efficacy and efficiency of offshore inspections.

''(vii) Any corrective actions levied upon offshore inspectors as a result of any form of misconduct.''.

TITLE V—UNITED STATES TERRITORIES

SEC. 501. 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'';

(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.''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113–131. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. 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:

Page 3, line 8, before the period insert '', and shall include and consider all such subdivisions in any environmental review conducted and statement prepared for such program under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2))''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is in the middle of an exciting energy revolution, but we will never truly reach energy security as long as 85 percent of our offshore areas remain off limits to oil and gas manufacturers.

Chairman HASTINGS' Offshore Energy and Jobs Act on the floor today will open more offshore areas to energy development and bring our Nation closer toward the bipartisan goal of energy independence. This is a great thing.

In particular, Chairman HASTINGS' innovative bill allows State Governors to request that certain offshore areas be included in the 5-year leasing plan. This gives States more power to unlock offshore energy resources and the jobs and the affordable energy that go along with responsible offshore energy development.

I'm offering an amendment to strengthen that language based on my More Energy, More Jobs legislation recently introduced with my colleagues, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois. It will require the Interior Department to include all these areas requested by State Governors in the environmental review process for the leasing plan.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires all major Federal actions, including offshore leasing plans, to undergo an environmental review. For offshore leasing, this is an environmental impact statement. Typically, this is a 2-year process at least, and a first step for including any area in an offshore leasing plan. Without environmental impact statements, new areas can't be leased for offshore drilling.

My amendment will bring more areas into consideration for offshore energy development and move them further along in the leasing process, regardless of whether they are included in the final leasing plan.

More importantly, it will make it easier for future Congresses to pass leasing plans like the underlying bill because more offshore areas will have gone through the necessary environmental review process.

I'd like to thank Chairman HASTINGS for working with me both on this amendment and including some of our ideas in the underlying bill. With this struggling economy and our Nation in the midst of an energy revolution, now is the time to act to unleash more American-made energy and more American jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

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

I think the gentleman's amendment adds to this legislation, and we support his amendment.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, at the end of the general debate we had some creative math and/or cherry-picking of years to make a point that is not accurate.

The point is that oil production from Federal lands today is higher than it was at the end of the Bush administration—596 million barrels compared to 565 in 2008.

Now, in the offshore, when you use a certain number of years, obviously there is some anomaly. The anomaly was the worst oil spill disaster in the history of the United States, which was the Macondo blowup in the gulf, which of course set back leasing activity and development in the gulf for a period of time. However, we have now adopted new regulations. We're actually requiring blowup preventers that work and a few other sorts of things that the Obama administration has done to make the drilling safer.

Under this administration, there are now more floating rigs in the gulf than before the spill and during the Bush years; and we approved 112 Deepwater drilling permits last year—the most since 2005. Of course that drilling is being conducted more safely than it has in the past.

So, I mean, we're going to be able to switch around, pick different years, and do all of these things, but these are aggregate, longer-term numbers as opposed to specifying a particular year—and particularly picking a year after the worst oil spill rig disaster in the history of the United States.

With that, Mr. Chairman, we do not object to the amendment by Mr. BRADY, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to respond to my good friend from Oregon's statistics.

What I said is that the production is down from when the President took office. And that, of course, is true. The gentleman makes the argument that there was more production initially in the Obama administration than the Bush administration. I never argued with that. But there's a reason for it. There were more lease sales during the Bush administration, and it takes a while to get these leases producing. They started producing at the first part of the Obama administration; and since then, they have gone down because of the actions of this administration.

So my statistics are correct, and I guess his statistics are correct; but it's not the whole story. The whole story is it takes a lot of time in order to bring a lease sale into production, and that's what the gentleman overlooked.

□ 1620

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

I am ready to close whenever the ranking member is.

Mr. DEFAZIO. As I pointed out earlier in the debate, yes, the chairman is correct, it does take time, and there are 5,484 leases, 30 million acres, mostly about 85 percent in the Gulf of Mexico, that have an estimated, according to the Energy Information Administration, 18 billion barrels of oil and 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that have not yet been developed.

In any case, I do not oppose the gentleman's amendment. He makes a small improvement in what we consider to be a bad bill by requiring that if States opt into leasing, that there will be a NEPA review. I'm glad that there is some recognition on the other side of the aisle on the value of NEPA reviews to protect our precious natural resources.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a commonsense amendment that helps us responsibly develop our traditional energy sources for more jobs, more revenue to help balance this budget, and more affordable energy for America.

I urge my colleagues' support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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:

Page 11, beginning at line 3, strike section 204.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Today, I am offering an amendment to H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. I want to thank my colleagues, Representatives GERRY CONNOLLY and JIM MORAN, for working with me to bring this amendment to the floor.

This amendment strikes section 204 of the underlying bill. Section 204 seeks to limit the ability to conduct a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement, EIS. Given our experience with devastating oil spills such as the BP spill, the Exxon Valdez, and a spill off the coast of Santa Barbara, we should be improving our review processes and strengthening safety requirements.

The combination of reduced resources and shortened timeframes that are mandated by the bill, as well as the expanse of area to be addressed, make the task of preparing a credible EIS difficult, if not impossible.

With these demanding schedules provided by section 204, what information is compelling Congress to seek such swift approval? Oil production, as has been said, is at a 20-year high and natural gas production is also at an all-time high. Furthermore, under President Obama's leadership, our dependence on foreign oil has fallen from 57 percent to 36 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to the American people to pass legislation that will serve them. Section 204 limits the environmental review to provide for less rigor than a typical review process, which can create huge environmental and economic risks.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I generally do not rise to vote or argue against a Hastings amendment, but in this case I feel I have to. It is the nature of who the author of the amendment is, perhaps, and I think the gentleman understands.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prioritizes bureaucracy over responsibly increasing energy production. The amendment, as the gentleman noted, would strike a section of the bill, but that bill, that section, requires an Environmental Impact Statement to be conducted prior to any leasing in any lease sale areas.

The gentleman takes issue in the manner in which the Environmental Impact Statement is required to be conducted. However, what he fails to mention is that the administration is required to do yet another environmental review prior to each lease sale and additional reviews on each lease block as part of the leasing process. Then each expiration plan has additional environmental work.

In effect, all of the areas in the underlying bill will be studied and then restudied for the effect that any activity will have on the environment.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but all of these lease sales will be subject to the many different laws that still impact the offshore leasing process, such as the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Fishing Enhancement Act, just to name a few.

The truth of the matter is that this bill doesn't harm the environment; it goes the extra mile in requiring a multi-sale EIS on all of the lease areas, while still ensuring that leasing does occur because of the certainty in the process.

Support for offshore energy does not mean that you cannot respect a wide range of different environmental needs based upon a lease area.

We want to drill safely and responsibly. I think that is embodied in the underlying bill. For that reason, I urge rejection of the Hastings amendment, the Hastings of Florida amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, would you be kind enough to tell me how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the cosponsor of this amendment and good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, maybe Mr. HASTINGS of Washington would be more comfortable calling it the Hastings-Connolly amendment, so that a Virginia name might make him feel more comfortable.

Mr. Chairman, have we already forgotten the consequences of lax regulation? I know the gulf coast hasn't. For many Americans, the image of more than 200 million gallons of oil spilling into the gulf, an area of oil spill and oil slick that if superimposed in this region would have gone from my district in northern Virginia all the way to New York City. It threatened America's largest fishery, jeopardizing tourism, wreaking havoc with the region's entire economy.

Sadly, the magnitude of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill might have been mitigated had BP and Transocean simply been required to do what this amendment requires—to comply with the basic environmental standards established to prevent such disasters from happening in the first place. Yet here we are 3 years later, and this Congress still has not taken a single action to improve drilling safety because the House majority has blocked every attempt. Now they want to make matters worse by gutting NEPA protections.

I am pleased to join my colleague in offering a commonsense amendment to preserve NEPA protections, and at least some modicum of impartiality in this attempt to legislate the majority's motto of ''drill, baby, drill'' everywhere.

Considering that all other major projects, even transit projects, with clear environmental benefits must undergo an Environmental Impact Statement, it is absurd to exclude from analysis activities that have the potential to destroy entire economies and ecosystems. For example, why is it that northern Virginia's Rail to Dulles project, a public project I oversaw, had to go through an extensive full 2-year environmental review, yet a privately-owned oil rig in the gulf was exempted from that same process? It makes no sense.

The BP spill was preventable, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, gulf coast residents will pay that price for that poor decision to waive an environmental review for decades to come as we continue to clean up the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history.

Let's not allow that to happen. Let's support this amendment.

□ 1630

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the impacts of a major oil spill off Florida's coast would be devastating to tourism, travel to nearby beaches, mangroves, and wildlife. This is a truncated process and wrong.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, what this bill does could have very serious consequences to Virginia's economy. By looking at multiple sales, you lose sight potentially of the harmful impact of individual parcels.

For example, drilling the close-in parcels could have a very adverse impact to the tourism industry in Virginia Beach. Other parcels would affect the absolutely essential shipping channels to Baltimore and Hampton Roads. Opening up other parts of Virginia's waters would have a very serious and consequential impact upon the ability of the Navy to use that area off Virginia's shores. Other parcels would have an adverse impact upon the fishing industry.

So what we are suggesting is to look specifically at these individual parcels. If you look at the entire broad scope of these sales, you're going to lose sight of some of the most serious adverse consequences.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting debate just simply on this amendment because I would point out to my colleagues that there has been a lot of reference on the floor today about the Senate's doing something or not doing something. I would just remind my colleagues that their Senators, both of whom are Democrats, support drilling off the Virginia coast. I've found out, too, that their candidate for Governor has switched his position now and that he, too, supports drilling off the coast of Virginia. So I can say here today, I think very honestly, that there is bipartisan support for drilling off the coast of Virginia.

Finally, I want to address the point that my good friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) made about no safety. I will just refer him to title IV in this legislation. If his concern is on not having safety and updating rules because of oil spills, then he should support this legislation, because title IV does that through the reorganization process.

So, Mr. Chairman, it hurts me to say vote ''no'' on a Hastings amendment, but I will in this case for the arguments that I made a moment ago. We simply don't need it because of all of the environmental reviews you have to go through on lease sales.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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:

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 104. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the issuance of a lease under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) to any person designated for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to—

(1) the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability and Divestiture Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.), the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a), or the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.);

(2) Executive Order 13622 (July 30, 2012), Executive Order 13628 (October 9, 2012), or Executive Order 13645 (June 3, 2013);

(3) Executive Order 13224 (September 23, 2001) or Executive Order 13338 (May 11, 2004); or

(4) the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, this straightforward amendment ensures that the Interior Department will not allow leases under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to go to any person currently subject to sanctions by the U.S. Government under existing Federal laws. This amendment will ensure that no company can benefit from today's legislation if it helps prop up oppressive and destabilizing regimes, such as Iran or Syria.

With the threat from Iran continuing to grow, it is vital that Congress respond with prudent and effective action. We must continue to isolate Iran, promote stability in the Middle East, and protect Israel. Growing our own domestic energy resources is an important part of further isolating Iran. My amendment ensures that we do not inadvertently or indirectly support the Iranian regime while opening American sources of energy. Iran is an existential threat to our best ally in the region, Israel; and it is a state sponsor of terrorism in addition to Iran's relentless pursuit of nuclear weapons and the abuse it directs to its own citizens.

With regard to Syria, existing sanctions are already helping increase the pressure on President Assad's regime. Thanks to the sanctions, Syrian oil production has decreased as companies have cut ties with the government and exited the country. Despite this pressure, more action is needed. This amendment is a responsible next step to ensure that nothing in this bill will empower President Assad's continuing war against the Syrian people.

The United States should not be rewarding companies that are currently subject to sanctions by the U.S. Government. We must ensure that none of the profit derived from today's legislation will prop up nations that would harm our national security interests or those of our ally, Israel. Israel has a hard enough time surviving in a dangerous neighborhood without letting it get any worse.

With both the Iranian and Syrian regimes threatening our allies in the Middle East and with Iran's proxy, Hezbollah, now directly involved in the fighting in Syria, I believe that Congress must show its unity in the protection of our good friend Israel and with the people of Syria.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I think the gentleman's amendment adds a great deal to this legislation, and I support your amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman for that and for his leadership on the entire bill.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this simple amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. At the beginning of the consideration of this bill, I talked about how this was a little bit of ''Groundhog Day'' because all or parts of this bill passed in the last Congress five times. Now the gentleman is kind of disproving my theory because, well, I guess, at the very end of the movie, they broke out of the ''Groundhog Day'' cycle's being repetitive; but the gentleman is actually breaking us out of the cycle.

Actually, last year, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), a Democrat, offered this identical amendment for sanctions to one of the many offshore oil drilling bills passed by the Republicans in the last Congress. On that day, which was the 25th of July 2012—almost a year ago today—I would note, on an amendment that does exactly what this amendment does, which we think is extraordinarily meritorious, that every Republican voted no—N-O. That would, of course, include Mr. LAMBORN and the esteemed chairman, Mr. HASTINGS.

So I'm not sure what has changed in the last year. Perhaps they just opposed it the last time because a Democrat was offering it and because the principle and the danger posed by businesses operating in these countries which are hostile to the United States of America wasn't worth dealing with when you could beat a Democratic amendment. I don't know. Maybe there has been a new realization on the other side of the aisle of the dangers of Iran and Syria since that time. Again, I don't know.

Not one Republican Member of the House voted in favor of this amendment 1 year ago despite the fact that the esteemed gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) offered it as a motion to recommit on a bill. It could be because Republicans lockstep oppose motions to recommit or Democratic amendments, even if they have merit, just to make some sort of a perverse point.

We support this amendment today, as Democrats did last year, and perhaps all of the Republicans will change their positions this year, and it will be a unanimous vote.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to receiving the vote of the ranking member. I suppose that means he is in favor of this amendment, so I appreciate and applaud that.

This is very similar to the amendment last year, though it is not identical as you stated. It is very similar, and this is an example that we can work together in a bipartisan way to commonly work together on good ideas. Motions to recommit, as I will remind you, do sometimes throw up a procedural roadblock that delay the progress of a bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1640

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding as I want to make this point.

Existing law already exists as it relates to sanctions with the countries we're talking about, but I think it is very important, since we're talking about a national commodity, that we reemphasize—and that's really what the gentleman's amendment does, it reemphasizes what is already on the books. I think that needs to be done, especially right now with the volatility that we see in the Middle East.

So I think the gentleman's amendment, as I stated, makes a great deal of sense. I support it, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LAMBORN. As I reclaim my time, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The gentleman would have been accurate had the motion to recommit been worded ''promptly,'' but it was worded ''forthwith,'' so it would only have delayed the bill by a total of 10 minutes or 15 minutes, however long the next vote was set for. It would not have sent the bill back to committee, and it would not have disrupted the movement of the legislation. So that part of the statement is not accurate and not a good explanation for why the Republicans uniformly opposed this excellent policy last year, even if it is, as the chairman says, reemphasizing existing law.

We happen to think it's a really great existing law, and we wanted to make that point last year. Your side didn't. I'm glad that you've come around on looking at the companies that do business in Iran and Syria as serious threats to the United States and are going to essentially support the amendment that we offered last year, which you opposed.

That's the best I can do, Mr. Chairman. Sometimes we change our minds around here. We haven't. All the Democrats, I expect, will vote in favor of this amendment, as they did last time. Apparently now, most or all Republicans will vote. That is a privilege we have around here, to change our minds. I just wish they had opposed it on better grounds last time rather than saying, well, it would have delayed the bill by 15 minutes.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I do look forward and appreciate the gentleman across the aisle's support of this amendment, and I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. I urge everyone's support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

Mr. FLORES. 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:

At the end of title IV add the following:

SEC. 410. PROHIBITION ON ACTION BASED ON NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY DEVELOPED UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 13547.

(a) PROHIBITION.—The Bureau of Ocean Energy and the Ocean Energy Safety Service may not develop, propose, finalize, administer, or implement, any limitation on activities under their jurisdiction as a result of the coastal and marine spatial planning component of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

(b) REPORT ON EXPENDITURES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate identifying all Federal expenditures in fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013, by the Bureau of Ocean Energy and the Ocean Energy Safety Service and their predecessor agencies, by agency, account, and any pertinent subaccounts, for the development, administration, or implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning component of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547, including staff time, travel, and other related expenses.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment. It basically says that it prohibits the offshore agencies of the Interior Department from imposing ocean zoning related to the Obama administration's continued attempts to establish the National Ocean Policy under Executive Order 13547 without congressional authorization.

It also requires the administration to submit a report to Congress identifying expenditures for fiscal years 2011 through 2013 by the Bureau of Ocean Energy, the Ocean Energy Safety Service, and their predecessor agencies.

Just as a little background, Executive Order 13547 was signed in 2010, and it requires that various bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof. This essentially means that a drop of rain that falls on your house could be subject to this overreaching policy because that drop of rain will ultimately wind up in the ocean.

There are concerns that have been raised recently that the National Ocean Policy may not only restrict ocean and inland activities, but it may also have a problem because it has not been given any specific appropriations by this Congress. We have had hearings on this in the Natural Resources Committee, and no agency has told us from which source they're getting the funding for this initiative.

As you can see in chart 1, this light green area shows the area that's covered under ocean zoning. As you can see, that covers a lot more than the blue areas that represent the ocean. There are 26 States just in the Mississippi watershed that would be affected by this executive order.

If we go to chart 2, you can see that the executive order creates a huge new bureaucracy at a time when we're trying to make government smaller, more efficient, and less intrusive. There are 63 agencies involved, as we see on the next chart, in this effort to try to zone the oceans. This looks like more than a planning exercise at this point.

Let me say that you're going to hear from the other side something that says planning is good. Yeah, planning may be good. Planning with the intent to regulate or a backdoor regulation or backdoor rulemaking is not, because here is what the executive order states on its face. It says:

> All executive departments, agencies, and offices that are members of the council and any other executive department, agency, or office whose actions affect the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes shall, to the fullest extent consistent with applicable law . . . comply with council certified coastal and marine spatial plans.

That means all these folks are going to have something to say on how we move forward.

This is a very simple amendment, and it was so simple that we offered it as a limitation amendment for the FY13 CJS appropriations bill, and it passed on a bipartisan vote of 246–174.

Let me close by saying that we're not plowing new ground here. This has already been approved in the CJS appropriations bill from last year. This amendment does not stop any existing statute, any existing rule, or any existing regulation. For instance, you may hear that it stops the Rigs-to-Reefs program. That is totally false. It does not get in the way of any existing program.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLORES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

The gentleman knows that I have the same concerns he has on this executive order, and I think his amendment adds a great deal to this bill, and I support his amendment.

Mr. FLORES. Reclaiming my time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in adamant opposition.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. This amendment would prohibit the Department of the Interior offshore agencies from using voluntary and commonsense planning as part of the National Ocean Policy to inform decisions they make under existing laws.

It's interesting that the National Ocean Industries Association, which represents offshore energy developers of many kinds, yesterday noted:

> This is a great example of the progress that can be made when industry and regulating agencies communicate with each other. It's gratifying to see government and an industry come together to cooperatively and responsibly address these complex and important environmental issues.

And the gentleman's amendment would bring that program to a halt, which obviously the industry actually seems to think is useful.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I think the gentleman might be well intended with his thought of what this amendment does, but it's exactly the opposite of what the industry wants.

The gentleman is a relatively new Member to Congress and does not represent a coastal area in his district. But if he were here during the nineties and early 2000, the reason we have a National Ocean Policy is because Congress set up a commission to study the conflicts of the sea brought to us by users of the ocean. That was the petroleum industry. That was the fishing industry. They were in conflict.

We had one agency saying, You can drill for oil, and others were saying, No, those are protected fishing grounds. Crab pots were being swept up by seismic boats going out and looking for oil and other geological issues. We had the Navy not corresponding with buoys. We had just tons of conflicts all within our 200-mile ocean exclusive economic zone, and the industry begged for some kind of collaboration of getting together.

□ 1650

Congress put together a commission; and on that commission Lawrence Dickerson, who was Diamond Offshore, chairman of the International Association of Drilling Contractors and chairman of the National Ocean Industries Association, was appointed by President Bush to sit on that commission. The recommendations of that commission, a commission that Congress created, were to create a national ocean policy. Congress actually introduced bills. The bills were introduced by Republican Members. Congressman Jim Greenwood carried the bill. Others carried the bill. The Resources Committee would never even give them a hearing. Admiral Watkins was chair of the committee, who was first President Bush's Energy Secretary, and also former CNO. All of these Republicans were asking for a national ocean policy.

Now we have it, and the gentleman says let's ignore it, let's ignore it. Let's not allow it to even be involved. This is a setback. If you want to absolutely have fast track in permitting, then do it under planning. That's the way we plan for our military with the quadrennial review. There isn't anything—health plans. Everything we do, transportation plans, you name it, it's around a big plan. We don't spend any money until the plan is in place.

Now we are in the process of having that plan, which the industry supports, and the gentleman wants to say, no, don't do anything, ignore it. You bring us back to conflicts at sea. You bring back regulatory fights. If you want to delay decisionmaking, then don't have a plan like we have.

This amendment destroys the ability to get the job done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The Chair would note that the gentleman does not have the right to close.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I am a newcomer to Congress, but the reason I'm a newcomer to Congress is because before I did this, I had 30 years of experience working offshore. So I have firsthand experience with this. Twenty years of that, it was as a sea level officer for different companies that operated offshore.

Congress studied this issue for 10 years, and took no action. What does that tell us? That means the intent of Congress is to have no statute or regulation to zone the oceans. So the gentleman's issue is a little off base here. And just to make sure we correct the statement about what NOIA said, here's what they're putting out today:

> NOIA staunchly supports the good work that Congressman FLORES has done and continues to do to fight back this ill-conceived national ocean policy, and stands in strong support of the Flores amendment on the House floor today.

I want to remind everybody I have this list of folks that support this. This is the fishing industry, both commercial and recreational. It's agriculture. It's home builders. It's the energy industry. We're not trying to stop a niche problem.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my colleagues that the national ocean policy is the recommendation of a commission that we created, bipartisan commission, appointed by President Bush, to recommend how we might avoid the conflicts of sea. The national ocean policy is that, to have a policy so that when we do activities in the ocean, we know whether those activities are consistent with a policy.

I think the gentleman is completely wrong in thinking that disrupting that policy planning is going to get a faster and more equitable way of drilling for oil. I think he's totally wrong in that, and the administration would probably veto the bill if it's in there. I don't think that it is an amendment that's going to do good. I think it's going to do harm, and I would oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

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

Mr. FARR. I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5, as modified, printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ___—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ___. 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) shall be applied by substituting ''2023, and shall not exceed $999,999,999 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2055'' for ''2055''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, in 2006 Congress passed the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, or GOMESA. This legislation for the first time allowed States to share in revenues generated from offshore drilling. GOMESA provided 37.5 percent of revenue to the Gulf States, to begin in the year 2017, but arbitrarily placed a $500 million cap on the collectively shared revenue.

Conversely, the Mineral Leasing Act requires the Federal Government to allocate 50 percent of the energy revenue generated on Federal lands to interior States in which the revenue is generated without an annual cap.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It simply moves offshore royalty sharing more in line with the benefit onshore interior States experience by moving the GOMESA cap from $500 million to $1 billion. This would begin 10 years from now. It's almost $1 billion, just short of $1 billion.

My amendment does not impact onshore producing States. If your State is receiving revenue sharing from onshore, my amendment does nothing to change that. It just moves Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, and Alabama a little bit closer to parity. You can look at this graph right here, and you can see that this graph shows that interior States are receiving 50 percent with no dollar cap. Gulf States, less a percentage and with a cap. And all other States have the same percent with no cap.

The House has previously passed a similar version of this amendment twice: once in the PIONEER Act and second on the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, both last year, overwhelmingly with bipartisan support. In fact, the House laid the groundwork for this with the landmark passage of the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act of 2006. This was the first offshore revenue-sharing bill to pass a congressional Chamber, and it did not include an arbitrary cap.

So I ask my colleagues, if you're worried about rising energy prices, I'd recommend a ''yes'' vote on this amendment. Thirty percent of the Nation's energy comes off the gulf coast. If you're interested in treating Gulf Coast States equally, the way we treat onshore drilling in Federal lands for inland States, I also recommend a ''yes.'' And if you're interested in the environment, let me just make the case here that by the Louisiana Constitution, 100 percent of the Federal tax revenue that comes from this will go to coastal restoration. That is important to us because every place you see red is a place where we will lose in Louisiana land over the next 50 years. And where you see red, I see families. I see families and businesses which will no longer exist unless we do something proactively to restore those lands.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to tell the gentleman that I support his amendment. I think it adds a great deal to this legislation, and I commend him for it.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his amendment. I think it is the right thing. I thing the Gulf Coast States are treated unfairly with the cap. This raises the cap. It's the right thing.

I was talking with a gentleman from an ACC school—I know you're an LSU guy—but he was from Virginia Tech. He said, Go Hokies. I didn't like that, but he understands that Louisiana is treated unfairly when you compare to what is going on in Wyoming where they got a billion dollars last year in revenue.

My State of South Carolina is included in this bill, and they want the revenue-sharing as well. It is the right thing for the States that help produce America's energy. So I commend the gentleman. Let's raise that cap, and let's treat those Gulf Coast States fairly because they are the producers of American energy. And so I commend the gentleman.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition because I can't believe—I am kind of excited that you want to get more money—but I can't believe the Republicans are suggesting that the Treasury of the United States ought to be robbed of another $11 billion that goes to deficit reduction so it can be spent on the Gulf States because in legislation we just passed we give the Gulf States something no other States get: we give them in law now $150 billion over the next 60 years in revenue earmarked for the Gulf States. And what this amendment says is that's not enough; we want $11 billion more. What gall.

□ 1700

Most of us, if we were doing this, would be accused of doing an earmark. And certainly you don't do earmarks anymore in the House of Representatives. So what is it that $150 billion isn't enough for four States and you need, now, before you even have spent that money, to put into law another $11 billion?

Could you answer that question?

Mr. CASSIDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. No, you have the time. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. FARR. I will yield to the gentleman for a question. Explain to me what is broken that needs $11 billion more, right now, with the $150 billion that you've already been given, or will be given.

Mr. CASSIDY. This is what is broken. This is our coastline, which is melting away. This is what increases our risk. We've lost a land mass equal to Rhode Island in Louisiana.

Now, the money that is received, our share will go to this, but it is not adequate to rebuild this coastline. And the other thing which is broken is—

Mr. FARR. You've lost the coastline why?

Mr. CASSIDY. Because we channeled the Mississippi in order to create navigational services for the rest of the inland nation. And so as you channel that Mississippi, the wetlands lost the nourishing sediment that comes to them.

Mr. FARR. And those are the States that have also instate waters and onshore and offshore drilling?

Mr. CASSIDY. Yes, we do have onshore and offshore drilling, absolutely.

Mr. FARR. Which are very lucrative revenues for the State.

Mr. CASSIDY. If we want to speak about lucrative revenue, all I ask is to have the same deal that every other State has. No, I don't even ask for the same deal that every other State has, because every other State, if they're interior, gets 50 percent of the revenue.

Other coastal States, for example, California, have no cap on the amount

of royalty sharing that they may have with the Federal Government. It is only in the gulf coast that there is a cap.

Now, if you want to have the same deal for our State that other States have, I would love to have the 50 percent that Wyoming has.

Mr. FARR. That's onshore, not offshore. We actually have caps with offshore, and we have banned further offshore drilling, both State and Federal waters.

Mr. CASSIDY. Well, if you decide to cut off your economic nose to spite your face, I can't help that.

Mr. FARR. The Republicans have been very big on deficit reduction and very much against earmarks. And now, with this amendment you're proposing it seems to fly in the face of the policy of your own party that you want to take out of the Treasury $11 billion that could be applied to deficit reduction and give it to the Gulf States, which already have $150 billion over the next—in revenue coming to you, earmarked for you. That is far more than California or other States.

Mr. CASSIDY. If I may say, I admire your verbal sleight-of-hand because never in the past has royalty sharing been considered earmarks. But if now we're going to start considering royalty sharing earmarks, heck, let's go back and look at every State. But that is, again, a verbal sleight-of-hand. That is not under the definition of an earmark, and I think the gentleman knows that.

Mr. FARR. Well, I'm on the Appropriations Committee, and if this were brought up in the Appropriations Committee, it certainly would be an earmark. And it is a process that should be in the appropriations process and not added to this bill, where you create an $11 million earmark for four Gulf States.

Mr. CASSIDY. Assuming that the gentleman continues to yield to me, I would say, in that case, we need to go back to every State which has a better royalty sharing arrangement with the Federal Government than we and ask to reconsider that.

We're not even asking to have the 50 percent on the inland or the no cap on the other coastal States. We're just asking that you raise the cap and keep our revenue sharing royalty percent at the same lower level than it is on the inland. Now, I don't know why we're being singled out when those other States do so well.

Mr. FARR. Well, I think the chair of your committee, Mr. HASTINGS, who knows this, that only about 40 percent of the money that comes in for the Land and Water Conservation account, of the revenue that comes from the offshore drilling, only 40 percent of it is given back to the States for land and water conservation purposes. That other 60 amount just goes into the Treasury. That's where this money goes, and what you're doing is getting something that none of the other States have.

If we want to revise the percentage of money that goes into the Land and Water Conservation Fund, I'm all for that.

Mr. CASSIDY. So, when I spoke to someone from Wyoming today, she goes, Oh, you're only getting 37.5? Wyoming gets 48 percent.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman from Louisiana yield to me for 15 seconds?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I just want to point out, the gentleman, my good friend from California, is talking about revenue loss.

I just want to make this point: the CBO says this legislation will create $1.5 billion to the Federal Government.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CASSIDY. How much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) for yielding and for bringing this amendment. I think it's important to point out that this was an arbitrary cap that was put in place based on problems that were really created in the 1950s when initial revenue sharing was done.

For whatever reason, there are various reasons, one State was singled out to not be able to participate in revenue sharing. It just so happens to be the State that produced about 30 percent of the offshore oil and gas. All we're asking for is a little bit closer to fairness.

This amendment's a really important step in the right direction and continues the concept that we've always promoted: to allow States that do participate in producing American energy to also participate in the revenue that's produced to the Federal Treasury. It's an incentive to continue to encourage that kind of American energy exploration.

I support the amendment.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I'll just close by saying—and I'm not sure I understand the logic of my friend on the other side of the aisle—apparently, this is going to increase our Federal revenue by $1.5 billion. But more importantly, it generates dollars for the State of Louisiana to preserve these, the homes of these families. This allows revenue that has been from our Outer Continental Shelf to come back to preserve this coastline, these families, and these businesses to remain in existence. And that's what this is really about, equity, increased revenue for the Federal Government, and families in Louisiana being able to preserve their existence.

I urge support for our amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

Mr. CASSIDY. 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:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ____. RULES REGARDING DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES UNDER GULF OF MEXICO ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2006.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue rules to provide more clarity, certainty, and stability to the revenue streams contemplated by the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note).

(b) CONTENTS.—The rules shall include clarification of the timing and methods of disbursements of funds under section 105(b)(2) of such Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply stipulates that no later than 60 days after the enactment of H.R. 2231, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue rules to provide clarity, certainty, and stability to the revenue streams we just discussed that were created by GOMESA of 2006.

This Federal law allows the State to use this money for the restoration of coastal areas and the mitigation of damage to natural resources. However, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, formerly MMS, has yet to issue the necessary rules and regulations.

In 2009, a letter signed by the Governors of Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas asked for these rules to be published and recommendations incorporated. It's now 2013, over 6 years since Congress passed in 2006, and the rules have still not been published. The lack of clarity in this phase 2 implementation of GOMESA impedes the ability of Gulf States and eligible coastal political subdivisions to conduct and achieve the planning efforts needed to maximize coastal protection.

It's long overdue for these rules to be published. The amendment is simple. It just directs it to do so. I move for approval of the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSIDY. I yield to the gentleman.

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

I think his amendment again adds a great deal to this legislation. I support the amendment.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, we do not oppose this amendment at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–131.

Mr. RIGELL. 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:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ___MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ___. SEISMIC TESTING IN THE ATLANTIC OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.

Not later than December 31, 2013, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management shall publish a record of decision on the Atlantic G&G Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. RIGELL. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 2231, which requires the administration to complete its Atlantic Environmental Impact Statement by December 31 of this year, which will pave the way for us to calculate new estimates of the tremendous energy potential that's off our shores.

□ 1710

It's been 30 years since geological and geophysical studies, including seismic studies, have been conducted in Atlantic waters. Those studies used outdated technology, and our current estimates for the energy that is out there are surely inaccurate. And I believe they're low. For example, we collected five times more oil from the Gulf of Mexico than the government estimated to be there in 1983. The study also will allow us to move forward with a critical component of renewable energy—and that's wind.

So for all those reasons, the administration must stay on track here and issue its long-awaited environmental impact statement—and do that on time. And that's what my amendment ensures happens. It should move forward with energy production and, most importantly, job creation, using the best science available.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I think the gentleman's amendment makes a great deal of sense. We've had discussions in our committee on the accuracy of the data.

The point is that this legislation says that one ought to drill where the resources are. And the gentleman's amendment, I think, goes a long way in that direction. I commend him for that and support it.

Mr. RIGELL. I thank the chairman for your leadership on this bill.

I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. I rise in support of the gentleman from Virginia's amendment that sets a deadline for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to complete an environmental review to allow offshore Atlantic seismic studies to go forward. I have joined 42 bipartisan House colleagues urging President Obama to move quickly to complete the environmental analysis.

Unfortunately, the Department of Interior is well over a year behind in completing its work. As you know, delays continue to prevent the creation of thousands of good-paying jobs and around $19.5 billion in Federal, State, and local revenue.

I'm glad to join with Chairman HASTINGS in support of the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. These measures are important for Virginia and this Nation, supporting domestic energy security, revenue sharing, and job creation. This is about jobs, energy independence, and just plain, old common sense. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and this important energy bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2013.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
President of the United States of America, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge that your Administration act to diligently complete the long-delayed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the conduct of a safe, environmentally protective seismic assessment of the oil and natural gas resources offshore the Atlantic outer continental shelf (OCS). The gathering of such information represents a critical step toward making science-based decisions with regard to any future commercial or recreational activities in the federal waters off our Atlantic coastline that could provide the nation much needed energy, economic, and environmental benefits.

It has been nearly two generations since seismic testing was last conducted along our eastern seaboard. Since that time, technological advancements have rendered those previous findings nearly irrelevant. For example, while 2-D imaging was restricted by certain geological characteristics, today's 3-D and 4-D imaging techniques allow us to identify resources previously unknown to exist. By relying solely on outdated technology and information, we are blindly assessing offshore resource potential and making uninformed decisions without the benefit of sound science. To further illustrate this point, in 1987 the Minerals Management Service estimated that there were 9.57 billion barrels of oil within the Gulf of Mexico. In 2011, with more recent seismic data and exploration, they adjusted that estimate to 48.4 billion barrels of oil—roughly a 500% increase.

Contrary to the hyperbolic comments of many opposed to this simple information-gathering process, history tells us it can be done safely with great deference to our valuable ocean ecosystems. Industry employs a number of effective mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts to wildlife in the seismic survey areas such as ramping up the sound levels to allow animals to leave the area before the full survey begins and placing marine mammal observers onboard the survey vessel to shut down the survey if an animal is spotted in the vicinity. Industry has been performing seismic surveys around the world, including the Gulf of Mexico, for decades and there has never been a documented case where use of an air gun to perform a seismic survey has caused the death of an animal. Similarly, a report by the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council stated that "No scientific studies have conclusively demonstrated a link between exposure to sound and adverse effects on a marine mammal population." It is past time to continue your Administration's efforts to safely accumulate this information using modern technology.

As you know, the Department of the Interior (DOI) held an initial scoping meeting on their EIS for Atlantic OCS seismic in April 2010. Previous to that in 2009, the FY 2010 House Interior Appropriations bill instructed DOI to indicate their expected timeline for completion of the EIS. DOI's response in February 2010 indicated a Final EIS being issued in April 2012. With nearly a full year having passed beyond this target date, we would urge the swift completion of this environmental analysis so that the many seismic permits already submitted to DOI may be properly considered, along with any future applications.

Finally, in order to ensure a viable market for Atlantic seismic data, we also urge your reconsideration of current policies prohibiting any new oil and gas leasing in the Atlantic OCS. Only the prospect of future leasing provides proper market incentive to make the significant investments needed to obtain this data.

We thank you for your consideration and hope to quickly move forward on Atlantic seismic testing to enable a science-based decision making process with regard to OCS access.

Sincerely,

Jeff Duncan; Doc Hastings; John Fleming; Steve Scalise; Joe Wilson, Morgan Griffith; Robert Wittman; Doug Lamborn; Rob Bishop; Tom Graves; Randy Forbes; Paul Broun.

Mick Mulvaney; Virginia Foxx; Robert Hurt; Tom Rooney; Frank Wolf; Richard Hudson; Trey Gowdy; Glenn Thompson; Tom Rice; Renee Ellmers; Scott Rigell; Bob Goodlatte; Mark Meadows; Robert Pittenger; Lynn Westmoreland; Bill Cassidy.

Cynthia Lummis; Michael Conaway; Steve Stivers; Kevin Cramer; Henry

Cuellar; Gene Green; Blake Farenthold; Bill Flores; Chris Stewart; Mark Amodei; Tim Huelskamp; Charles Boustany; Bill Johnson; Andy Harris.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2013.

Hon. ROBERT WITTMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WITTMAN: Thank you for your letter dated March 21, 2013, to President Barack Obama expressing your support for the completion of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to evaluate potential effects of multiple geological and geophysical (G&G) activities in the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). President Obama has asked me to respond. A similar letter is being sent to each co-signer of your letter.

We share your commitment to ensuring that our resource management decisions are based on the best available science. To that end, the information developed from the PEIS will help guide future decision making regarding the resources available on the Atlantic Coast OCS as well as the social, economic, and environmental impacts of developing those resources.

The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) is in the process of preparing a PEIS under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate potential effects of multiple G&G activities in these areas, including seismic surveys using air guns. BOEM was directed to develop this PEIS under the Conference Report for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.

This PEIS is part of a region-specific strategy for oil and gas exploration and development in the Mid and South Atlantic that focuses on the need to update resource information in order to inform future decisions about whether and, if so, where leasing would be appropriate in these areas. Seismic surveys and other G&G activities being evaluated in this PEIS are valuable to understanding the location, extent, and properties of hydrocarbon resources. G&G surveys are also used to identify geologic hazards, archaeological resources, and hard bottom habitats that would need to be avoided during exploration and development. A variety of G&G techniques in addition to air guns are being evaluated in the study. These techniques are also used to understand the potential to site renewable energy structures and locate marine mineral resources, such as sand and gravel used for beach and barrier island restoration.

In preparing the PEIS, BOEM uses the best available science and works with experts and other regulatory agencies, such as the National Marine Fisheries Service. BOEM has contributed close to $40 million over the last decade on groundbreaking research to better understand the potential for acoustic impacts to marine life from geophysical sound sources. The BOEM has also conducted several expert stakeholder workshops to discuss and identify information needs on acoustic impacts and reasonable measures to manage and mitigate such effects.

We appreciate your interest in potential seismic exploration in the Mid and South Atlantic OCS waters. Please be assured that completion of this important environmental review remains a high priority for us.

Sincerely,

TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU,
Acting Assistant Secretary—Land and Minerals Management.

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

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. As part of the Interior Department's 5-year plan, they are preparing to allow companies to reevaluate the potential oil and gas resources in the Mid- and South Atlantic using seismic and other testing. The Interior Department is currently going through the process of preparing a programmatic environmental impact statement for that testing because they have received nine permit requests for seismic airgun surveys. They have determined that because of the scope of interest, a programmatic EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act is needed prior to permitting any new, large-scale seismic surveys. The programmatic EIS would establish a framework for future NEPA evaluations of site-specific actions while identifying and analyzing mitigation measures for future programmatic use.

Despite the claims of the majority, Mr. Chair, the Interior Department already intends to finish the programmatic EIS by the end of this year. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management Director Beaudreau testified before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on May 16 of this year that:

> In the spring of 2012, BOEM released the draft programmatic environmental impact statement, or PEIS, for proposed geological and geophysical activities in the Mid- and South Atlantic for public comment. The completion of this PEIS is part of a region-specific strategy with respect to oil and gas exploration and development that will focus on the need to update information in order to inform future decisions on whether, and where, leasing would be appropriate. The final PEIS is expected to be published this year.

That's just what Interior said just over 1 month ago. Their intention is to finish this work by the end of this year. But if for some reason Interior needs to complete additional surveys, we should not prevent them from doing so. But that's what this amendment would do. It would potentially short-circuit the NEPA process. We should allow the Interior Department to finish its work to ensure that these activities can occur in a way that does not adversely impact the environment and not tie their hands, as the gentleman would do.

I urge defeat of this amendment that would potentially truncate a proper environmental review, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGELL. How much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

I appreciate the gentleman's argument. I certainly don't agree with it. The concern that we have—that I have personally—is that the administration's willingness to keep the tempo and the cadence of this whole process going forward is real. And if I approach this with a great sense of urgency, it's because people are hurting. We need to diversify our local economy. This bill that the underlying bill supports could create 18,000 jobs in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia alone.

I so appreciate the full support that we have, in principle, from Senators WARNER and KAINE on this very issue. This is a commonsense, common ground, overall initiative to grow revenue that we need for better roads and healthier schools in an environmentally responsible way, moving forward with coastal Virginia energy. Our Governor supports it. Our general assembly supports it. Our two U.S. Senators support it, in principle. I ran on it. And it has the support of so many different groups, including the local chapter of the NAACP, the chambers of commerce. It's just a wonderful and, frankly, diverse group of coalitions that has come together to say this is what is best for Virginia and job creation. We need to move forward with this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his arguments. And we have no problem with the underlying process. The question is, why should we truncate this process at this time when important work is now being done by the Department of Interior? We do not object to the Department of Interior going forward. The Department has said in a timely manner they will finish this this year. That is appropriate. It is not necessary at this moment to eliminate the environmental process when in fact we know it's moving forward in a fair and a judicious way. If anything comes up, we need to hear that and understand that for future oil leases.

And so I really request that we urge the defeat of this amendment and allow the proper process to go forward because we do not oppose the underlying theme of the bill but we do oppose the truncation of the process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGELL. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

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

Mr. RIGELL. I appreciate the gentleman's argument but my deep concern about the Federal government's real commitment to moving this forward is legitimate. I urge the adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. But the Federal Government does have a commitment in the Department of Interior to finish this in a timely manner. It has just been reported in the past month that they are working at this. They will finish it this year. So notwithstanding the very strong arguments of the gentleman from Virginia, we do not support truncating the environmental review process, 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 Virginia (Mr. RIGELL).

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

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

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

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. WITTMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1720

NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO SUSPEND DESIGNATION OF BANGLADESH AS A BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 502(f)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the ''1974 Act'') (19 U.S.C. 2462(f)(2)), I am providing notification of my intent to suspend the designation of Bangladesh as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program. Section 502(b)(2)(G) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(b)(2)(G)) provides that the President shall not designate any country a beneficiary developing country under the GSP if such country has not taken or is not taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights in the country (including any designated zone in that country). Section 502(d)(2) of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2462(d)(2)) provides that, after complying with the requirements of section 502(f)(2) of the 1974 Act, the President shall withdraw or suspend the designation of any country as a beneficiary developing country if, after such designation, the President determines that as the result of changed circumstances such country would be barred from designation as a beneficiary developing country under section 502(b)(2) of the 1974 Act.

Pursuant to section 502(d) of the 1974 Act, having considered the factors set forth in section 502(b)(2)(G), I have determined that it is appropriate to suspend Bangladesh's designation as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP program because it is not taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights to workers in the country.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 2013.*

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI) at 6 p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, H–232 U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 27, 2013 at 5:28 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 189.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2231.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1802

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–131 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–131 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. CASSIDY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—188

Andrews	Clay	Enyart
Barber	Cleaver	Eshoo
Beatty	Clyburn	Esty
Becerra	Cohen	Farr
Bera (CA)	Connolly	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Foster
Blumenauer	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Crowley	Fudge
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Gabbard
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Garcia
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Grayson
Bustos	DeGette	Green, Al
Butterfield	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Capps	DeLauro	Hahn
Capuano	DelBene	Hanabusa
Carney	Deutch	Hastings (FL)
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Cartwright	Doggett	Higgins
Castor (FL)	Doyle	Himes
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Hinojosa
Chu	Edwards	Holt
Cicilline	Ellison	Honda
Clarke	Engel	Horsford

Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—233

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Cárdenas
Fincher
Grijalva
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Nunes
Schiff
Smith (WA)
Young (FL)

□ 1827

Messrs. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, KING of Iowa, MARCHANT, WITTMAN, GRAVES of Missouri, SHUSTER, and GOSAR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. ANDREWS and SIRES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 295, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) 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 233, noes 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—233

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Andrews
Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney

Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Bass
Campbell
Fincher
Hartzler
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Nunes
Renacci
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1832

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 296 I was unavoidable detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 5, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) 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 238, noes 185, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—238

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—185

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Bass
Campbell
Cleaver
Fincher
Griffith (VA)
Hartzler
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Nunes
Smith (WA)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1836

So the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) 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 234, noes 191, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—234

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—191

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bass
Campbell
Fincher
Hartzler
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Nunes
Smith (WA)
Young (FL)

□ 1840

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 291 on H.R. 1613, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 292 on H.R. 1613, on Motion to Recommit, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293 on H.R. 1613, on Passage, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 294 on H.R. 1864, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, to amend title 10, United States Code, to require an Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 295 on H.R. 2231, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida Amendment No. 2, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 296 on H.R. 2231, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. FLORES of Texas Amendment No. 4, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 297 on H.R. 2231, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. CASSIDY of Louisiana Amendment No. 5, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 298 on H.R. 2231, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia Amendment No. 7, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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. MESSER) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, 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. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

STUDENT LOANS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have acted to stop Federal student loan interest rates from doubling on July 1. Our assignment is turned in, while the President and his Democrat Senate are registering an incomplete.

Yesterday, I spoke with high school and college students about our Smarter Solutions for Students Act that removes the distraction of politics from the equation and permanently settles how interest rates are set.

The President requested a solution much like ours, but his own party in the Senate refused to pass the legislation.

July 1 is coming, and students know that means interest rates will double if the President doesn't lead and the Senate doesn't act. Political procrastination is what we are seeing from the President and Senate. It is a good thing they sell Red Bull in the cafeteria, because a Senate all-nighter on student loans might require some.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Congressional Black Caucus to talk about this week's Supreme Court decision on the Voting Rights Act, which is a devastating blow to one

of our most fundamental rights, and that is the right to vote.

I was born and raised in Texas and I vividly remember the days of Jim Crow, segregation, and the poll tax. The Supreme Court decision could turn the clock back to these very, very tragic days in our American history.

It is truly tragic how the majority of the Court has simply refused to acknowledge these real threats to our voting rights and turned its back on the law that people fought and died for.

Now is the time for urgent, bipartisan congressional action. We must defend the heart and soul of this democracy.

As our drum major for justice, Dr. Martin Luther King, once said, ''Voting is the foundation stone for political action.''

I am reminded of this every year when I march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, with our great warrior, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who really sacrificed so much for justice and for freedom.

Truly, our votes are the bedrock of our democracy.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, today in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing on border security, we heard from border officials that the border is not secure, or more specifically we heard no response when we asked: Is the border secure or not? And they would not answer ''yes'' and they would not answer ''no.''

The American people have been asking for a secure border before we engage in comprehensive immigration reform for years. The fact that this administration and, quite frankly, previous administrations have not secured the border, makes it premature to address the Senate bill here in the House.

Comprehensive immigration reform must be preceded by a secure border.

□ 1850

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to right a shameful wrong committed by the Supreme Court and update the Voting Rights Act to restore an essential protection against voter discrimination.

By gutting the Voting Rights Act, the Court greatly dishonored those who fought and died to protect the rights of the disenfranchised, who continue to face pervasive voting discrimination. Recent efforts in parts of the country to impose voter ID laws, to limit access to early voting and to gerrymander districts to hinder the minority vote serve as irrefutable proof that voter discrimination remains a real threat to our democracy. The Voting Rights Act prevented discrimination in these cases, something it can't do as it exists now.

We must act immediately to fix the gaping hole in this vital protection of the right to vote. Each day that passes without a strong Voting Rights Act is another day justice is deferred. We have a moral imperative to act swiftly in a bipartisan manner to get this done. I urge my colleagues to act now.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Supreme Court made a decision that threatens the right to vote for millions of Americans.

With this misguided decision, leaders in States with a history of discrimination can proceed unimpeded with plans to obstruct the civil rights of American citizens. Whether through gerrymandering or voter ID laws, like the one in my home State of Indiana, efforts are being made to restrict the voting rights of minorities, low-income families and seniors.

I stand today to ask my colleagues in Congress to recognize the importance of preserving the right to vote for all Americans, regardless of background. As elected Representatives, we understand better than anyone that an open, equitable process is the very foundation and definition of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court called on Congress to act for the good of our country and our constituents. We must act boldly and quickly.

SAVE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

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

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask—I beg—of all of our colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to come together and save the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I wish somehow, in some way, that members of the United States Supreme Court could come and walk in my shoes. I have seen hundreds and thousands of people stand in a movable line, asked to count the numbers of bubbles in a bar of soap, the number of jellybeans in a jar. I've seen too many of my sisters and brothers denied the right to register, denied the right to vote, simply because of the color of their skin.

We've come too far. We've made too much progress, Mr. Speaker, and we cannot go back—for the vote is precious. It is almost sacred. It is the most powerful, nonviolent tool we have in a democratic society, and no one, but no one—African American, Latino, White, Asian American, Native American—should be denied the right to participate in the democratic process. So let's come together and do what we should do, and what another generation of elected officials did.

STUDENT LOAN RATES

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

Mr. BARBER. I am deeply discouraged that as we face the impending doubling of interest rates for student loans that House leadership will send us home tomorrow without a solution.

More than 7 million students, former students and their families in the United States, including more than 450,000 in my home State of Arizona, rely on these loans to help pay for college. Federal student loans are a critical tool for ensuring that educational opportunities remain open to as many Americans as possible.

Higher education is a critical economic engine for my State and for the Nation. Workers age 25 and older, with a bachelor's degree, we know, earn 63 percent more than those with a high school diploma. These differences will only increase as the world economy becomes more competitive and technologically advanced.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stay here, not go home tomorrow, but stay here and work together to prevent student loan interest rates from doubling in 4 days. D-day is July 1, and we must act now to support the aspiring young Americans to get their college educations.

BALDWIN STREET MIDDLE SCHOOL, A SCHOOL TO WATCH

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity today to do a little bragging about Baldwin Street Middle School, which came to visit me today from Hudsonville, Michigan. They came to brag about their excellence and success as being designated a School to Watch.

That's a national program that goes in and identifies middle schools around the country that are very focused on innovation and success but also on improvement. Every single day, they are going into that building as administrators and as teachers to improve, not only the students, but themselves. And I think that is what we need more of here in education in the United States. They were also very proud to know that I had a staff member, Nate Bult, who is an alumni of that middle school. They were very, very proud to see him and the success that he has been able to have.

So, again, I just want to congratulate Baldwin Street Middle School in Hudsonville, Michigan, for their dedication to the students of the Second

District and for their willingness to put the students and innovation above any of themselves as they serve our community.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Let me just say it's good to see the freshman class president from the other side at the Speaker's podium this evening.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Supreme Court struck down critical parts of the Voting Rights Act, and I, like my colleagues, am deeply disappointed in this decision.

Justice Scalia said the Voting Rights Act is a ''racial entitlement.''

Voting is not a racial entitlement. It is a right for every eligible voting age citizen. It is an American entitlement.

Voter suppression tactics have become more sophisticated, but they have not disappeared. The Voting Rights Act blocked more than 1,000 voting law changes between 1982 and 2006, and last year alone, the Voting Rights Act stopped a voter ID law in Texas and a Florida law that eliminated early voting days.

Now it has fallen to Congress to safeguard our most sacred right, and I will work with anyone from either party who understands the need to protect this fundamental right. I urge this body to work together to fix the Voting Rights Act.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep disappointment in the Supreme Court's decision on the Voting Rights Act. I stand not just as a Member of Congress but as a Member of Congress who represents Selma, Alabama. I stand not only as a Member who represents Selma, Alabama, but also as a native of Selma.

I can tell you that, as I think about the Edmund Pettus Bridge each and every time I go home, I think about JOHN LEWIS and of so many foot soldiers who dedicated their lives for the right to vote. I know that I would not be able to stand in this well had it not been for their fight.

So I implore my colleagues: we as elected officials cannot afford to not protect the right to vote. It is sacred, our right to vote. I think that the only way that we, with dignity, can continue as elected officials is if we protect each and every person's right to vote in America. So I implore us to work together to figure out a coverage formula that will work. I also urge all of us to remember what it's like to see JOHN LEWIS in this well. JOHN LEWIS is the face of voting rights in America. I ask us to work together to figure out a formula to protect the right to vote.

□ 1900

INVESTIGATING POSSIBLE UNETHICAL ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, we've had reports that HHS Secretary Sebelius has been soliciting funds from private companies to go and promote the President's health care law. In fact, there's a committee in Congress that's investigating these reports and how it would either potentially break the law or clearly violate ethics laws. In addition to that, now we're seeing reports that the Obama administration is pressuring the NFL and the NBA to go and promote their health care law.

It is unethical for the Obama administration to pressure organizations that they regulate to try to promote their policies. So if Secretary Sebelius or any other Federal administrator is using their power in the regulatory structure to go and pressure organizations to promote their policies, they need to stop it right now, Mr. Speaker; and we need to continue in the House our oversight investigations into any kind of unethical activities like those that are being reported.

STUDENT LOAN RATES

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Education is the key to prosperity in this country. Families know that. That's why they save up for college for their students, but the cost of college has become so expensive that they've had to borrow money. The interest rates now are absolutely ridiculous, but they're about to get even worse on July 1 because Congress has not acted.

Families across our country and in my State of New Hampshire are depending on Congress to fix this problem. We cannot allow these rates to double. These families cannot afford that. I am calling on Congress to stay here until we settle this, to think about those families across this country, put off that vacation, stay right here and work it out.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle obviously are concerned about section 4 of the Voting Rights Act being struck down.

We debated the extension of the Voting Rights Act in the Judiciary Committee, and I have great respect for then-Chairman JOHN CONYERS. And as I mentioned to him privately, as well, there's no way it's going to avoid being violative of equal protection when you have, as was determined in 2009, five of the six original States that now have less racial disparity than the rest of the country and the worst racial disparity is in Massachusetts. You can't just cram a punishment down on States just because you have a majority when great work has been done by the Voting Rights Act. It has done a good thing, and it was time for a new formula so we could capture the States that showed such racial disparity.

I look forward to working with my friends across the aisle to subjecting Massachusetts and any other violators—I know there aren't any others that bad—to section 5, and I'm sure we can get that done.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, my first babysitter was the Reverend Noah Albert Cleaver, my great-grandfather. He took care of me and my oldest sister every day after preschool. He lived to be 103 years old. I was in college when he died.

My grandpa, born in Cherokee County, Texas, who died in Ellis County, Texas, never voted, not one time in 103 years because they had to pay $3.50 in a poll tax.

When the Supreme Court ruled on Tuesday saying that because of progress we don't need the voting rights any more, it's like having a cruise ship require everyone wear some kind of life vest. The ship goes down, everybody is saved, and they say, Well, because everybody was saved, we don't need life vests any more. It was the life vests that saved them. It was the Voting Rights Act that caused the voter participation to rise.

I will not insult the death and life of my great-grandpa by not being as active as I can to reinstitute section 4 of the Voting Rights Act.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for coming to the floor to discuss what I think is one of the most activist Court decisions probably in my lifetime.

When I was elected to Congress in 1992, it was the first time an African American won an election in Florida in 129 years in this body. And I can't stand in this body and not think about what happened in the 2000 election when we had a coup d'etat in this country, when 27,000 voters from my districts, Districts 7, 8, 9 and 10, their ballots were not counted and were thrown out because of poor equipment.

Let's don't talk about what happened 4 years later when Jeb Bush paid $4

million to a company that took all of the people off the ballot that were not even felons.

In this recent election with this latest Governor, what did he do? They did away with Sunday voting because African Americans and others vote on Sunday.

So our work is cut out for us. The legislature for the first time put together a program that clearly lays out what we need to do to move forward. So I urge my colleagues to move forward in making sure that we reinstate section 4 of the Voting Rights Act.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I stand here today to remark on the Supreme Court's terrible decision to roll back one of the most effective safeguards to Americans' fundamental right to vote. The Court's decision ignores the current reality that voter suppression is alive and well in the United States. We saw indisputable evidence of its presence just last year. We saw attempts to implement discriminatory and unnecessary voter ID laws. We saw attempts to shorten early vote periods that have had a significant impact on minority voters.

The ball is now in Congress' court. The Senate Judiciary Committee is already taking action to restore essential protections for minority voters, and I call on Speaker BOEHNER to exercise true leadership in the House.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is our watch, and we must guard our rights for ourselves and for generations yet unborn. We must act swiftly and decisively in a bipartisan manner as we did in 2006 to create a new formula to ensure that the Voting Rights Act can continue to be a powerful tool to protect voters from discrimination.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

HONORING JOHN DINGELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. 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 subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1910

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and honored to rise tonight to lead a Special Order which honors a great American, a great colleague, and a great legislator whose service to this country and to this institution have been unmatched. It is appropriate that we rise tonight—appropriate particularly in light of the action that was taken and has been discussed today on the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, let me observe tangentially that the gentleman from Texas said something about cramming something down somebody's throat—the Voting Rights Act. I will remind my colleagues that it was passed 388–23 in this House and 98–0 in the Senate in 2006.

Let me say we honor a man tonight who not only voted for the Voting Rights Act in 1965, but has voted for every reauthorization of that act since that time. JOHN DINGELL came to Congress as a Member in 1955, winning a special election to fill the seat held by his father, John Dingell, Sr., who himself served from 1933–1955. JOHN DINGELL and his father have represented the people of southeastern Michigan in this House for eight decades. What an extraordinary testimony to the faith of their voters and the constancy and loyalty of their representation.

But very frankly, ladies and gentlemen, JOHN'S story in Congress actually began earlier than 1955. It really began in 1938, which is to say JOHN DINGELL, a year before I was born, and I'm one of the older Members. He came here as a young House page. We don't have the pages anymore, but nearly all of us remember seeing the pages, wide-eyed, sitting along the desk up front, sitting in the back, listening to speeches and watching floor proceedings as they waited to carry messages. That was JOHN DINGELL three-quarters of a century ago. The House of Representatives has been part of his life, and he has been part of it, for 75 years.

On December 8, 1941, a day that will live in infamy, 15-year-old JOHN DINGELL was in this Chamber as President Franklin Delano Roosevelt stood at the rostrum and asked Congress to declare war against Japan, whose forces had just attacked Pearl Harbor on that day to which he referred as a ''day that will live in infamy.'' President Roosevelt spoke these words:

With the unbounded determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph.

Throughout his time in this House, as a page, as the son of a Congressman, as a Member himself, as a committee chairman, and as a leader on issues of national importance, JOHN DINGELL has taught us, who have served with him, that America's triumph is only inevitable if we bring to bear the unbounded determination of which President Roosevelt spoke.

In JOHN DINGELL's record 57 years and 188 days as a Member of Congress, he has approached our greatest challenges with his own unrivaled determination. In every Congress, for half a century, he continued his father's work of introducing legislation to expand health care coverage to all Americans, even in the many years when no one thought it possible to do so. But JOHN DINGELL stuck with it.

He stuck with it and eventually had the opportunity to help shape and vote for the Affordable Care Act, which will extend to millions and millions of Americans access to affordable, quality health care. Millions of Americans owe JOHN DINGELL a debt of gratitude for his faithfulness and the advocacy of their best interest.

JOHN, in fact, was presiding over this House when it enacted Medicare in 1965. I told you he voted for the Voting Rights Act in 1965, but he presided over the adoption of Medicare. And he helped write the Endangered Species Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the 1990 Clean Air Act, among many historic pieces of legislation that he has authored, fought for, and seen adopted.

But JOHN has done more in this Chamber than shepherd key legislation to passage. He has been an unwavering voice for the working families and small business owners not just of southeastern Michigan, but of all America. He has been a giant in promoting and preserving the great American automobile industry and the millions of jobs that rely on it. He has been a mentor and a friend to me and so many current and former Members of the House.

My colleagues, JOHN DINGELL is a living link to an era when bipartisan compromise was a practiced reality, not just a slogan, not just something we say we're going to do, but something that was actually done. Members looked to JOHN DINGELL for his quick wit, his tenacious spirit, his extraordinary knowledge of legislation, and of the history of this House, and, yes, his warm heart.

JOHN loves this House and has always worked to preserve its collegiality and its good order. His unrivaled skill as a legislator is matched by his sense of decency, his integrity, and his devotion to country. And he has never lost that determination that was sparked as FDR called our Nation to arms and to service. JOHN DINGELL took up arms. He served in the United States Army from 1944–1946 as a second lieutenant

who prepared to take part in the first wave of a planned invasion of Japan. Fortunately, that invasion did not occur; but JOHN DINGELL, as always, was ready, willing, and able.

JOHN DINGELL, my colleagues, as all of you know, has served America and its people for most of his life. But it is not the length of his service that we honor alone. It is even more importantly the quality of his service, the depth of his commitment, and the strength of his character that we honor tonight, and JOHN DINGELL who we honor always.

We are all better Representatives because of his example. I congratulate my friend on 75 years—75 years—in the House of Representatives, 57 of them as a Member. JOHN DINGELL has, with diligence, faithfulness, extraordinary skill and judgment, courage and fidelity to God and country, lived up to President Roosevelt's words. He has served with unbounded determination, and he has led a triumphant life. What an example for us all.

A triumphant life not because he won every fight, but because he never gave up. He never was unfaithful to his oath of office. He was never unfaithful to his pledge to support working men and women and, yes, everybody in this country.

My colleagues, JOHN DINGELL today is much like Tennyson's Ulysses who said:

> We are not now that strength which in old days moved heaven and Earth. That which we are, we are; on equal temper of heroic hearts, made weak by time and fate, but strong in will to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

JOHN DINGELL, he pledged to his people when first elected to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

□ 1920

And he has, indeed, done all of those. He has kept the faith, and we expect him to be keeping the faith for years to come, for that is the spirit of my friend, my colleague, a great legislator, a great American, JOHN DINGELL of Michigan.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield back so Mr. BARROW can have the remaining balance of my time.

HONORING JOHN DINGELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Representative JOHN DINGELL, who, this month became the longest-serving Member of Congress in our Nation's history.

Representative DINGELL has taught literally thousands of Members of Congress how to do good things for the people we represent, a legacy he continues to build in his 30th term in the people's House.

I've had the honor to serve with Mr. DINGELL on the House Energy and Commerce Committee. As we all know, oftentimes our schedules don't allow us to stick around for an entire committee meeting, but I always make it a point to stay until Mr. DINGELL is finished. He is such a skilled cross-examiner that, by the time he's finished, we've heard the only questions that are worth asking, and we've got the only answers we're ever likely to get.

JOHN DINGELL's ability to reach across the aisle and find compromise is the cure for what ails this place, and I only hope that thousands more will get the opportunity to learn from the master.

I congratulate Mr. DINGELL on this historic milestone and for his over 57 years of service to our country.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Well, Mr. DINGELL, there are many aspects of life that I could comment on, for example, friendship.

Our families have known each other well over 75 years, going back to the relationship between your father and some of my relatives. It's been a long time. And I could talk about the friendship between yourself and your wife, Debbie, and our family for part of that time.

I could also talk about your accomplishments, and there have been so many. I remember when I first came, how we worked to clean up the Rouge River; and without your efforts, I think today it would be more like it was than it now is.

We could talk about health care and your historical role. We could talk about broader issues of clean water and clean air. We could talk about your devotion to the auto industry of this country and what would have happened all these years except for your dedication. And there are more accomplishments that I could talk about.

But instead, let me just say a few words about what struck me as you spoke a few weeks ago—was it?—as we were celebrating your tenure. And you spoke at some length. The rumor is that Debbie, a few times, said, cut it a bit shorter, but you went on; and the reason I think you did is what I want to speak about.

You began to talk about your years here, not in terms of the number of years, but what you have seen about this institution. And I think all of us who were there were glad that you continued to talk, because you've been here 55 years as a Member, and you've seen the changes, you've seen how there was a greater sense of working together in this place.

You saw and were a key part of sure differences and, with you, sometimes sharp questioning, but there was a greater feel of common purpose in this unparalleled institution, and you spoke how we have lost some of it.

So that's really what I wanted to focus on, because if anybody can speak about the need for all of us who work here and all of us who are Members here, if there's anybody who can remind us of how the importance of this institution should determine how we relate to each other, it's JOHN DINGELL.

And I must confess, as I listened to your words, I felt that there had been something lost and that you reminded us it was vital that we regain. And it was interesting, you didn't really want to talk about anything else except your love for Debbie and this institution.

So you, in a sense, are Mr. Institution. And your belief in it, your belief in our need to remind ourselves as to how we must try to work together, how we must try to relate, how we must try to take our basic principles—and you really have them—to use them not as a wall, but as an opportunity to proceed.

So we owe you a lot. Your constituents owe you a lot, though you'll deny it. But all of us, I think, owe you immensely for the years you have served here, for your dedication, for your honesty, and for your reminding people in this institution why it was founded.

In that sense, I think you are the exemplar of what sparked this creation in its first place. Keep going, keep reminding, and I hope we'll begin to follow better than we have.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, I rise tonight to honor a man that I'm proud to call a good friend and a mentor, JOHN DINGELL. Recently, JOHN became the longest-serving Member of the Congress, serving for 57 years, 5 months, and 26 days, surpassing the service record of the late Senator Robert C. Byrd.

JOHN has a storied career in the House of Representatives, and you'll hear a lot about that tonight and already have. He has served with 11 Presidents, congressional icons like Speaker Sam Rayburn from Texas, and had the opportunity to vote on landmark legislation like the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

He is the ultimate legislator for both Michigan and for America. He's also played an integral part in groundbreaking legislation, like the creation of the Medicare program, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Clean Air Act, just to name a few.

I always think of him as chairman, though. Since 1996 I've been fortunate to serve on the House Energy and Commerce Committee, with JOHN as our committee leader for much of that time. While most associate JOHN's leadership on the committee with his tenacious government watchdog activities, I saw a leader that did not fall victim to the partisan politics that define

the current House, but instead epitomized what we are here to do—the people's business.

□ 1930

He's a true legislator. It has truly been an honor to serve with him and learn from him, and, most importantly, to call him friend. He has a partner in his wonderful wife, Deborah, and a friend who, like my wife, Helen, allows us to serve our respective districts.

JOHN, I look forward to continuing our friendship and our work together.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for holding this Special Order. It is truly right and fitting that we honor this legislative giant, this man who represents everything that this institution is all about. I have served with Mr. DINGELL for 37 years on the Energy and Commerce Committee. It has been an honor every day to serve with him.

I want to tell you two stories about Mr. DINGELL. A few years ago, the Energy and Commerce Committee was made a part of a conference committee that was going to create something called Farmer Mac, which was a new security that was going to be issued. Mr. DINGELL and I were not happy that Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae had been exempted from the Securities and Exchange Commission jurisdiction. We were not happy.

And so I arrived a little bit late to this conference, which was an Agriculture Committee conference with the Senate. I arrived and I sat next to Mr. DINGELL. At the time, I was the chairman of the Securities Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Mr. DINGELL had been doing all the negotiating. He turned to me about a half hour into the conference and just wrote out a note and passed it over to me. I read the note, and Mr. DINGELL got up and left the room. So I continued to negotiate on behalf of Mr. DINGELL and the Commerce Committee.

At the end of the day, we won everything that we were looking for. Farmer Mac securities were going to be regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. It wasn't going to be like Freddie Mac. It wasn't going to be like Fannie Mae. And so at the end of the conference, I just took the piece of paper and crumbled it up and threw it into the wastepaper basket and I walked out of the conference room.

About an hour later, we were out on the House floor and Kika de le Garza, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, came over to me and he had the piece of paper that was crumbled. He had actually gone into the wastepaper basket to see what was on the note that Mr. DINGELL had passed to me. And here is what the note says, as Kika de le Garza is reading it to me. It said:

Mr. Markey, we have just won the first two out of three issues with the Agriculture Committee. Do not give an inch to them on the third issue.

And we did not. Chairman de le Garza looked at me and said, You Commerce Committee guys, you're not like the other people here in the House.

And that was JOHN DINGELL. It was an important issue. It was ensuring that the Securities Exchange Commission would in fact monitor these securities.

By the way, would we have not been better off all along than allowing these agencies to escape the scrutiny which they deserved?

And so that then brings me to the second little story. The seven most feared words ever uttered in Congress are words uttered by JOHN DINGELL as a witness is sitting at the table waiting for questioning, and those seven feared words are, ''I am just a poor Polish lawyer.'' Because that's the beginning of a very bad day for a witness as Mr. DINGELL asks for explanations on detailed questions without any mercy shown to an unprepared witness.

For me, it's an honor to be here to honor JOHN DINGELL, who is still at the top of his game, still able to perform those same type of cross-examinations of witnesses as they tremble, knowing that this legislative giant is about to cross-examine.

I thank him for his service. I thank the wonderful Debbie for giving him to us for his service here. I thank him for the honor of being able to serve on that committee for 37 years with a legislative legend who will go down in history.

One of the first things he wants you to know when you got on that committee was that there was a map of the entire world—the globe—over his head; and he just wanted us to know, as we got on the committee, that that was the jurisdiction of the committee—the entire planet. And that is how he acted as that giant over all those years.

It was an honor to have served with you.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and congratulate him on the beatification he's received by the voters of his State as he's about to join the other body. I wish him every success in the Senate, to which I can add that the next most feared seven words uttered to any witness is, ''Please answer the question 'yes' or 'no.' ''

At this time, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Thank you to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia.

It's an honor to lend my voice to that of several of my colleagues as we pay tribute to Representative JOHN DINGELL from the great State of Michigan. I am only in my third term in the House of Representatives so I can't profess to have known JOHN DINGELL as long as most of my colleagues who have known this great gentleman for quite some time. But as anyone serving in this House soon learns, it doesn't take very much time to know JOHN DINGELL and to assess the greatness of this individual, one who carries himself with great humility, which I believe is his hallmark of representation.

His identity with common folks through our many conversations about the richness of the Polish culture and the embarking upon the American Dream of immigrants of that persuasion and of all persuasions who have tethered that dream for the betterment of individual and family opportunities is, I think, what drives this individual. His motivation to be a public servant is obvious. It's well-documented by his many years of service—57 years in this House and dating back to 1938 as a page.

His service to this Nation through the military, all of that driven, I believe, by the great, deep-rooted sense of opportunity that is borne by this Nation to many of those immigrants who traveled here and then developed that dream through generations to follow.

JOHN DINGELL is a person of greatness and a person whose institutional memory of so many issues in this House is called upon time and time again.

□ 1940

As a recently appointed member to the Energy and Commerce Committee, I marvel at the sense of involvement that he has had and his recall on the development of so many bills, bills that speak to the protection of our environment, making certain that the air we breathe, the water we drink, the soil that we cultivate is there for us for a better future. That resulted from JOHN DINGELL's passion.

His involvement in making certain that the auto industry was not only saved, but made stronger, a great commitment by JOHN DINGELL. His incorporation of the many acts of concern and compassion for those who require access and affordability to quality health care, well documented again; driven by the roots established by his dad that enabled him to bang that gavel when we were passing the Affordable Care Act in 2010.

So many, many stories in just a short time that I learned from this gentleman that empower me. His direction, his instruction, his concern, his guidance, his encouragement and his praise of any of us, routinely done by this very, very generous man, strengthens us and gives us that motivation to go forward. And what he has always taught us, what he has said to me repeatedly: your word is your honor in this business.

I can't help but think what the House would be like if it were filled with JOHN DINGELLs, where there was respect for your colleagues, where there was drive and passion to make a difference for America's great many working families, where there was a sense of honor and respect for this work, and where there was this attachment to the

American Dream that ennobles and empowers this arena. He has taught us the nobility—with a small ''n''—of the art and science of politics. He will forever be the measuring stick of quality service and representation, the consummate Representative, JOHN DINGELL.

JOHN, it's an honor to serve with you. I wish you well as you continue to build upon your legacy. And thank you and Debbie for being such a well-respected, much-loved couple in this town, our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C. God bless you, my friend.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for participating in this evening's Special Order.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just say that, while we are obviously here to give honor and recognize the service of Mr. DINGELL, the honor, at least from where I stand, the honor is really all mine to be able to participate in this moment, Mr. Speaker.

I grew up in Michigan. I was born in 1958, 3 years after Mr. DINGELL began his service in this body. I grew up in Michigan politics. And if you come from Michigan and if you're interested in politics or government, you know a lot about JOHN DINGELL. His name is really synonymous not only with politics and government, but is synonymous with all the good that comes with service in government.

We hear so much these days, of course, about the public's opinion of the work that we do and the often cynical nature of public opinion when it comes to government. Well, JOHN really represents all the best in public service and has been a role model for so many people like me, who have had a chance to observe him and watch and learn from the great example that he sets.

He, after 21 years in this body, was joined by my uncle, Dale Kildee, my predecessor, who was elected to serve in the Congress in 1976. For 36 years, the two served together. So while I knew of Mr. DINGELL as an observer of politics as a young man as he and my uncle serving together so closely and so well, I felt like in many ways JOHN became a part, and we became a part, of his extended family. I have often felt that JOHN and Debbie are so close that I can always rely and count on them for counsel and advice and for friendship because it does feel very much like family.

For the whole time during that period that I knew JOHN, I didn't call him JOHN; I always called him Mr. Chairman or Mr. DINGELL. I will never forget the first day on January 3, just 6 months ago, when I was sworn in Congress. I came over to shake his hand and I called him Mr. Chairman, and he said, No, call me JOHN; we are friends.

We represent an amazing and beautiful State. I always look at JOHN as a role model, as an example of somebody who, in a position of tremendous authority within this institution, understood how to advance the interests of the State of Michigan by balancing the very important need to be a great and protective steward of the natural beauty and natural assets that make Michigan such a unique place that we both love so much, but to also be able to keep and breathe life into the great capacity of the workforce, particularly of our great industry—and particularly the automotive industry, which was born in our State, and which JOHN has been such a careful advocate for and steward on behalf of. He has seen some difficult times and has helped to steer that industry through tough times, and now seeing it obviously have new life and new vitality. Much of that—a great deal of that—is attributable directly to his perseverance and his willingness to take on a fight and see it through to the very end.

There's no other issue more than health care that I think makes it clear the value of perseverance and the perseverance that he had demonstrated for so many years, term in and term out, reintroducing in this body something that his father first brought to the Congress, and that is the basic right of every American citizen to not ever have to go to bed at night worrying about whether their own health would stand between them and the long-term viability of their own family. JOHN was here not only to see that battle fought, but actually see it brought to a successful conclusion.

So 6 months ago, when I walked onto this floor and realized a dream that I had been contemplating for a very long time—to serve in what I think is still and always will be the greatest democratic body in the history of this planet—it was a great honor to become a Member of Congress; but perhaps an even greater honor, to be able to call JOHN DINGELL a colleague—not just a friend, not just a mentor, not just somebody that I had looked up to, but a person with whom I now serve.

I was elected to succeed my own uncle. I would like to think that we have some things in common, Mr. DINGELL. And one of the things is you were elected to represent your district to succeed your very own father. I think that what you've demonstrated is that you obviously have your first obligation to serve your Nation, to serve the interests of the people that you represent, but also to do great service to the legacy of your predecessor. I can only imagine what your father must think, looking here and now seeing that not only have you taken up the mantle from him, but have served so long, but more importantly so ably in advancing the goals and the values that he embodied when he came here, and that you were able to see them through to fruition.

So thank you so much for allowing me just a few minutes as a freshman—with not a lot of old stories about the House, but with great admiration for the man who has been here for so long.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his participation. I would note that he, like our honoree, exemplifies the truth that is written in Proverbs: A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor rather than silver or gold.

At this time, I am pleased to recognize the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. BARROW, for leading this Special Order.

I am just so honored really to be here to celebrate and honor somebody I call a friend, JOHN DINGELL.

I notice, as we're talking here today and as so many have approached the podium, that everyone who approaches says: JOHN DINGELL, my friend, my colleague, my mentor, someone I look up to, someone I respect. I would just like to say to my good friend from Michigan that I can't really change those words because they echo my own sentiments.

□ 1950

I want to share with you—and so many of us have talked about the long legislative legacy of JOHN DINGELL. As I sat here, Mr. DINGELL, I thought, well, I too, when you came into Congress, I had not been born yet. It was about 3 years before I entered the world. When you took that courageous vote in support of the Voting Rights Act and civil rights, I was 6-years-old. I recall at the time living here in the Washington metropolitan area that my father and mother used to bring us to this Capitol almost every Sunday after church. They would bring us and we would run up and down the east front of the Capitol. We would picnic on the west front of the Capitol.

I am thinking today how wonderful it is to know that there was someone who was in this institution who so valued this institution and who, even when I was a 6-year old, JOHN DINGELL was working to protect my rights. When I think about that, Mr. DINGELL, I think of all of the Members who lined up even before we began this Special Order and talked about the need to work in a bipartisan way to make sure that we create a formula for the Voting Rights Act that the Supreme Court would support, that institutes and puts into place the formula for the way that we protect our voting rights in section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and almost to one, including JOHN LEWIS, none of us would be here had you not had the courage to take that vote in 1964.

So it's such an honor to serve with you and to know that while that may have been the battle in 1964, that you are fully prepared to engage in the battle here in 2013, and what an honor that we all have the great privilege of being able to serve with JOHN DINGELL.

I almost think, and Mr. KILDEE mentioned this, but I almost think there is hardly anything that impacts our modern day laws that we can't attribute to

the great hard work and public service of JOHN DINGELL. The fact that I got up this morning and turned on a faucet and ran a glass of water and was able to drink it and know that it was clean, was about JOHN DINGELL. That I walked outside today, and even on a stuffy day like this, knew that I could breathe air that was okay—we still have work to do, Mr. DINGELL—but to know that that clean air, and the cleaner we make our air, is attributed to JOHN DINGELL.

I think back to my grandmother who came to live with us at a point as she was aging—and it was actually just prior to the passage of Medicare—and how different families' lives are now because of the protections that they have for health care as they age and are disabled. Those things are attributable to the great work, the legislative legacy and the service of JOHN DINGELL.

So here we are today, and when I first came into Congress, I came in a different kind of way. One day JOHN DINGELL pulled me aside in the cloak room and he said, ''Come sit down, I want to talk to you, I want to get to know you.'' And I was, frankly, afraid of him. I knew his history, I had watched several Energy and Commerce hearings, and I knew that he was a great friend of my predecessor—a great friend of my predecessor.

I sat down and I talked to him, and what I gained from JOHN DINGELL was the kind of honor and dedication that he has, and reverence that he has, for this institution. It is unlike any that we see, and we learn from that. So we talked, and we became friends.

Then a funny thing happened. Barack Obama was elected President of the United States, and an inauguration was coming forward, and again another reminder that JOHN DINGELL's 50 years of service are about this amazing legislative work, but it is also about the people of his district—the children, women, men, families, of his district.

There was a high school in his district—actually, I'm not quite sure it was still in his district, but at one time he represented that high school—and they had gotten the great gift of being able to play in the inaugural parade for President Obama. Somehow or other things got confused and they were staying in a hotel that was many, many miles, a couple of hours away, from Washington, D.C., and they would have had to get up at 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning to get to the staging area on time. I represent a district just outside of Washington, D.C., in Maryland. JOHN DINGELL reached out to me and he told me this story, and I said, Well, maybe we can figure out something.

We found a high school out in Prince George's County, Maryland, and a parent-teacher organization and the students. They welcomed these students from Michigan that they didn't know at all into their high school. They fed them pizzas and sodas and everything. So the students were able to actually get to the inaugural parade on time.

JOHN DINGELL and I have been locked at the hand and the hip ever since. Those students were so grateful to him. What I saw in this great legislator is that the people of his district really did come first and he looked out for them, and they knew that he looked out for them. Like I said, I don't know whether he still represented them or not. I suppose over that 57 years, the way lines get drawn, at some point or other he did and he didn't, and he did and he didn't.

But whatever, he thought of them as his constituents and they thought of him as their Member of Congress. I thought that that is the kind of Member of Congress that I want to be. I think there are so many of us who serve in this institution who really do value it and who listen, who really listen to the message that JOHN DINGELL gave us about the need to work together and to preserve and protect our democracy by working in a kind of way that gives value and service to all of our communities and to this great Nation. So for that, I want to thank JOHN DINGELL for being such an important part of this institution and important part of the way I have learned to become a Member of Congress.

I want to say, just finally, on health care, when I came to the Congress, I had had an experience of not having had health care and getting very sick and going to an emergency room and having a lot of bills that I couldn't pay because I didn't have health insurance. When we gaveled in that health care bill, the Affordable Care Act, it was JOHN DINGELL sitting as speaker pro tempore who gaveled in the Affordable Care Act with the gavel that he used for Medicare.

Then during the course of that debate, I helped to gavel in the debate on health care. There was one moment that JOHN DINGELL was speaking on the floor about his father's experience and about his experience working on health care. I was sitting in as speaker pro tempore. Mr. DINGELL, I will never forget that picture because for me it was what we do as legislators, but it also felt very personal, and it felt so wonderful to know that in your service you never stopped not a single day of the 57 years to make sure that millions of Americans like me could have health care that was quality and that was affordable and that was accessible. So I thank you so much for your service, and I am so honored to serve with you.

□ 2000

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady.

At this time, I am pleased to recognize the gentlelady from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Thank you very much.

I would like to add my voice to the others here in speaking about this wonderful man, JOHN DINGELL, who, I'm sure, is quite embarrassed as we talk about him because he has a great deal of humility, which is rather unusual here, so he stands out for that.

When I first won election in 2006 and came in in early 2007, I knew about JOHN DINGELL. I had taught politics and history. I knew his great reputation as a legislator—I knew a lot about him—but what I didn't know about him is what I want to talk about.

When I first arrived, you heard a lot of people call him ''friend'' because he has a gift for friendship. He uses the words ''my friend'' all the time, and you believe him. He really has a gift for friendship.

So he said, Sit down here, my friend.

And I sat and I talked to the great JOHN DINGELL, and he asked me about me instead of telling me about him. I, too, was pretty overwhelmed at the idea that I was going to be this wonderful man's colleague. He has taught me a lot through the years, but any time you want a little bit of wisdom, we know you can just go sit with JOHN DINGELL. He sits there very quietly, and people come to him. If you just want to have a quiet chat, JOHN DINGELL is available. If you want to remind yourself that civility exists here in this Chamber, sit next to JOHN DINGELL because he is always civil; he is polite; he is intelligent; he is warm; and he cares about the people.

Now, he has done a wonderful job in representing Michigan, but he has always done a wonderful job in representing New Hampshire and every other State in the country. Through his legislation, we are so much better, but through his presence here, we as Members of Congress look better, too.

So I want to thank you, JOHN DINGELL, for all that you've done for me and for all of our colleagues and for this country. I wish you the best of health and many more years in serving America.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I recall the words of Thomas Carlyle. He was an advocate of the Great Man theory of history.

Carlyle wrote: ''History is but the biography of great men.'' If that's true, then the legislative history of this country for over half a century has been but the biography of JOHN DINGELL.

With gratitude for the service, for the example, and for the friendship of our honoree and with the greatest of affection for our honoree, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who would like an opportunity at rebuttal.

Mr. DINGELL. I don't know whether to rebut or to agree.

I want to begin by thanking Mr. HOYER, our leader and our whip, and my dear friend Mr. BARROW, a wonderful, courageous gentleman from Georgia, who has to fight very hard to remain here.

I am proud that you are my friend. Thank you.

You, DAN KILDEE, bear a great family name. Your uncle was my dear friend.

I am satisfied that he is going to be very, very proud of you, and I am grateful for your friendship.

I want to thank my old friend GENE GREEN from Texas for his kind words about me. He is a wonderful man. He has a wonderful wife. He is concerned with and cares about people.

And I want to say how much the remarks of my colleague from Maryland, DONNA EDWARDS, meant to me.

DONNA, you are a wonderful lady.

There is a story about her. I worked awfully hard to see to it that her predecessor was able to stay here, but, by golly, she was so good that he never stood a chance despite everything I could do to save him. She has made me proud that she is here. She is a great lady and full of goodness. The story she told about the kids was just a story about her goodness, because she saw to it that these wonderful young people had a place to stay here during the President's inauguration when they were going to play and march in the parade.

I want to say to my old friend SANDER LEVIN how grateful I am to him. Our families have been friends and have a history that's interwoven with affection and friendship going back into the 1920s when I was just a glint in my dad's eye.

I want to also say to Mr. MARKEY, our colleague who is going to be leaving us, how much we have cherished his friendship and his valuable service on the Commerce Committee and how proud I am of his service. He and I have had the opportunity of engaging in some fights over the jurisdiction of the committee when they were trying to raid the Commerce Committee, and we found—guess what?—when the fight was over, every time that he and I were involved in it, we had more jurisdiction than we'd had when we went into the fight.

To you, my wonderful friend CAROL SHEA-PORTER, what a wonderful lady you are, and how proud we are that we have a friend like you here who cares about people and who works so hard for them, and I am proud of the words that you have said.

To my Polish colleague, PAUL TONKO from New York, we Polacks—and I am very proud to be a Pole—are very, very concerned about loyalty and friendship and about homes, and he certainly exemplifies that and the goodness.

I am proud of the little things I've been able to do while I've been here. I am prouder even still more of the people I've been able to serve and help, and I am very grateful for the friendship of the people of southeast Michigan. The legislature has redistricted me so many times that they can't find a place now that they can put me that I haven't served before. So I have a great deal to be grateful for.

My father was a wonderful public servant, and he taught me that we here are public servants. We are not masters of the people—we are their servants. This is reason for us to be particularly proud because that is the highest calling of all.

So to you, my colleagues, who have so graciously and kindly made this rather embarrassing evening possible for me, I express to you my thanks and my gratitude for your friendship and for reminding me that there still is the wonderful warmth of friendship and goodness in this institution. The lovely Deborah, my wife, and I thank you for your friendship and kindness.

To all of the other colleagues whom we are serving with now and those with whom we have served before who are no longer with us, we are grateful to them, and we are proud.

This is the greatest Nation in the world. We are part of the greatest experience and the greatest experiment in the history of mankind—an experiment in government, which gives equality and opportunity to all of us. We are reminded that serving and saving and protecting those people whom we serve and the values that they hold dear is a tremendously important concern, one which we are going to have to go to bat about again to see to it that the Voting Rights Act is extended because the protections of the rights of our people—the greatest of all in the right to vote—are not yet fully assured.

So, to all of my colleagues tonight who have been so gracious and kind to me, I express to you my thanks and gratitude. It's a privilege to serve with you. It's even a greater privilege to have you for friends and to have you be people up to whom I can look for your goodness and decency and concern and for the service which you so gladly and generously give to the people of the United States and to the people you represent in your different districts.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back with great gratitude to my dear friend from Georgia and with my thanks to all of my colleagues who have spoken excessively kindly about me tonight.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2010

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE) laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) providing for conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON RES. 19

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, June 27, 2013, through Friday, July 5, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, July 8, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, June 28, 2013, through Friday, July 5, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, July 8, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is concurred in.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 28, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2005. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Frank J. Kisner, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2006. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert R. Allardice, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2007. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Douglas H. Owens, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2008. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III fund for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2009. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Harris County, TX); [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B-1164] [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2010. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (New Haven County, CT, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8285] received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2011. A letter from the General Counsel and Agency Ethics Official, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the National Credit Union Administration (RIN: 3133-AE10) received June 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2012. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease: 2013 Update''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2013. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's fifth report on the Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey and Assessment for 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2014. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Energy Labeling Rule (RIN: 3084-AB15) received June 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2015. A letter from the Office Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Environmental Review for Renewal of Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses [NRC-2008-0608] (RIN: 3150-AI42) received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2016. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-35, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2017. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of a proposed lease with the Government of Iraq (Transmittal No. 03-13) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2018. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Expenditure of Cooperative Threat Reduction Funds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2019. A letter from the Director, Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report for FY 2012 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2020. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2021. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002 Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2022. A letter from the Chairman and Acting General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2023. A letter from the Acting Chief, Division of Restoration and Recovery, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marine Mammals; Incidental Take During Specified Activities [Docket No.: FWS-R7-ES-2012-0043] (RIN: 1018-AY67) received June 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2024. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 120814337-3488-02] (RIN: 0648-BC44) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2025. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North and South Atlantic 2013 Commercial Swordfish Quotas [Docket No.: 121101598-3455-02] (RIN: 0648-XC334) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2026. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; 5-Year Extension of Moratorium on Harvest of Gold Corals [Docket No.: 130103006-3477-02] (RIN: 0648-BC89) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2027. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Western Pacific Fisheries; Fishing in the Marianas Trench, Pacific Remote Islands, and Rose Atoll Marine National Monuments [Docket No.: 110819515-3444-02] (RIN: 0648-BA98) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2028. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Gag Management Measures [Docket No.: 121004516-3498-02] (RIN: 0648-BC64) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2029. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 110207108-3430-02] (RIN: 0648-BA82) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2030. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2013 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Snowy Grouper [Docket No.: 0907271173-0629-03) (RIN: 0648-XC672) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2031. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting notification that the Department has decided not to seek further review of the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit in the case of United States v. Yimmi Bellaizac-Hurtado et al., Nos. 11-14049, 11-14227, 11-14310, and 11-14311, 700 F.3d 1245 (11th Cir. Nov. 6, 2012); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2032. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Mandatory Label Information for Wine [Docket No.: TTB-2007-0065; T.D. TTB-114; Re: Notice No. 74] (RIN: 1513-AB36) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2033. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Conclusive Presumption of Worthlessness of Debts [Notice 2013-35] received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2034. A letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a notification of a correction to the ''Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Statistics by Congressional District'' report; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2529. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to amend the definition of the term ''spouse'' to recognize new State definitions of such term for the purpose of the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2530. A bill to improve transparency and efficiency with respect to audits and communications between taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2531. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from asking taxpayers questions regarding religious, political, or social beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2532. A bill to provide for the establishment of new procedures at the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2533. A bill to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 2534. A bill to provide $50,000,000,000 in new transportation infrastructure funding through bonding to empower States and local governments to complete significant infrastructure projects across all modes of transportation, including roads, bridges, rail and transit systems, ports, and inland waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 2535. A bill to cause increased seigniorage for the United States Mint leading

to enhanced revenue to the Treasury and increased offsets to annual budget deficits in perpetuity, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins commemorating and celebrating American Liberty, ''The Union'', and the American values and attributes of freedom, independence, civil governance, enlightenment, peace, strength, equality, democracy, and justice, to provide for the continued and concurrent production and distribution of existing presidentially-themed circulating and numismatic coinage designs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HANNA, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 2536. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 2537. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to employee protective arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 2538. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting positive consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies by public utility or telecommunications companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain provisions of the renewable energy credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 2540. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire psychiatrists; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RADEL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 2541. A bill to allow certain off-duty law enforcement officers and retired law enforcement officers to carry a concealed firearm to protect children in a school zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 2542. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 2543. A bill to protect consumers from discriminatory State taxes on motor vehicle rentals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 2544. A bill to limit United States economic assistance and to oppose World Bank and International Monetary Fund assistance to the Government of Egypt; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2545. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an expert advisory panel regarding relative value scale process used under the Medicare physician fee schedule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 2546. A bill to protect financial transactions in the United States from enforcement of certain excise taxes imposed by any foreign government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 2547. A bill to determine appropriate risk based capital requirements for community, mid-size, and regional institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2548. A bill to establish a comprehensive United States government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty alleviation and drive economic growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2549. A bill to award grants to States to establish a Seal of Biliteracy program to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2550. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to enhance services to small business concerns that are disadvantaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2551. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that certain Federal contracts are set aside for small businesses, to enhance services to small businesses that are disadvantaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2552. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CHU, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SIRES, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WATT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KEATING, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2553. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new job creation through the establishment of a National Infrastructure Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 2554. A bill to increase water storage availability at the New Melones Reservoir to provide additional water for areas served below the reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2555. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2556. A bill to provide for the establishment of Vertical Centers of Excellence

on Cybersecurity to create solutions to, and promote best practices for, industry-specific cybersecurity challenges; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make imprisonment mandatory for unauthorized disclosure of returns and return information, unauthorized inspection of returns or return information, and willful oppression under color of law by officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 2558. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of small business start-up savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2559. A bill to permit employees to request, and to ensure employers consider requests for, flexible work terms and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2560. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETRI, Mr. POLIS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H.R. 2561. A bill to provide for the removal of default information from a borrower's credit report with respect to certain rehabilitated education loans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a certain interim final or final rule regarding nutrition programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 2563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the mortgage interest deduction with respect to boats only if the boat is used as the principal residence of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2564. A bill to extend the additional duty on ethanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 2565. A bill to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BASS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2566. A bill to modify the definition of armor piercing ammunition to better capture its capabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2567. A bill to require that all handguns manufactured, sold in, or imported into, the United States incorporate technology that precludes the average five year old child from operating the handgun when it is ready to fire; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 2568. A bill to reauthorize the Essex National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2569. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Missisquoi River and the Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H. Res. 280. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding a taxpayer bill of rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H. Res. 281. A resolution expressing concern over persistent and credible reports of systematic, state-sanctioned organ harvesting from non-consenting prisoners of conscience, in the People's Republic of China, including from large numbers of Falun Gong practitioners imprisoned for their religious beliefs, and members of other religious and ethnic minority groups; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WATT, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 282. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on Nelson Mandela International Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. Res. 283. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should become an international human rights leader by ratifying and implementing certain core international conventions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MARINO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 284. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to promoting energy security of European allies through opening up the Southern Gas Corridor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. BARR introduced a bill (H.R. 2570) to exempt the vessel John Craig from certain requirements when operating on a portion of the Kentucky River, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. ROSKAM:
H.R. 2530.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states ''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''
By Mr. ROSKAM:
H.R. 2531.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states ''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''
By Mr. ROSKAM:
H.R. 2532.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states ''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''
By Mr. ROSKAM:
H.R. 2533.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states ''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''
By Mr. WHITFIELD:
H.R. 2534.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, that grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. BARR:
H.R. 2535.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 5, which gives Congress the power ''To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.'' This is appropriate because this legislation sets forth new guidelines for designing and minting new ''liberty'' themed quarters, dimes, and half-dollars.
By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana
H.R. 2536.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:
H.R. 2537.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which states, ''The Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.''
By Mr. FITZPATRICK:
H.R. 2538.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:
H.R. 2539.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII.
By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 2540.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I; Section 8 of the Constitution states ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;''
By Mrs. HARTZLER:
H.R. 2541.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 to prevent the infringement of the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution which reads: ''A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.''
By Mr. BACHUS:
H.R. 2542.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Sections 8 and 9 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by those sections, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;'' and Article III, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.
By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 2543.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:
H.R. 2544.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. McDERMOTT:
H.R. 2545.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Spending Clause (Art. I, Section 8, cl. 1)
By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:
H.R. 2546.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 8, which provides that, ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises to pay debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.'' The Secretary of the Treasury is responsible for collecting taxes at the Federal level. It is the purview of the Congress to determine which taxes the Secretary shall or shall not collect. Clarifying directions to the Secretary in regard to a foreign transaction tax will ease the administrative and compliance burden on the private financial sector and the federal government.
By Mrs. CAPITO:
H.R. 2547.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have power to regulate the regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. ROYCE:
H.R. 2548.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:
H.R. 2549.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII
By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 2550.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
''The Congress Shall have the Power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''
By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 2551.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
''The Congress Shall have the Power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''
By Ms. DEGETTE:
H.R. 2552.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 2553.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 3 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. DENHAM:
H.R. 2554.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).
By Ms. ESTY:
H.R. 2555.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. HONDA:
H.R. 2556.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
section 8 of article I of the Constitution.
By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 2557.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. MAFFEI:
H.R. 2558.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 2560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 2561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The United States Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, and imposts and excises, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 2565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 2568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To...make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..

Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 14, which gives Congress the power ''to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.'' This is appropriate because this legislation involves the U.S. Coast Guard and licensing regulations for the captains of ships.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 36: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 107: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 129: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 140: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 182: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 274: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 400: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 451: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 460: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 508: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 533: Mr. COLE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 543: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 556: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 560: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 596: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 610: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 611: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 632: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 647: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 685: Mr. JONES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 688: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 690: Mr. HOLT and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 698: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 721: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 724: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 727: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 755: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 760: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 761: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 769: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 798: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 850: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 851: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 855: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina

H.R. 871: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 872: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 873: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 904: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 914: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 915: Mr. HIMES and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 919: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 924: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 938: Ms. FOXX, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COLE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 946: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 948: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1001: Mr. SALMON and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1014: Mr. TONKO and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1078: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1079: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1129: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1179: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1187: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1250: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1254: Mr. MESSER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1310: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1334: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1354: Mr. HALL and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1387: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1422: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1428: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1440: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1493: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1507: Mr. PETRI, Mr. HOLT, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1508: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1518: Mr. TONKO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1528: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1529: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1566: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1593: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1598: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1616: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1620: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1645: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1663: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1683: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1690: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1692: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1695: Ms. FUDGE and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1699: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1726: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1743: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1750: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1764: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1771: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1779: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 1812: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1823: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1825: Mr. FLORES and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1827: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1830: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1833: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1842: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1852: Mr. DENHAM and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1856: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1874: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1878: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1880: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 1890: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1893: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1897: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 1975: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1979: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1998: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 2000: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2002: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2003: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2009: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2014: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 2016: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2019: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2023: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2026: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2027: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2030: Mr. HOLT and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2052: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2053: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2055: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2061: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2068: Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2084: Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2089: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2125: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2132: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2146: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2170: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2192: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2208: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2218: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2232: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2237: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2241: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 2250: Mr. WELCH and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2273: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2274: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 2288: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2290: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2300: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 2310: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2317: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2319: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2322: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2328: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2329: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2360: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2368: Mr. TONKO and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2369: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2370: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2371: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2372: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2375: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2389: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2403: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 2405: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2407: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2408: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2422: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2446: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 2455: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2458: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2459: Mr. HOLT and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2464: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2465: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2472: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2473: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2479: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2492: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2498: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2501: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COLE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2504: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2507: Mr. POSEY and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2511: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2514: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2523: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2526: Mr. CONYERS.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. TERRY.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. COBLE.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 35: Mr. BARLETTA.
H. Res. 75: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H. Res. 111: Mr. COBLE and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H. Res. 112: Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. MESSER.
H. Res. 129: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H. Res. 131: Mr. ROYCE.
H. Res. 135: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. KUSTER.
H. Res. 190: Ms. ESTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. HARRIS.
H. Res. 208: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 213: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 222: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 247: Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Res. 273: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. MEEKS.