United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2013 No. 166

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 20, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS MASSIE 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, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

TALK TO IRAN

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, for much of the past decade, Iran's nuclear weapons development program has been a top national security concern for the United States. An Iran armed with nuclear weapons, capable of threatening Israel and other regional states, would touch off a nuclear arms race in the world's most volatile region.

For this reason, I have pressed for ever-increasing sanctions to isolate Iran from the global economy and have supported a policy that leaves all options on the table, including military force. The stakes are too high to risk any miscalculation of our resolve by Iran's leaders.

In pushing for ever more punitive sanctions, I have held out the hope that increased economic pressure might force Iran to give up its nuclear weapons ambition and rejoin the community of nations. Now we are at a moment in the standoff with Tehran that will test that assumption.

In repeated statements since his election as Iran's new President in June, Hassan Rouhani expressed interest in exploring a negotiated end to the sanctions in exchange for walking back its nuclear program. While the first Geneva meeting did not lead to a breakthrough on an interim deal, the parties reportedly came close and will be reconvening today for a second round.

Some have called on the Senate to continue work on a new round of sanctions that was passed by the House with my support earlier this year. Advocates of this approach say that sanctions brought us to this point, and increased pressure during the negotiations will improve the likelihood of success at the bargaining table.

I disagree.

President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry have asked for more time to test Iran's willingness to enter into a tough and verifiable agreement, and I think we should give it to them.

I am pleased to see reports that there appears to be a bipartisan agreement in the Senate that we will hold off for now. We will know soon enough if the Iranian regime is serious about a new direction in its nuclear program and in its relationship with the West. If it is not, there will be ample opportunity to tighten the stranglehold on Iran's economy, and further sanctions will have my full support.

Some have warned that any relaxation of sanctions in an interim deal risks unraveling the whole sanctions regime. This is not an illusory concern, and for this reason, any partial lifting of the freeze on Iranian assets must be quickly reversible if the Iranians balk on a final deal; but the absence of an interim deal is also problematic if it means another 6 months of Iranian enrichment. The Iranians must be made to understand that, if they walk away or cheat, the sanctions will be tightened to the point of strangulation—and the international community must be prepared to make good on that threat.

I have no illusions about the character of the Iranian regime; nor do I trust it. I do not believe that we can look into Rouhani's eyes and see the truth, let alone his soul. Even if Rouhani were serious about his intentions, there is no guarantee that Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khomeini, would bless any agreement that forces Iran to verifiably foreswear the development of the bomb.

Ultimately, this is not about trust. It is not about making concessions to Iran or awarding the mullahs for thwarting the will of the international community for many years. It is about seizing the opportunity to see whether we can end Iran's nuclear weapons program without resorting to military action; and if we cannot, no doubt it will remain that the United States made every effort to resolve this grave threat diplomatically.

No negotiation is without risk, and the Iranians' track record is cause for great skepticism. The administration must not accept a bad deal, but neither should it be prevented from testing whether it can obtain a good deal that advances our security interests and those of our allies.

Yitzhak Rabin, the former Israeli Prime Minister who signed the Oslo Accords two decades ago, once noted:

> You make peace with your enemies, not the Queen of Holland.

I agree and urge us to give diplomacy a chance.

Printed on recycled paper.

GENERAL JAMES D. THURMAN

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate General James D. Thurman on his retirement from the United States Army after 38 years of dedicated, distinguished, and honorable service. He will retire on November 22, 2013, concluding his service over the past 2 years as commander of the U.S. forces in Korea. During both war and peace, General Thurman has served with courage and distinction in the face of tremendous adversity, demonstrating his commitment to America and to our people.

During his long and honorable career, General Thurman successfully commanded 10 different units at every echelon of command, including extensive operational combat deployments. Besides his command of the 4th Infantry Division and the Multinational Division in Baghdad, Iraq, he made significant contributions during the initial invasion of Iraq as the chief of operations for the Coalition Forces Land Component Command. Other notable assignments during his tenure include operations in Kosova as the chief of the Plans and Policy Division for Allied Forces Southern Europe and battalion executive officer in the 1st Cavalry Division during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

In his final assignment, General Thurman served as the senior U.S. military officer in Korea where he was responsible for 28,500 U.S. forces stationed there. His top command priority was to deter and defend against North Korean provocations and aggression and, should deterrence fail, to be prepared to ''fight tonight'' and win. He ensured the readiness of his multinational, combined and joint forces through a broad range of actions.

As a result of changes he directed during the two annual multinational, combined and joint exercises in Korea, forces under his command became the most mission-focused training exercises in U.S.-ROK history. His initial assessment of existing capabilities on the peninsula resulted in the addition of an armed reconnaissance squadron and other changes to better prepare and position U.S. forces to respond. His steady hand and strong relationships with his ROK counterparts, as well as with senior civilian and military leaders in the U.S., were critical to safely navigating several operational crises.

A native of Marietta, Oklahoma, General Thurman graduated from East Central Oklahoma University, where he earned his commission through the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. His first assignment was with the 4th Infantry Division, which he later commanded and deployed with to Iraq. Since his first assignment, he and his wife, Delia, known as ''Dee'' Thurman, have moved over 25 times in 38 years, including four tours in Germany, two at the National Training Center, and three in my district at Fort Hood, Texas. During that time, they raised two daughters, and they are now proud grandparents.

Retirement is to be celebrated and enjoyed. It is not the end of a career but, rather, the beginning of a new adventure. I commend General Thurman for his selfless service to the Nation and to the United States Army. I wish him and his wife the best in the years ahead, and I welcome them as new constituents to the 31st Congressional District.

CUTS TO SNAP HURT VETERANS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, next week is Thanksgiving. All of us in this Chamber will go back to our districts, and we will celebrate this holiday with our families, usually with a big turkey dinner with all of the fixings and with all of these wonderful desserts; but, Mr. Speaker, for millions and millions of Americans, they won't have anything to celebrate next week because they don't have enough to put food on their tables for their families. There are close to 50 million people in the United States of America—the richest country in the history of the world—who are hungry. Close to 17 million of them are kids.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of these terrible statistics, we have a Congress that is working overtime to make life for many of these people even more miserable. There has already been a cut in SNAP as a result of the ending of the Recovery Act moneys that provided an extra boost to the program. So everybody who is on this program, on November 1, received a cut in their benefit—a benefit that is, on average, about $1.50 per meal per day. They received a cut. On top of that, the House of Representatives passed a farm bill that has an additional $40 billion cut in this program.

That would result in millions of families who currently receive the benefit losing it altogether. It would result in hundreds of thousands of children who right now are able to take advantage of a free breakfast and lunch program at school to lose that benefit. It would also result in about 170,000 veterans losing the benefit.

So I want to talk a little bit today about our veterans and about how they are being adversely impacted by some of the policies that we are pursuing here in the House of Representatives.

On November 1, Jonathan Capehart of The Washington Post wrote a column entitled, ''Oh, SNAP. Veterans Get Dissed by the GOP.'' I want to read the first few paragraphs of his piece:

> Remember all the howling by Republicans about the closed monuments and war memorials during the Ted Cruz government shutdown? Remember how they helped World War II vets storm their memorial on the very first day? Remember how one of the Members of Congress snarled at a Park Service ranger for trying to abide by the law and keep the memorial closed to the public? Remember how the likes of Cruz and Sarah Palin railed against President Obama for the cuts to veterans' benefits that resulted from the Cruz-caused shutdown?
>
> ''Our veterans should be above political games,'' Cruz said at the Million Vets March on October 13. ''Veterans have proven they are not timid, and we will not be timid in calling out anybody that uses the military as pawns.'' Palin said at the same event, ''We can only be America, home of the free, if we are America, home of the brave.''
>
> So, pardon the forthcoming blue language: Where the hell are they now that a multi-billion-dollar cut to the food stamp program has hit thousands of veterans squarely in their wallets?

He is referring to the cut that occurred on November 1.

> According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, ''In any given month, a total of 900,000 veterans nationwide lived in households that relied on SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, to provide food for their families.''
>
> In any given year or in any given month, millions and millions of dollars of SNAP funds are spent at military commissaries to help feed military members and their families who struggle against hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I raise this issue because there seems to be somewhat of a contradiction here in this people's House of Representatives. We are all very good at kind of talking the talk. People get up time and time again, and they talk about how important and how wonderful our veterans are. We all go back to our districts on Veterans Day and on Memorial Day, and we praise our veterans, and we thank them for their service to their country and for their sacrifice; but when it comes to making sure that our veterans have enough to eat, that they have enough food to put on their tables for their families, we are worse than indifferent in this House of Representatives. We are making things worse for them.

If this cut that the House of Representatives passed goes into effect—this $40 billion cut in SNAP—as I said, 170,000 veterans and their families will lose their benefit altogether. This is on top of a cut in their benefit that they have already received.

□ 1015

I don't know what people think is meant by praising our veterans. But instead of talking the talk, we ought to walk the walk a little bit more. We ought to make sure that the men and women who served our country, who this Congress voted to send over to Iraq and send over to Afghanistan, we ought to ensure that when they come back that they at least have enough to eat. Many veterans that come back have a tough time getting back into the workforce, and yet some of the language that was put in the House farm bill would actually make it almost impossible for them to get this benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues as we approach Thanksgiving to not forget our veterans.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am again on the floor today because our Nation has failed to heed the warning of George Washington, who told us to beware of foreign entanglements.

We have lost over 4,474 Americans in Iraq and 2,276 Americans in Afghanistan. In both of these wars combined, 46,720 of our servicemembers have been wounded. Furthermore, the American taxpayer is spending $10.45 million every hour to pay for the cost of the war in Afghanistan since 2001. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that. We are spending $10.45 million an hour just to pay for the money spent in Afghanistan since 2001. Despite these facts, we are now entering into a long-term agreement that, at best, is a failure—at best is a failure.

It is with great disappointment that I share an NBC article, entitled, ''Endless Afghanistan? United States-Afghanistan Agreement Would Keep Troops in Place and Funds Flowing Perhaps Indefinitely''—perhaps until 2024. I would like to read a short paragraph and submit for the record a few additional excerpts.

> While many Americans have been led to believe the war in Afghanistan will soon be over, a draft of a key United States-Afghan security deal obtained by NBC News shows the United States is prepared to maintain military outposts in Afghanistan for many years to come, and pay to support hundreds of thousands of Afghan security forces.

Mr. Speaker, George Washington was right. Afghanistan is an impossible situation. History has proven that it is impossible. The Bilateral Security Agreement will only serve to endanger American lives and squander taxpayers' money. I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in standing up for the American people in opposition to the signing of this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the President has the constitutional right to enter into the agreement. We have no oversight on the agreement itself, but we can put a resolution on the floor and let the Congress debate and let the American people know that we realize what we are doing in Afghanistan, instead of continuing to pass budget bills to fund Karzai.

Mr. Speaker, I have got a little poster here of Karzai. The man is a corrupt leader. All he is doing is taking the taxpayers' money and becoming richer and richer. Mr. Speaker, the funny and sad thing about this in the poster—it is a cartoon—there is a poor American soldier standing behind Karzai, who is at a money machine, and it says the thoughts of the soldier:

> I would like to make a quick withdrawal from here.

To the American soldier, I am sorry to say, if we don't do our job in Congress, you will be there until 2024.

The American people need to call their Members of Congress and say that we do not accept this agreement to keep our troops there until 2024. If you can't stop it, at least have a debate on the floor of the House and pass a resolution to say this is what the American people want to see: no long-term agreement with Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank God for blessing our troops and blessing America.

EXCERPTS FOR THE RECORD FROM NBC NEWS ARTICLE ''ENDLESS AFGHANISTAN? US-AFGHAN AGREEMENT WOULD KEEP TROOPS IN PLACE AND FUNDS FLOWING, PERHAPS INDEFINITELY''

> While many Americans have been led to believe the war in Afghanistan will soon be over, a draft of a key U.S.-Afghan security deal obtained by NBC News shows the United States is prepared to maintain military outposts in Afghanistan for many years to come, and pay to support hundreds of thousands of Afghan security forces.
>
> The wide-ranging document, still unsigned by the United States and Afghanistan, has the potential to commit thousands of American troops to Afghanistan and spend billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars.
>
> The document outlines what appears to be the start of a new, open-ended military commitment in Afghanistan in the name of training and continuing to fight al-Qaeda. The war in Afghanistan doesn't seem to be ending, but renewed under new, scaled-down U.S.-Afghan terms.
>
> The deal, according to the text, would take effect on Jan. 1, 2015 and ''shall remain in force until the end of 2024 and beyond.''
>
> The document doesn't specifically say how many U.S. and NATO troops would remain in Afghanistan beyond 2014. Afghan officials tell NBC News they hope it will be 10 to 15 thousand. U.S. officials tell NBC News the number is closer to seven to eight thousand, with an additional contribution from NATO.
>
> Factoring in troop rotations, home leave, and breaks between deployments, the service of tens of thousands of American troops would be required to maintain a force of seven to eight thousand for a decade or longer. The anticipated costs would likely run into the billions quickly.
>
> [T]he United States shall have an obligation to seek funds on a yearly basis to support the training, equipping, advising and sustaining of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF).

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you another letter I received from a constituent about the Affordable Care Act. He writes:

> About 9 months ago, my wife was forced to leave her job, in part because they wanted her to travel to Boston twice a week and the responsibilities to care for our daughter who has cerebral palsy made that impossible. Our health insurance was from her employment.
>
> We went on to COBRA, which cost about $1,400 per month. Waiting to have permanent insurance that did not have a termination date, we contacted Anthem Blue Cross for a quote for private insurance.
>
> We were told that my wife was uninsurable for 10 years because she had been treated for depression a few years ago when our daughter was diagnosed with cerebral palsy and we were told she would require spinal cord surgery to possibly walk.
>
> They then said, because of her condition, the cost for only my daughter and I was almost $4,000 per month. The burden for the last 6 months was overwhelming. Insurance brokers informed us that only the Affordable Health Care Act could help us.
>
> Yesterday my wife signed up for health insurance for all of us. Due to our income, we do not qualify for assistance and we were never looking for any. All we wanted was affordable insurance for my family. The policy we selected will end up costing about what our COBRA payment is, $1,400, depending on how much deductible we end up using, which is all we ever wanted.
>
> I know the only reason our family is safe is because of the President, who cares more about people like us than the CEO of Anthem Blue Cross or Aetna.

Mr. Speaker, I receive calls and letters like this all the time. It is why I worked so hard to pass the Affordable Care Act in the first place.

This is a transformative piece of legislation, a law that provides more security for the middle class and a better, healthy quality of life for the entire community. It empowers patients and doctors again and puts them, and not insurers, back at the center of care. It makes important, long-overdue reforms that most people just take as common sense.

But for 3 years now, this House Republican majority has been trying to roll the clock back and bring back the bad old days when insurance companies could discriminate against people with preexisting conditions, even children with preexisting conditions, once again. They want to see women pay more for the same coverage than men, be denied coverage because they survived breast cancer, were a victim of domestic violence, or had a child by cesarean section. They want to see small businesses lose tax credits and seniors' health care and drug costs continue to rise at staggering rates.

But we are not going to go back. The Affordable Care Act is already making a profound difference for individuals and families in need. It is time to stop with the partisan political games and let it work for families who desperately need to have health care coverage and insurance that they can't afford.

EURASIAN SITUATION

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to talk about some European issues, especially in eastern Europe.

First, I want to talk about the country of Belarus. Three years after the brutal and bloody crackdown on peaceful demonstrators after the December 10 presidential elections, nine political prisoners remain behind bars under deplorable conditions in Belarus. This includes Nikolai Statkevich, who ran against Lukashenko in 2010; Ales Bialiatski, the head of Viasna, a

human rights organization; and Mikalai Autukhovich, who sliced open his stomach in September to protest his poor treatment by prison guards. While the regime recently released three political activists—Zmitser Dashkevich, Aliaksandr Frantskevich, and Pavel Seviarynets—it continues to restrict their freedom of movement and activities.

The general human rights situation in Belarus also continues to deteriorate. Recent laws passed to regulate demonstrations and political information have greatly curtailed freedom of assembly, and independent journalists and political activists are under a constant threat of intimidation and arbitrary detention. In October, the regime made amendments to the Electoral Code designed to undermine the ability of opposition candidates to receive funding and compete in the 2014 local elections.

The EU voted in October to expand sanctions on the Lukashenko regime for an additional year citing the regime's failure to release or effectively rehabilitate political prisoners and its disregard for human rights or democratic principles in their decision making. The United States should continue to work with the European Union to remain consolidated, impose economic sanctions, and have a single plan of action regarding the promotion of dramatic processes in Belarus.

Tensions with Russia increased when the Lukashenko regime arrested Vladislav Baumgertner, a Russian citizen who is the head of a major Russian potash firm. The move was in retaliation for this firm dropping its joint venture with a local Belorussian potash firm, resulting in a steep drop in the commodity price and harming the Belarus economy. This began an ongoing ''potash war'' with Russia. Meanwhile, negotiations to put a Russian airbase in Belarus have proved controversial and allowed opposition parties an opening to criticize the regime and focus attention on national independence and sovereignty issues. The United States should continue to support Belorussian citizens as they fight to maintain their sovereignty.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the Eastern Partnership. On November 28 through 29, just coming up soon, the European Union will host the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania. The goal of the event is to promote closer ties between the EU and its eastern neighbors and, in particular, to further the progress on association agreements with Georgia, Moldova, and the Ukraine. The governments of these countries have worked for years to meet conditions for signing the agreements, and the summit is viewed as an historic step in European integration for these countries.

Russia has responded to the Eastern Partnership initiative by applying intense pressure on these countries to abandon EU engagement and join a Russian-led Eurasian union instead. Russia has started erecting barbed wire fences on Georgian territory, prompting a stern rebuke from the EU condemning the action and calling for their removal. In Moldova, Russia has resorted to its tactics of banning Moldova wine imports and threatening to cut off gas during the winter months. Russia has banned dairy products from Lithuania and certain chocolate products from the Ukraine and threatened both countries with disruption or price hikes on gas supplies. The EU has warned Russia to stop these actions, and the U.S. should join in the condemnation of Russia's aggressive behavior towards the sovereignty of nations on its border.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time for talking about these emerging democracies in eastern Europe, the threat that still continues, and the importance of the United States Government being involved in promoting democracy, freedom, and the rule of law.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT SUCCESS STORIES

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, we have been in this huge debate around the Affordable Care Act for quite a while now. One of the things that I cannot ever forget is the health care nightmare stories that I listened to before we passed the Affordable Care Act. As I see so many of my Republican colleagues gleefully celebrate the difficulties with the Web site or cancelations and then think that that is going to somehow help them in an election, I can't think about any election. All I can think about are people like the people whom I want to share with you right now.

Let me tell you about Marty Olson. Marty built a small business creating marble sinks and countertops. He poured everything he had into his business, and it flourished. He became a job creator, in the language of some people. I call him a ''small business person.'' I call his customers ''job creators.''

Just a few years ago, he employed more than half a dozen employees. Recently, things changed drastically for him. Over the course of the last year, his 9-year-old daughter, Abby, was diagnosed with leukemia. She beat the odds and was in remission for 6 months until her cancer symptoms returned. She is now awaiting a bone marrow transplant. Mr. Olson spent time with his ailing daughter, and his business began to decrease.

□ 1030

He is now the sole employee of the marble business. Three months ago, he suffered a detached artery and had heart surgery. He is still recuperating from his surgery and losing his insurance on January 1 due to a divorce. He began to search for affordable health insurance, but most premium quotes were too much for him to afford. The implementation of the Affordable Care Act means he will not be denied insurance due to his preexisting heart condition. The health care exchange in Minnesota, mnsure.org, is allowing him to purchase a policy he can afford. Without the plans available on the Minnesota health care exchange, he likely would have to choose between health insurance or paying his other monthly bills.

When his business was growing, he often trained employees who increased his production, but sometimes lost that employee because he was unable to provide them with an adequate health care insurance plan. The small business exchange is there for him to use when his business grows again in the future.

Of course Marty is not by himself in this. Tracy Brock is another small business owner. She has presided over a small business for 21 years. She is able to earn enough to support herself and hire several part-time employees. However, her health insurance premiums have forced her to work six to seven days a week. Those high premiums, around $650 a month, prevent her from taking time to enjoy life and get some well-deserved rest. Her insurance premiums were taking most of her marginal profits. The assets from her business disqualified her from receiving any assistance with her premiums.

Tracy had the misfortune of being a cancer patient. She also needs knee replacement surgery, and Ms. Brock's business has not been as profitable recently so she continues to work every day despite her health condition. She began researching mnsure.org, the health care exchange available in Minnesota, and she found health plans with better coverage at prices that she can afford. Some plans she found were only 50 percent of the cost of her current premium. The additional coverage will give her more options to treat her conditions, and the savings will allow her to work less and enjoy life more.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't look at difficulties in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act as a political opportunity. We should never take our eye off the fact that we have citizens who desperately need something way better than we had before we had the Affordable Care Act. I wish Republicans would say, You know what, it is there. It is passed. The Supreme Court has said it is constitutional, and we are going to do everything we can to make it work even if we would do it different, and we will offer constructive improvements, but we are not going to sit back and just try to wreck it with poison pill bills like the Upton bill last week, or with the 47 attempts to repeal it, or with the myriad of other tricks, sabotage, and devices that they have employed.

It is time to help Americans like Marty Olson, like Tracy Brock, and like millions of other people, including

one of my own interns, Abby Schanfield. Abby is an awesome young woman. She has had numerous surgeries since she was 10 months old. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, Abby is able to stay on her parents' insurance until she is 26, and her parents were able to pay premiums and copays that have given her access to the health care that she needs.

So for that and for many other reasons, I urge support of the Affordable Care Act.

HONORING FIVE FORT BENNING SOLDIERS

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to honor five soldiers, those attached to and those of the 75th Ranger Battalion, Fort Benning, Georgia.

Fort Benning is home to about 1,500 Rangers of the entire 75th Ranger Regiment. They are an elite group of solider who perform specialized operations for the Army. Currently, the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, as well as Rangers of the Regimental Headquarters and the Regimental Special Troop Battalion, are deployed. I have a deep commitment to Fort Benning, and once these Rangers pass through Fort Benning, Georgia, they become part of the State's family.

On October 6, five of these brave Rangers were part of a mission gone wrong. Sergeant Patrick Hawkins, Private 1st Class Cody Patterson, 1st Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, and Special Agent Joseph Peters were killed by an improvised explosive device while conducting combat operations in Kandahar province, Afghanistan, and Corporal Joshua Hargis was seriously injured.

These soldiers came to Fort Benning from across the Nation. They are sons and daughters and parents, spouses, loved by many. Their loss is felt across our Nation, and we thank them for paying the ultimate sacrifice.

As we mourn the loss of these four soldiers, I also want to give thanks for the life of Corporal Joshua Hargis. Corporal Hargis was injured on the same mission on October 6 and is pictured here beside me. This photo has been nicknamed ''the salute seen around the world'' because it shows the strong character of an American soldier.

After hours of surgery, Corporal Hargis' commander held a small ceremony in the hospital room to honor Corporal Hargis with the Purple Heart award. They thought he was unconscious. Doctors, nurses, and fellow Rangers crowded into the room to watch him receive his award. Despite his injuries, tubes, and intense pain, Corporal Hargis still saluted his commander when his Purple Heart was pinned on his hospital blanket. This act of determination despite pain embodies all that is a Ranger. This is the heart of a warrior. This is America. We need not apologize to anyone for our strength and our greatness.

I want to thank these five brave Rangers, Sergeant Patrick Hawkins, Private 1st Class Cody Patterson, 1st Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, Special Agent Joseph Peters, and Corporal Joshua Hargis, for their service and their sacrifice. Joan and I send our prayers to their families and to their friends.

God bless America, and God bless our troops.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT CANCELATIONS

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act is working for many of my constituents on the central coast of California, like Danna in San Luis Obispo County, who tells me she will be saving 40 percent on her family's premiums. It is working for the Pacelas in Solvang, who tell me they now have better coverage while saving $8,000 a year on their premiums. It is working for the thousands of families whose young adult children can continue on their parents' plans, and for everyone who has a preexisting condition who now cannot be turned down for coverage.

I know that this is not the case for all central coast residents, especially those who may have received cancelation notices this year, either because their insurer is only selling in the exchanges, or because the insurance companies have stopped offering plans in our area all together. Cancelation of these plans has caused real pain and confusion for our constituents in California who are faced with Covered California marketplace options that have different provider networks or different premium costs.

After hearing numerous stories from the families I represent, it is clear we must address this problem with the implementation of the Affordable Care Act so we can protect all California families and businesses. The President has offered an administrative fix to this issue to allow insurance companies to offer plans to those already enrolled for the next year, but States will be the final decisionmakers.

That is why I led a letter, with Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN and 22 of our California colleagues, to Covered California's leadership asking them to implement this administrative fix without delay.

Covered California has led the way in bringing new, quality health care opportunities to millions of Californians. The Web site is working, and enrollment is steadily increasing. But with over 1 million Californians receiving cancelation notices of their current plans, we must and we will do more to ensure that no one is left without the opportunity for affordable coverage. These families were told that if they liked their plan they can keep it, and that is a promise we must keep for them.

AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE RIGHT TO KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, President Obama purports to protect and defend the idea of open government, but his staff seems to have missed the memo. You see, just 5 months ago, I asked Treasury Secretary Jack Lew about his personal knowledge of the IRS' reprehensible practice of targeting innocent Americans. I inquired of him three basic things, one of which was what was the Secretary's knowledge and what was his involvement with any of the various meetings with then-IRS Commissioner Doug Shulman and the White House. You see, back then a year ago, Jack Lew served as the chief of staff to the President while some of the most egregious, reprehensible behavior ever displayed by the IRS took place while Doug Shulman was the IRS Commissioner and while Doug Shulman reportedly attended meetings at the White House at various times. Unfortunately, rather than answer some of these basic and simple questions and putting to bed any and all appearance of impropriety by Jack Lew, Secretary Lew continues to ignore all of my questions.

The American people have the right to know. The American people have the right to know exactly what Secretary Lew knew and what he did. So I rise today to ask the American people to join with me and demand openness from this government, from this President, and from Secretary Jack Lew.

Secretary Lew, it is time to answer the questions of the American public.

MESSAGES AND MISSIONS YET UNDONE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak of messages and missions yet undone. This Congress, both House and Senate, was sent here on behalf of the American people to ensure that their voices and their needs are adhered to. They are not interested in the clanging of voices; they are interested in the rolling up of sleeves and making sure our government works. So I stand here in reflection of a very successful enrollment day in Houston, Texas, last Saturday, where people came and stood in line to be able to seek information and, yes, enroll because they have faith in this Nation.

As the Affordable Care Act goes along and fixes broken promises and

broken technology, what we should be focused on is making it work for the American people. Making sure that those with preexisting disease can have insurance, young people with minimal income can have insurance, those between 50 and 65 can have insurance, and those with catastrophic illnesses can have insurance. I have faith that as we work through this, what is best for the American people is the choices they will have, and the fact that they will keep what they have and be able to enroll for a year is a response to the pain.

We know that the insurance companies did not need to send cancelation letters; they could have sent modification letters, but I want to go forward.

Things yet unfinished—one happens to be the enormity of gun violence among our young people that has been reflected in incidents in Houston, Texas; 19 shot, two dead, teenagers at a house party. This past weekend, one shot at a house party, who has lost his life. My sympathy to their families. I call out now for all of our forces, Federal, local, and State, PTOs and school districts, teachers, civic organizations and faith organizations, that we work together to be able to stop the surge of gun violence and the loss of our young people.

Statistics will show that in African American communities and Hispanic communities where there is homicide, that a high percentage is by a gun. So I would ask that we look seriously at legislation I introduced, H.R. 65, the gun storage and safety device bill, and a bill that also indicates, except for exceptions, that guns should not be in the hands of young people under the age of 21, and for someone who allows that to happen, there should be higher penalties on that individual.

I have been told by urban mayors that there are stash houses where people can go and rent guns. Let's not be afraid of background checks. More importantly, let's not be afraid of weeding out this horrible scourge on our community, and the deaths that families have to contend with.

Then, I think it is important to note that we have got to continue to speak on the issue of mental health needs. Tragedy occurred in Virginia, and the story that is unfolding saddens me because that story is similar to the one in Sandy Hook. The young perpetrator had issues they had to deal with in terms of their mental health. We have got to be able to provide more resources for beds for young people. We have got to intervene. We have got to help families. We have got to not run away from mental health issues, but run toward them.

□ 1045

Then I would like to make mention of those families who are suffering because their Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program over the last month has been cut. They are expecting in this budget coming forward that $40 billion will be on the table to be cut again.

I have visited my food banks. I took the SNAP challenge and ate on that budget. No one should call those folks deadbeats. And every time there is a deadbeat, you can be assured that person will be found out. I am concerned about the seniors and the young children that go to bed hungry, and one-half of those who get SNAP benefits, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits, are in actuality children.

As we go toward this budget process deadline of December 13, let us have a sense of compassion. Let us have sources that will help us and the Department of Justice to be able to deal with this proliferation of guns, these Saturday night specials, these stash houses to help our children. Let's expand counseling and pronouncements by the local community that we are standing up against this violence that is attacking our children. Let's find dollars to help out local and State communities on resources for mental health.

Let me thank one of the leaders in my community, Patrick, who is a Vietnam veteran who has raised up the issue in Houston on the need for mental health beds and intervention, stories that I have heard in my own community where a grandfather took his grandchild to a county facility, they did not have a bed, and ultimately that grandchild stabbed and killed his grandfather and the grandfather's daughter.

We know that there are challenges, missions, and messages yet undone. Let's get to work on behalf of the American people.

THE NATION'S BROKEN BUDGET

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss our Nation's broken budget process and ways we can begin to fix it.

The government shutdown is caused by the broken budget process. Funding our government with continuing resolutions is caused by a broken budget process. If we fix this, we could get away from this type of management of the taxpayer dollars.

Every year, Congress is required by law to pass a budget resolution. Every year, it is required to pass 12 appropriation bills by October 1, the start of the fiscal year. Yet, since 2001, Congress has managed to enact only 8.3 percent of our required appropriation bills on time. In the past 8 election years, Congress has failed to pass a budget resolution a full 75 percent of the time.

The Washington Post recently did an article about this process. It showed that this broken process allows Federal departments and agencies to develop a use-it-or-lose-it mentality. A full 20 percent of all Federal spending and contracting happens in the last month of the fiscal year. Look at how it spikes. It is not just one time. It did it in 2010, 2011, and 2012. The spending happens in the last month of the year and, in particular, the very last week of the year. This is true about contracting, as well. There were 156,000 contracts, 154,000 contracts, 149,000 contracts all done in the last few weeks of each budget year.

This use-it-or-lose-it mentality is costing the taxpayers millions of dollars. We must begin to fix this broken process, and that is why I have introduced the Biennial Budgeting and Enhanced Oversight Act of 2013. Overnight, it would cut this in half.

A biennial budgeting system, like the one my legislation creates, allows Congress to set budget and spending priorities in the first year and then do real oversight in the second year. This will allow Congress to better understand how the Federal Government is spending taxpayer money and be better equipped to make spending decisions in the future.

This biennial budgeting process has strong bipartisan support with 110 cosponsors so far. They range from the most progressive Member of Congress to the most conservative, painting a broad picture of support from Members of Congress and the Americans that they represent.

Here is a list of groups within Congress that have multiple Members supporting the legislation: the House Budget Committee, the Republican Study Committee, the Tuesday Group, the Blue Dog Democrats, the New Democratic Coalition, the Progressive Caucus, a broad cross-section of the Congress and the people that they are here to represent.

Not only that, every President since Ronald Reagan has supported biennial budgeting. Here is a quote from Jack Lew, the former OMB Director and White House Chief of Staff, our Nation's current Secretary of the Treasury:

> The 2-year system is a good idea. The 1-year budget process gives both the administration and Congress little time to focus on implementing the programs.

It is time that we begin to address the serious nature of not managing the taxpayer dollars in following the requirements of the law. We need to fix this broken process this year. It is time to do it.

Mr. Speaker, if the past few months have taught us anything, it is that our current budget process isn't working. It is time to create a system that will help us budget responsibly, foster greater certainty in the U.S. economy, and save taxpayer dollars. We can do it in bipartisan fashion.

I urge all Members of Congress to cosponsor H.R. 1869 today and help us govern again.

TRIBUTE TO COMMISSIONER DEVERRA BEVERLY

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, I rise to pay tribute to a woman who spent her life trying to help others. This is a tribute to Commissioner Deverra Beverly, a premiere public housing advocate.

In and around Chicago and in public housing circles throughout the Nation, Ms. Deverra Beverly was known as a staunch defender and key player in making decisions about public housing issues and plans, not only in the ABLA community where she lived, but throughout Chicago and with impact on national policy.

Ms. Deverra Beverly is what sociologists and urban planners and politicians call ''grassroots.'' She was from the people, of the people and with the people, and a representative for the people. She was first of all a wife, a mother, a friend, a confidant, a leader who emerged from the people and was trusted by the people.

Many people did not know it, but Ms. Beverly worked for the city of Chicago's Department of Human Services for more than 30 years. After her retirement in 1997, she devoted the rest of her life to providing leadership on Chicago public housing issues. She was president of the Local Advisory Council of ABLA, vice president of the Central Advisory Council, acting chair and treasurer of the Central Advisory Council, and was a close friend and supporter of Commissioner Artensia Randolph, who set the bar for CHA resident leadership.

As a result of her local leadership, national public housing leaders and groups were attracted to her, and she became a founding chair of the National Public Housing Museum. She was appointed a Chicago Housing Authority commissioner by Mayor Daley and retained by Mayor Emanuel.

Ms. Beverly was a skilled negotiator; and as a result of the many changes taking place in the ABLA community, she often sat at the table with Alderman Bob Fioretti, Danny Solis, Jason Ervin, university officials, people from the mayor's office, philanthropists, developers, myself, and others.

Deverra Beverly always expressed the position of the tenants, the people; and when you look at the ABLA community today, much of it is a reflection of the thinking and the work of Commissioner Deverra Beverly.

Contrary to much popular opinion, working families do live in public and mixed-income housing. As a result of the process known as ''urban renewal,'' Deverra Beverly's family moved into the ABLA homes in 1943. Her father was a postal employee. Her mother worked in the home. Deverra worked for the city of Chicago for more than 30 years. She did not have to live in ABLA, but she chose to live there because that is where her heart was.

I guess maybe the poet Sam Walter Foss may have been thinking of her when he wrote his poem that said:

> Let me live in my house by the side of the road, where the race of men go by.
>
> They are good, they are bad, they are weak, they are strong, wise, and foolish—so am I.
>
> Then why should I sit in the scorner's seat, or hurl the cynic's ban?

Let me live in my house by the side of the road like Deverra Beverly and be a friend to man.

AMERICAN DIABETES MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize the month of November as National Diabetes Awareness Month.

It is observed every year in November to raise awareness of diabetes across America; but I am here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, diabetes is a 365-day, 24-hour-a-day, 7-days-a-week disease that kids and adults that deal with the disease have to attend to.

Mr. Speaker, how do I know that? Well, this is personal to me. My son Will was diagnosed at age 4 with type 1 diabetes. He is 13 now, Mr. Speaker, and he has grown up with this disease. I can tell you that we get up every night, my wife in particular, as I stay down here in Washington, D.C., still monitoring his blood sugar by poking his fingers and taking his blood at 2 a.m. every time he eats just to see where his sugars are going to be.

This is a disease that has not been cured, but I tell you I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we will find a cure. We need to find a cure. We work in our household with the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, JDRF. It is a great organization that dedicates a significant majority of its funds to research for a cure for type 1 diabetes.

Just last week, Mr. Speaker, at a town hall that I held at Fayette, New York, back in upstate New York, I had a young lady 5 years old come and speak before us and talk about diabetes and how it impacts her since she was diagnosed at the age of 3.

This is a disease, Mr. Speaker, that we have the ability, in my opinion, to find a cure. We need to work together in a bipartisan basis. I am vice chair of the Congressional Diabetes Caucus. It is the largest caucus here in Washington, D.C. The focus on education and awareness of diabetes cannot just occur in November, but it must occur every day.

I urge everyone to be aware of the risk factors and discuss your individual risks with your doctor, your health care provider. And my heartfelt thanks go out to all the providers and the parents and the caregivers of each and every person associated with somebody with this disease.

Working together, my son, Will, in his lifetime, will have a cure and won't have to deal with this disease every day. Please, take a moment, recognize this disease, and in November, in particular, be aware of what diabetes is all about.

AMERICA'S ENERGY SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my colleague, Mr. REED, for his leadership on the Congressional Diabetes Caucus. Thank you, that was very inspiring.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the firm conviction that America's national security and America's economic security are tied directly to America's energy security.

We have a wonderful opportunity today to vote on a couple of very important bills that will enhance that energy security, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on both of them.

I get to represent the entire State of North Dakota. North Dakota was once described by one of our favorite sons, Eric Sevareid, the famous CBS newsman, as the rectangular blank spot in the Nation's mind. But today, everybody is talking about North Dakota. It is the fastest growing economy in the word. It has the lowest unemployment rate in the country. It has the fastest growing personal income in the country. In fact, today, Mr. Speaker, there are tens of thousands of high-paying jobs in North Dakota waiting for more people to come to the State to fill them. If you are willing to work hard and put in a full day's honest work, you can be very successful there.

We have heard some speeches already this morning about the need to reduce hunger. We have heard some speeches this morning about the availability of affordable health care. I am for both of those things, and the best way to enhance availability of health care and to reduce hunger is to provide jobs.

Again, I would urge my colleagues today to vote for the bills that will be in front of us.

□ 1100

H.R. 1965 is the Federal Lands Jobs and Energy Security Act. It is not a complicated bill. It acknowledges two things. It acknowledges the vast energy resources that our country owns under its Federal lands onshore. It also acknowledges contemporary technology that provides all of the security and safety that is required to do the job well. But what it does is it diverts some of the resources into the right places, that allows the streamlining of permitting while also empowering the local offices of our Bureau of Land Management and our U.S. Forest Service in ways that allow them to do the jobs that they do very well even better.

This is something I know a little bit about. Prior to coming to Congress, I was an energy regulator for 10 years in North Dakota. I worked closely with our Federal partners, in fact, found them to be some of the best people that

I had the opportunity to know. I just met with a number of them last week out in the western part of the State. They do a great job, but they need more resources, especially in an economy that is so competitive for workforce and so competitive in areas like rent and housing and the cost of living.

So by allowing the local offices to keep more of the permitting fees, we can channel the resources to allow them to do their jobs better and faster, without compromising the integrity of their charge to protect our other natural resources above the ground. They do it as well as anybody, and we ought to let them do that job and empower them to do it.

H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, simply acknowledges what the Constitution guarantees, and that is that we are a Nation of States and that States are, in fact, sovereign, and that nobody is more protective of the land and the water and the air than the people who live on it and drink it and breathe it. It simply states that if you have fracturing rules in your State, that is good enough. It is your State, and the Federal Government's minimum standards ought not impose, be an imposition, on the States and their rights to develop their resources the way they want to. It frees up resources of the Federal Government, while unleashing the ingenuity and innovation of our energy economy, providing wealth, providing jobs, and, by the way, reducing the cost of energy for the rest of us, which makes us even more competitive in the global marketplace.

We have a grand opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to pass these two bills and to put America on a path to full economic recovery and, perhaps, to bring more troops home from the Middle East to reduce our dependency on foreign oil. Let's do this not only as a country, but as a continent, acknowledging that our friends in Canada are better trading partners than Venezuela. Let's build the pipelines and infrastructure necessary. Let's unleash American ingenuity, and let's put America back to work by becoming more energy secure.

IMPACTS OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some of the stories that fellow Californians in my district are having with the impact under the ACA, the ObamaCare plan.

A funny thing happened on the way to government-run health care nirvana. 1.1 million Californians have lost their health care coverage. In fact, for every one person who has selected a new ACA ObamaCare plan, 40 people have received cancellation notices. They find that their costs are going to increase, especially in rural California, where choices are more limited of plans, of places to seek health care. Their access to health care is being jeopardized. The law is creating a huge burden for rural health care, where, again, you have to travel maybe several hours, many miles, to seek the kind of health care you need.

Despite the President's promise to the public on this issue, ''If you like your plan, you can keep it. Period,'' we heard; ''If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Period,'' we heard, this is clearly not the case. Less access, fewer choices, skyrocketing premiums, it is the wrong direction from the President's health care plan as promised.

I would like to share, again, some of the people from our district.

Bill and Corina Eiler from Fort Jones, California, they write, I received a letter from Anthem Blue Cross notifying me that, due to the Affordable Care Act, my plan had been canceled. My new monthly premium of $919, it used to be $480 a month, a 192 percent increase, which Bill finds absurd. They have two daughters in college and one more at home. How are they supposed to come up with that kind of money?

Tricia Plass of Tulelake writes that she and her husband, they are business owners. They are self-employed. They have always purchased their own health insurance. Their monthly premium has been around $800 a month for both of them. Their monthly premium will now jump to over $1,000 for just one of them. They still have to determine what the other one is going to do. It now appears they will be forced into California's insurance coverage, known as Covered California, where there are no plans with coverage for their doctor that they use now. Since they live near the State line of Oregon, they get their health care on the other side in Oregon. Their facility is there. Their doctor is there. They will no longer be able to see that doctor. They are going to have to drive maybe 2 or 3 hours to Redding or somewhere else to find new physicians. So they live with the constant fear that their new policy will not even provide coverage when they need it.

Janice Marquis from Redding writes:

> I recently received a letter from Aetna stating that my medical care coverage policy would be canceled at the end of the year.

She is 62 and must wait 2½ years before she is eligible for Medicare. Her insurance coverage will jump from $318 a month to over $500 a month. The promise made by President Obama, ''if you like your policy, you can keep it,'' she feels, was a lie.

> This entire program is a nightmare.

Lastly, this one is really disturbing. A lady named Ramona Larramendy from Redding, California, says she was diagnosed with stage 3 ovarian cancer in July. With her current plan she was able to get the surgery and treatment she needed. A very large hospital bill of $128,000 was covered. Her insurance paid all but $700 of that because she had good coverage. Now, because she is going to be canceled, she doesn't know what is going to happen to her. She still needs a lot more treatment in this crisis moment of her life, and yet, for her Christmas present, she is going to get uncertainty. She is going to get the worry, at a time where she is being treated for stage 3 cancer, what is the health care plan that, for political purposes, it appears, since we have done everything else to try and point out to the American people and to the politicians in this building that it needs to be fixed or changed, that we are not getting it right here.

So what are we going to do? Again, these Californians are not alone. These Americans are not alone. Millions are paying the price for the President's broken promises.

It should not be a political issue. It should be us serving the public. We cannot continue to stand by and watch as millions are losing their coverage that they want, that they shopped for, that they were diligent about, with people that are professionals that know what they are doing, unlike what we see with the people running the Web sites, which is only a small part of the whole big picture of what is wrong with this system.

We need to set the egos aside, go back to the drawing board—at the very least, set this aside for a year. I believe we should repeal it and go back to targeting the people that really do need the help and let the folks in this country that are already reasonably happy with their plan, have done the diligence, have made the efforts to get the coverage and be responsible Americans, they don't need to be bothered in this scenario. Let's help the people that need the help. The American Health Care Reform Act, as put over by the Republican Study Committee, is one way to do that.

So let's look for alternatives. We have alternatives. We have had them all along, as Republicans, as conservatives, as people that understand business. And so let's make these choices available to the American public, not force them into something that they never asked for other than for political purposes.

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 8 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Paul Taylor, St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

We stand before You, O Holy God, conscious of our sinfulness, but aware that we gather in Your name.

Come to us, remain with us, and enlighten our hearts. Give us light and strength to know Your will, to make it our own, and to live it in our lives.

Guide us by Your wisdom, support us by Your power, for You are God, our God, the holy God.

You desire justice for all. Enable us to uphold the rights of others. Do not allow us to be misled by ignorance or corrupted by fear or favor.

Unite us to Yourself in the bond of love and keep us faithful to all that is true.

As we gather in Your name, may we temper justice with love, so that all our discussions and reflections may be pleasing to You and earn the reward promised to good and faithful servants.

We ask this of You who live and reign forever and ever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TSONGAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. PAUL TAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and introduce a good friend and community leader in my home State, Reverend Paul Taylor, and to thank him for offering today's invocation. Reverend Taylor made the trip to the Nation's Capital from the great city of Latrobe, Pennsylvania. I know my colleague, TIM MURPHY, joins me in welcoming Reverend Taylor to the House of Representatives.

For the past 17 years, Reverend Taylor has dedicated his life to the students and faculty at Saint Vincent College. As a member of the college, he has held several prominent positions, including dean of admission, dean of students, and his current role as executive vice president.

Reverend Taylor's civic engagement and enthusiasm for improving the lives of others is not limited to higher education. Reverend Taylor also serves on the board of directors for the Latrobe Area Hospital Charitable Foundation and assists as a weekend parish priest.

In his personal life, Reverend Taylor is an avid hunter and serves as the chaplain to the six-time Super Bowl champion Pittsburgh Steelers, and he performs mass every Sunday for every home game.

Reverend Taylor is a warm and welcoming leader. He has helped build a strong foundation at Saint Vincent College that will last for decades to come. I am proud of the work he has done in the Pennsylvania community and am privileged to call him my friend.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

FRACKING

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, is a commonsense bill that promotes energy independence, protects jobs, and preserves states' rights.

The 25th District of Texas contains the Barnett Shale, a major job creator, energy provider, and economic driver in the oil and gas industry. Reports this month showed that 825 out of the 1,762 active rigs in the United States are located throughout the State of Texas. That is almost half the Nation's active drilling rigs.

The shale oil boom in Texas contributes to our Nation's overall ability to cut reliance on foreign oil and get one step closer to energy independence. I will tell you one thing that can stop this progress dead in its tracks, however, and that is red tape and Federal bureaucracy.

For 60 years, States have regulated their own hydraulic fracturing operations, but the Obama administration is attempting to step in and add duplicative and costly regulations. For example, on average, it takes a State 30 days to approve permits for drilling. The Federal Government's Bureau of Land Management takes an average of 228 days.

Subjecting States to this is senseless, harmful, and unnecessary. H.R. 2728 will prevent this and many other destructive regulations from stifling energy production and job creation.

IRAN AND DIPLOMACY

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as the diplomats gather in Geneva today, I applaud their hard work in moving toward an interim agreement on the Iranian nuclear challenge.

After years of confrontation, today marks an important moment for all of us who support a diplomatic solution. We have spent a great deal of time to get to this place: taxpayer dollars, political capital, and global influence. We must not turn back now.

Right now, we have the maximum amount of leverage for a deal vis-a-vis Iran without fracturing the international coalition. Therefore, we should focus 100 percent on reaching a deal in Geneva under the P5+1 framework. It is absolutely critical.

Like using a wrench to tighten a nut, you can strip it if you push too hard. We have pushed to exactly the right point, and I hope that we will be successful.

We must, however, remember Mr. Reagan said, ''Trust, but verify.'' It is possible to prevent nuclear problems if we trust, but verify. That is what these diplomats are doing.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, I have heard from thousands of people in the Dayton area who have been affected by the unilateral and irresponsible spending cuts known as sequestration, which I have strongly opposed. Among those are numerous business owners who have contacted my office with details about the need to cut hours and eliminate full-time jobs in an effort to keep their doors open in this time of budgetary uncertainty.

Because of this continued uncertainty in contracts and the military's ability to make commitments, thousands of jobs in the Dayton area are at risk as we head into the second year of sequestration. Many of these subcontractors are critical to the training and further education of our military personnel. As a result of these cutbacks, our readiness and the ability to deal with global conflicts are greatly diminished.

Hundreds of hardworking civilian employees are struggling to pay their personal bills as a result of furloughs, and many more will suffer in 2014 as reductions in force will be necessary if the burdens of sequestration are not lifted.

I encourage those members of the Budget Committee to find targeted and meaningful spending cuts that will alleviate the pressure that sequestration is having on Dayton and similar communities across the country that serve as strong supporters of our military.

EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, as we mark National Transgender Day of Remembrance, I rise in support of H.R. 1755, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

Earlier this month, the Senate made history by passing employment protections for transgender workers for the first time ever. This bipartisan legislation is about one thing: ensuring that all Americans, regardless of who they are or who they love, are treated with the dignity and equality that they deserve.

Last week, I heard from a teenager constituent in New Hampshire who would be deeply impacted by this bill. This courageous young man is just beginning to search for his first job, but he is worried that he will be at a significant disadvantage right off the bat because he is transgender.

Finding a job in tough economic times is hard enough without the obstacle of discrimination. We must work toward becoming a country that rewards the hard work of every person, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

MENTAL HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, another preventable tragedy: a young man searching for psychiatric help is turned away. According to news reports, just 24 hours before this deadly incident, the young man underwent an emergency psychiatric evaluation but could not get the inpatient treatment he so desperately needed. His story ended like too many others suffering from serious illness—in a violent death.

Why did the system fail him? One, there were no psychiatric beds available. In 1955, there were 550,000 beds; today, there are fewer than 40,000. Two, the standard to make sure a mentally ill person gets treatment is unworkable. Three, Federal laws like HIPAA and FERPA prevent information from being shared.

I am introducing legislation next month to fix the problems that have plagued the Nation's mental health system for decades. It will increase inpatient options and make sure people get the treatment they need. We have to advance this so we have a key to unlock the door.

I ask my colleagues to join me in working for these mental health reforms so that families can share the joy of recovery instead of the sadness of loss.

NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize National Alzheimer's Awareness Month.

One of my constituents, Alan Holbrook of Groton, Massachusetts, lost his wife this year after their family endured her 8-year battle with Alzheimer's disease. Bernadette Holbrook was diagnosed with Alzheimer's at 57. Alan left his job to lovingly take care of her.

He is not alone. For every person with Alzheimer's, there are approximately two to three others that generously give unpaid care.

Alzheimer's is a disease that disproportionately impacts women. Nearly two-thirds of those with the disease are women, and that number is growing. Today, 5 million people in this country suffer from the disease, and it will likely be an estimated 15 million by 2025.

This disease not only exacts a tremendous physical and emotional toll, but a financial one as well. In 2013, the estimated direct costs just to take care of those with Alzheimer's were $203 billion.

Mr. Speaker, for the Holbrooks and the millions of those who suffer from Alzheimer's disease, we must dedicate ourselves towards curing and preventing this disease.

IF YOU LIKE YOUR HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN, YOU CAN KEEP IT—WITHOUT THE FINE PRINT

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, if you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it—without the fine print.

The American people were told repeatedly by the President that if they liked their health insurance plan, they could keep it. This pledge didn't come with an asterisk, a footnote, or other fine print. Now, after millions of Americans are receiving cancelation notices from their preferred health care plans, the White House is doing its best to insert fine print into this pledge where none ever existed.

The original pledge wasn't that most Americans could keep their health care plan or that others would lose their plans and be given coverage that the government thought was better for them. Instead, the White House is making excuses for why thousands of people in my district are losing their preferred coverage.

I ask for the administration to stop making excuses and looking for ways to take my constituents' policies away. My constituents deserve the truth and real solutions.

□ 1215

PANCREATIC CANCER ACTION NETWORK

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I welcomed Rhode Island volunteers from the Pancreatic Cancer Action Network to the United States Capitol and discussed their concerns about our commitment to fighting this terrible disease.

According to the National Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health, 45,000 new cases of pancreatic cancer will be diagnosed this year. About 38,000 men, women, and children across our Nation will die from this disease over this same period of time.

While our scientific and medical communities have made enormous strides in the fight against other forms of disease, the fact is that more than 90 percent of pancreatic cancer patients will die within 5 years of diagnosis.

We have to do more to make it easier for doctors to catch this disease early and develop treatments that will improve the prognosis for patients with pancreatic cancer. I applaud the men and women of the Pancreatic Cancer Action Network today for their ongoing work in the fight against this disease, and I look forward to working with them to support continued research and the development of new forms of treatment that will benefit all those whose lives are touched by cancer.

WHERE ARE THE OBAMACARE SAVINGS?

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Steven from Salisbury, North Carolina, wrote to tell that the insurance that has served his family well is going to be canceled. In its place, he has been pointed to an ObamaCare alternative. However, it will cost $523 more each month. Steven finds that unbelievable. He writes:

> In return for this increase, I get coverage I do not need. This one-size-fits-all insurance is paternalistic and restricting the choices of American citizens.

Doug, who is also from Salisbury, was told his health insurance plan doesn't pass ObamaCare muster either. A similar government-sanctioned policy will cost him 200 percent more each month. Doug wants to know:

> Where is the savings President Obama told me I would enjoy? As a single male with a suffering small business and a monthly mortgage, I simply can't afford this.

Steven and Doug know better than Washington bureaucrats what coverage will best meet their family and individual needs. They want the freedom to continue making that choice, the freedom to keep the plans they like, for good.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week there was a ribbon cutting at Miami International Airport for 36 new customer service kiosks. While this was greeted as good news, there is still a great unanswered question: What happens to all the customer service workers that machines like this replace?

It is the same story at grocery stores, drugstores, toll booths, and so on. Customer service jobs that used to be gateways to the middle class are increasingly being replaced with technology.

Mr. Speaker, this is not bad news. Time-saving technologies must be created, constructed, maintained, and repaired—and this takes human labor as well, but we must train our workforce to perform these jobs. This is the essence of the skills gap that is afflicting our communities. By cutting job training programs, reckless budget cuts like the sequester are making it harder to close the skills gap and, in turn, reduce unemployment. The mantra of this Congress should be jobs, jobs, jobs.

ENSURING AMERICANS CAN KEEP THEIR HEALTH PLAN

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to tell the story of one of my constituents, Jane, whose health care plan was canceled in the wake of ObamaCare. Here is a recent email she sent to me:

> I am a 61-year-old woman with a husband on Medicare. The day before the exchange opened, I received a letter from BlueCross/BlueShield informing me my policy is no longer available. The policy that is closest in coverage is approximately 50 percent higher in premiums and had an almost 50 percent higher deductible. I feel it is extremely unfair that I was told I could keep my coverage if I liked it. I will also have to pay substantially more for the same coverage. I wonder if the administration ever thought about those of us who have to pay for our health coverage with no extra help and how much more we would be paying.

Mr. Speaker, this House passed H.R. 3350 so Jane and others can keep the plan they want and can afford. The Senate must act and not cover for the President, who conceded he broke his promise to Americans. Let's give good news to Americans.

PASS IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, since this Congress convened, it has done nothing to help create jobs. In fact, through ill-advised and overenthusiastic cutting, the sequester, the shutdown, the threat to our full faith and credit, this Congress has destroyed jobs.

Mr. Speaker, what if I told you there was a jobs bill just sitting waiting to be passed that would add almost $1 trillion to our economy in a 10-year period? What if I told you this jobs bill would create 121,000 new jobs every single year for 10 years? What if I told you that this would also make us a more humane Nation that would stop the breakup of families and the deportations of moms and dads, of Dreamers? What if I told you that this jobs plan got 68 votes in the United States Senate, a divided United States Senate.

Of course, I am describing the comprehensive immigration bill, which the Speaker of this House refuses to bring up. There is no principled, no logical objection to this thing. There are just scare tactics that people with funny accents and names you can't pronounce will come and take your job. That is not true. It is time to pass that jobs bill.

MORE BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, American families are watching the train wreck of the President's health care reform law coming down the track at them each and every day.

Promises were made by the President and by supporters of the law that if you like your plan, you can keep it. Promises were made that family plans would cost $2,500 a year less under ObamaCare. Those promises just weren't true.

David in Carroll County wrote me just this morning to let me know what his family is going through with their health insurance. David is self-employed and is married with three children. He likes his family plan. He doesn't think it is substandard in any way, but his family just got a cancelation notice.

Mr. Speaker, they won't get to keep the plan they like. His new plan, which the Federal Government says that they have to buy, will cost $400 more per month, an increase of almost $5,000 more per year, not a decrease as the President promised.

David's family is just a hardworking, middle class family trying to make ends meet. Mr. Speaker, David and his family deserve better than broken promises.

BENEFITS OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tout the very real benefits of ObamaCare.

Karrie Brooks, a resident in my district, wrote to me saying:

> The individual coverage that I could afford as a healthy 54-year-old woman has been $418 a month with a $5,000 deductible. I avoided going to the doctor mostly for fear that if I used the insurance, my policy would be canceled.

She goes on to say:

> Recently, Anthem let me know that I would have to change to a compliant plan. The plan they suggested is similar, but it will cost me $53 less each month. Yes, less. Most important, I know that it cannot be canceled. The peace of mind and security that these changes have given me is huge.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in decades, a single illness or accident will not plunge American families into financial ruin. The positive effects of ObamaCare are real, and Americans like Karrie Brooks are evidence of that.

DECREASING SPENDING

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, yesterday The Washington Times reported that the U.S. is now spending millions on life skills and art seminars for prisoners at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. The paper said a multimillion dollar Federal contract is teaching Gitmo detainees basic landscaping, calligraphy, and Microsoft PowerPoint, among other seminars and library services.

Last July, the Comptroller of the Defense Department reported that the cost of keeping Guantanamo prison open during 2013 would be an astounding $454 million for just 164 prisoners. This comes out to roughly $2.7 million per year for each one of these detainees held in the prison camp. This compares to $72,000 per year per prisoner in Federal high security prisons. Because the Federal Government is so wasteful and inefficient, States are housing State prisoners for half that amount.

The taxpayers of this Nation should not be forced to spend $454 million to give the good life to former terrorists. They should be sent to the most unpleasant prison in the U.S., but this and other abuses of U.S. taxpayers will continue until we drastically downsize the Federal Government and greatly decrease its funding.

PROPOSALS TO CREATE JOBS

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Republican leadership handed out a blank piece of paper labeled ''Agenda 2014.'' Blank means no goals, no plan, no immigration reform, no jobs, no nothing.

Well, I have a list of proposals that I would like to write on that blank slate, proposals that would create jobs, grow the economy, and strengthen the middle class. So I will start today by introducing commonsense legislation that achieves these objectives and invests in our country's ability to compete in the 21st century.

The Training Highly Skilled Americans Act would use revenue from H–1B visas to promote STEM education at minority-serving colleges and universities and provide scholarships to minority students who are going into STEM fields.

Science and technology companies are already paying our government to bring foreign workers to the U.S. to fill STEM jobs, so why not use some of these funds to train our own folks to have these skills to fill these jobs in the future? This is particularly critical for minority students, who are significantly underrepresented in these fields. By opening our doors to STEM education, we will strengthen our education system and our economy.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT WEB SITE PROBLEMS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this fall the President said the Affordable Care Act is more than just a Web site and that the problems with the Web site will soon be fixed. While I don't disagree with either of those two statements, I don't understand the timeline involved because yesterday in the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the deputy chief information officer for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services told us that the Web site was launched, but it wasn't finished upon launch.

I have to ask: Why in the world would they proceed with this if they knew it wasn't finished? When asked to give a percentage completion, it was confusing. His answer was either 40 or 60 percent; no one really knows, and here is the kicker. When you get to January and providers, doctors, and hospitals are seeing patients who think they have coverage under the Affordable Care Act, part of the problem with the unfinished Web site is there may be difficulty in delivering provider payments. That is an intolerable situation that must be resolved and must be resolved quickly. It could start with the administration being honest with the committee about where they are in the development of the Web site.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, today world leaders are meeting in Geneva to negotiate an agreement that could lead to the elimination or reduction in the threat of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. This is a good thing. The goal of the negotiations is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, particularly those in the possession of or that could potentially be developed by Iran. We don't want Iran to have a nuclear weapon. We ourselves are trying to reduce stockpiles, so negotiations to prevent that are squarely within the United States national security interests.

The American people support these negotiations. A new Washington Post poll shows that Americans want a negotiated deal with Iran by a 2–1 margin. The alternative to negotiation is not good. In fact, it could lead to war. Americans do not want another war. Therefore, negotiations are the right way to handle this particular problem with regard to preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. Support negotiations. We support them, and hope they succeed.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, recently, I received an email from a woman in my district named Shannon. Shannon received a letter from her health care provider stating that her current health care policy did not meet the requirements of the Affordable Care Act and that she would have to choose a new plan or go to the health care marketplace and find coverage.

She went to the health care marketplace and found a comparable plan that cost $400 a month more. This is outrageous. More than 300,000 Floridians, like Shannon, received letters that their current health care plans were canceled. Premiums and deductibles are increasing for countless Americans. So many people received notices that their plans were canceled. We have only begun to experience the devastating effects of this law.

I submit that the next concern of my constituents will be not only that they can't keep their health care plan, but they won't be able to keep their doctors. We need to get rid of this law, and we need to replace it with one that is consumer-focused and market-driven so that Americans like Shannon can get affordable health care coverage and keep their doctors.

□ 1230

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(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, many of my colleagues have highlighted the challenges of implementing the Affordable Care Act at the Federal level. While these must be addressed, I would like to take a minute to highlight the successes we have seen at the State level in Rhode Island. Although a majority of States opted not to operate an exchange of their own, Rhode Island chose to be a leader in creating a State-driven, integrated marketplace to provide quality, affordable health insurance for its citizens.

On October 1, Health Source RI, the Ocean State's online portal and health insurance marketplace, opened for business. It has successfully enrolled over 5,000 residents to date without many of the issues plaguing the Federal Web site. Of course, we are still at the beginning stages of this process, and efforts are under way to improve and expand the successful rollout with many of our State partners.

This has been a highly collaborative effort, and I look forward to continuing our work together so that individuals, families, and small businesses can shop for insurance that meets their needs based on transparent, competitive pricing and robust coverage.

PRO-GROWTH ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, Americans are working hard to make ends meet during this sluggish economy, and a clear and predictable pro-growth energy policy will help to alleviate financial stress on American families as energy costs rise. But most of all, pro-growth energy policies will create jobs and put Americans back to work.

If you are looking for legislation that will create jobs across America, there are several opportunities to vote ''yes'' this week in the United States House.

The Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, Federal Lands Jobs and Energy Security Act, and the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act are all pro-growth, pro-energy policies that the House will consider this week and will give all my colleagues an opportunity to show whether they are pro-jobs or not.

These bills will promote natural gas pipeline infrastructure construction projects, expand onshore American energy production, and create jobs by passing these bills that will streamline government red tape and eliminate duplicative and costly regulations that only delay safe energy production on American soil.

Mr. Speaker, let's unite on behalf of the American people and support these pro-energy growth, pro-job creation bills.

CONGRATULATING TEACHER OF THE YEAR, ART ALMQUIST

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Tucson High Magnet School's teacher, Art Almquist, as being named Teacher of the Year by People Magazine.

For the past 17 years, Mr. Almquist has been Tucson Magnet's drama teacher. He has built a phenomenal theater program rarely seen on any high school level. His programs and plays have won numerous awards from universities, as well as regularly being named one of the best high school theaters in America by the American High School Theater Festival.

Mr. Almquist is known for staging productions on topics such as AIDS, environmental activism, and immigration. He believes the theater offers each student an opportunity to learn new skills and enhance his skills.

As an educator, he has influenced thousands of students to pursue a career that both challenges them, but also brings them joy.

I give my most sincere thanks and congratulations to Mr. Art Almquist for representing Tucson as a leader in the field of education. Mr. Almquist exemplifies how a role model can effect change and educate the next generation.

THANKSGIVING AND SNAP

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, next week we celebrate Thanksgiving, a holiday in which we express our gratitude for all that life in this land has given us. We celebrate our good fortune with family, friends, and foods.

One of the most iconic portrayals of this day is Norman Rockwell's 1941 painting, ''Freedom from Want,'' which shows a large family seated around a dinner table waiting to carve up a turkey. This painting was created to depict what Franklin Roosevelt called one of the ''four essential human freedoms,'' the freedoms that millions of Americans would fight and die to protect in World War II.

Roosevelt reminded us as Americans that ''we cannot be content . . . if some fraction of our people, whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth, is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.'' Instead, ''after this war is won, we must be prepared to move forward . . . to new goals of human happiness and well-being.''

Mr. Speaker, we are moving in the wrong direction. Right now in America, 49 million Americans, one out of every seven households in our country, are struggling with hunger, including 16 million kids. At this time of great need, this body proposes to cut $40 billion from food stamps, forcing 4 million low-income Americans to go hungry. It is immoral.

HOMES ACT

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, energy efficiency investments work. A recent study by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory found that improving the airtightness in homes would achieve $33 billion in annual energy savings.

Across the country, 113 million homes use 23 percent of U.S. source energy, and the largest potential is in the hottest and the coldest climates.

In Vermont, we are leading the country on energy efficiency, demonstrating the potential these home improvements can have for saving money and protecting the environment.

I have introduced bipartisan legislation with my good friend and Republican colleague, Representative MCKINLEY, that would provide homeowners with an incentive to install precisely these kinds of efficiency measures in their own homes.

Whatever your preferred source of energy, we can all agree that using less energy is good for the taxpayer and the environment. This is something we can and should work together on accomplishing.

I encourage everyone to read Lawrence Berkeley's article in the science digest Energy and Buildings. It can be found at www.elsevier.com/locate/enbuild.

HONORING NATIVE AMERICAN CODE TALKERS

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, November is Native American Heritage Month, and I rise today to honor the many contributions that Native Americans have made and continue to make to our Nation's proud history and culture.

Earlier today, we awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to 26 tribes whose members served as code talkers during World War II and World War I, including the Pueblo of Acoma, which is one of 22 Native tribes that call New Mexico home. At a later date, we will honor seven more code talker tribes, including another from New Mexico, the Pueblo of Laguna.

The code talkers proudly served our country with great honor and distinction. They transmitted vital information during some of the most dangerous battles, including every assault the marines conducted in the Pacific from 1942 to 1945. Without the code talkers, the world wars would have lasted longer and America would have suffered many more casualties.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the Pueblos of Acoma and Laguna and the other code talker tribes are officially getting the thanks and recognition they deserve from a very grateful Nation.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1900, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 420

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1900) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-25. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from November 22, 2013, through November 29, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of

this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 420 provides for the consideration of a critical piece of legislation that was passed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce designed to address the costly and unnecessary delays which many businesses experience when trying to get a final determination to be made by the Federal Government in relation to a pending pipeline.

A member of the committee, Mr. POMPEO from Kansas, the bill's author, has drafted a meaningful piece of legislation, taking into account the various competing interests involved in the permitting process and has found a fair and just balance for ensuring that our critical infrastructure moves forward.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of general debate on the bill. Five of the six amendments submitted to the Rules Committee were made in order, all Democratic amendments. The sixth was neither germane nor did it meet the CutGo rules of the House. Finally, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit on the bill, allowing for yet another opportunity to amend the legislation.

H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, is the product of hours of work with stakeholders that Mr. POMPEO has put in to improve the legislation. The bill streamlines our Nation's pipeline permitting processes in an effort to allow for greater capacity and promote safe infrastructure. Specifically, the bill directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve or deny a permit application for a new natural gas pipeline within 12 months.

Natural gas is one of the clearest examples of how this country can move itself toward a more sustainable energy-independent future while at the same time allowing and encouraging our economy to grow. My own district in north Texas sits 8,000 feet above the Barnett shale, a natural gas formation that industry has been using to produce gas for decades. Indeed, due to the technological advances and strong market, the area that I represent felt few of the effects of the recession until at least a year after the recession was initiated due to the booming economy that resulted from the development of the resources under our feet.

Obviously, with increased production and demand, as we have seen with the natural gas industry, comes an increased need for infrastructure. I welcome any legislation which would streamline the permitting process and allow companies to spend less time with Washington bureaucrats and more time creating jobs, producing products that consumers want and are eager to buy.

□ 1245

Indeed, with the increase in supply that hydraulic fracturing has created with natural gas, the pace at which the Federal Government has approved increased infrastructure, namely pipelines, to transport this commodity has not kept up.

Pipelines provide the safest, fastest, and cleanest mode of transportation for natural gas, as we in the Energy and Commerce Committee have heard from witnesses again and again. Making certain that our country has the number of pipelines necessary for transporting the gas we need to heat our homes and run our cars is a critical step toward energy independence.

Moreover, Members of this body who annually support more robust funding for programs like the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, commonly referred to as LIHEAP, should be joining with Republicans today in supporting an increase in pipeline infrastructure in our country, as the natural gas being produced in Western States could more efficiently be transported to the Northeastern States, reducing home heating costs and lessening the need for government assistance for many families.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an important bill. It will create opportunity to put thousands of workers to work, creating the infrastructure that this country has needed for some time due to the energy boom in natural gas. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that this Republican-controlled House of Representatives is incapable of doing anything that matters in people's lives. When the history is written on the 113th Congress, especially as it pertains to the House of Representatives, they have accomplished nothing. They have made a lot of noise. They shut the government down. They whine about the health care bill every chance they get, but they have accomplished absolutely nothing.

And it is frustrating because our country is facing great challenges. Our economic growth is slower than it should be, thanks to the Republican shutdown of government, and their willingness to play politics with the debt ceiling has had a negative impact on our economy. Job growth is too slow, and we should be working together to invest in education and in job training and in infrastructure projects to help put people back to work. We ought to have a long-term highway bill. I think every Governor in the country, Republican and Democrat, would agree with me on that statement. Yet this House of Representatives just seems incapable of accomplishing anything to help rebuild our infrastructure.

The sequester that my Republican friends embraced has taken a terrible toll on our science and research programs. Talk to the people at NIH. Potentially lifesaving research into diseases like cancer and Parkinson's disease have been crippled, yet there is no urgency over on the side of my friends on the other side of the aisle to try to do anything about it. They just sit there and twiddle their thumbs and life goes on; meanwhile, we are losing our competitive edge in medical research and in science.

The Senate has passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill. The Republican leadership claims that we simply don't have the time to take it up. That is nonsense. We had time to take up this horrible bill that my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING) authored that would allow for the mass deportation of young, undocumented immigrants, the so-called DREAMers who were brought here as children by their parents. They have time to demagogue these issues, but to actually fix our broken immigration system, they claim we don't have any time.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD today's Washington Post editorial, ''John Boehner Must Act on Immigration Now.''

And just so my colleagues understand this, when my friends on the other side of the aisle say they don't have time, the Republicans will take 4 out of 5 days off for the rest of the year. That is how hard they are working on behalf of the American people. Four out of 5 days remaining from now until the end of the year they are going to take off. That is not doing your job, Mr. Speaker. That is not doing your job.

Instead of dealing with these important issues, we have this bill before us now that has come to the floor, H.R. 1900. The bill before is rather curious. Rather than solving a problem that actually exists, it is a solution in search of a problem, and it is just another partisan messaging bill that is going nowhere in the Senate. The White House has already said they would veto it.

H.R. 1900 would require FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, to approve or deny an application for a natural gas pipeline within 12 months of its filing date. FERC already

decides 92 percent of permit applications within 12 months, and the GAO has concluded that its pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent and gets pipelines built. The small percentage of applications that have taken more than a year involve complex proposals that deserve a more thoughtful review.

Instead of speeding up the permitting process, this bill will lead to unnecessary permit denials and increased litigation that will ultimately slow the process down. If FERC cannot properly review permits within the rigid 12-month deadline, they may be forced to deny applications that would otherwise end up being approved.

For me, the most troubling part of H.R. 1900 is that it may result in truncated or inadequate environmental analysis, which threatens the health and safety of communities these potentially hazardous pipelines run through. Just last week, a Chevron pipeline exploded in Milford, Texas, forcing the entire town to evacuate. Mr. Speaker, it isn't too much to ask the oil and gas industry to go through a process to make sure that these pipelines are safe.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and on the underlying bill, and I urge my Republican colleagues to get back to work on solving real problems on behalf of the American people.

Enough of the press releases, enough of this polarizing rhetoric and these meaningless debates that we seem to be consumed with here in the House of Representatives. People want us to work on their behalf, to do things that will improve their lives, that will strengthen our country; and instead, my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be cheering for our country to fail all the time and bringing this kind of stuff to the floor, which is going nowhere and is meaningless.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

[The Washington Post, Nov. 19, 2013]

JOHN BOEHNER MUST ACT ON IMMIGRATION NOW

(By Editorial Board)

Poor John Boehner. The beleaguered House speaker can't even eat breakfast in peace. The other day, a pair of teenage girls, activists for immigration reform, accosted him at Pete's Diner, his early-morning hangout, to ask how he'd like to be deported.

''How would you feel if you had to tell your kids at the age of 10 that you were never coming home?'' 13-year-old Carmen Lima, of California, asked Mr. Boehner. ''That wouldn't be good,'' allowed the Speaker.

He got that right. The rest of his remarks on immigration that day, not so much. Mr. Boehner, who pledged to press ahead with immigration reform a year ago following Mitt Romney's dismal performance with Latino voters, now says the House will not negotiate with Democrats on the basis of the sweeping reform bill passed by the Senate in June with bipartisan support. Translation: Don't hold your breath for immigration reform this year, and don't get your hopes high for next year, either.

Mr. Boehner says he still wants to ''deal with'' immigration, but ''in a commonsense, step-by-step way.''

The trouble is, no one knows what those steps would be. The only immigration bill on which Mr. Boehner has permitted a vote by the full House would allow for the mass deportation of young, undocumented immigrants brought to this country illegally as children by their parents—the so-called Dreamers.

Deporting hundreds of thousands of youngsters who grew up and went to school in the United States does not seem an especially promising way to resolve the broader issue of the nation's broken immigration system. Neither does heaving billions of dollars more at border security without tackling the entire problem. Some partial reforms, such as opening the visa spigot for high-tech engineers, scientists and mathematicians, may make sense, but they don't get at the fundamental problem.

As it happens, border security and high-tech visas are addressed in the Senate bill, along with more fundamental reform; that's why it's 1,300 pages long, a fact that Mr. Boehner cited to dismiss its viability as the basis for negotiations. In the wake of Obamacare's rollout troubles, large-scale reforms are in poor repute, we understand. But there are 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States. The country needs to deal with them in some way. When it does so, it needs to set up a sensible system for future immigration so we don't wind up in the same fix 10 or 20 years from now. That requires legislation of some complexity, it's true, but members of Congress are elected to solve complex problems.

President Obama said Tuesday that he is open to dealing with immigration in a piecemeal fashion. But the House can't dictate that only border security and deportation are on the table. Mr. Boehner should let House Republicans vote on the parts of immigration reform they consider priorities and take that ''sensible step-by-step'' approach into negotiations with the Senate. It is unserious, and unconstructive, to tell the Senate what it can and cannot bring to the table in negotiations with the House.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I rise today in opposition to the rule and to H.R. 1900.

As many of my colleagues are aware, natural gas is extremely important to the State of Texas. It seems like every day more and more natural gas deposits are being found. More importantly, with the commercialization of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, we are now able to develop these resources effectively and economically, but that is only half the story. Once we have found these resources, we need a way to move them to market in a safe and environmentally responsible way.

In 1956, the United States decided it was in our best interest to build a network of highways. These highways, totaling approximately 47,000 miles, moved goods to market and dramatically expanded commerce. It may surprise some, but the interstate and intrastate pipeline system is approximately seven times larger than the highway system in the United States.

The natural gas pipeline system in this country is critical and extensive infrastructure. The permitting and review process that is required to site and construct pipelines in this country has ensured an environmental safety record that is second to none. That doesn't mean there aren't still going to be problems, when you consider the amount of miles we have.

Unfortunately, I can't support this particular bill. I support an expedited review process and expansion of the pipeline system. Our intrastate natural gas pipeline system is not broken. I cannot support a bill that would issue a license or permit or approval after merely an expired time line. In testimony in our committee, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the FERC, has an average of about a year turnaround.

I want to continue to support the construction of pipelines, and my ardent support is firmly backed by a safety record that is unmatched. I will continue to support an industry that has been an engine of our economic growth for the last decade.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the future on another approach that will benefit all stakeholders, our environment, and our economy.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and the bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I see four people in the gallery. I see three Members on the floor. The galleries are empty, the floor is empty because we are not doing anything, and it is not because we don't have a lot of things to do.

We have 6—7 if you count tomorrow where we will leave by 12:00—6 full days left in the session in 2013, and yet we fiddle here while the country sees itself burning on bills that are going nowhere, that have no priority and deal with a subject, energy, which, happily, is one of the most successful places we are at in America today, where we are fast becoming the energy-independent, low-cost energy situs of the world.

We have no budget conference coming to this floor scheduled in the 6 full days that we have left and the 2 other days that may be counted in which we come in at 6:30 and meet for probably a half an hour or 45 minutes and vote on suspension bills. Yet we have spent this entire week—and we left, of course, hardworking day yesterday, we left doing work at 2:30 in the afternoon. No budget conference, no fiscal policy, no solution to the crisis that confronted us when we shut down government.

I urged that we have a budget conference report by November 22—that is tomorrow—so that we didn't, as our practice has been in recent months and

years, confront real issues only when crisis gives us no other alternative.

No immigration reform has been brought to the floor, although it passed the Senate with 68 votes, comprehensive immigration reform, which will address a problem that every Member of this House says is an immigration system that is broken. The majority leader said that the other day, and I asked him about the four bills that our Republican friends, Mr. Speaker, have reported out of committee but they languish somewhere in the netherworld, not brought to the floor for consideration by this House.

And yet we have time to consider bills that will have no impact, which the President says he will veto, and are not bipartisan bills, were reported out of the committee in a partisan fashion, as so much of the legislation that we consider on this House floor is, partisan, confrontational, no-consensus pieces of legislation.

Yet a comprehensive immigration reform bill that had 68 votes, over two-thirds of the United States Senate, 14 Republicans voted for that bill, yet the Speaker says he is not for it and won't bring it to the floor. That is the same Speaker that says let the House work its will. The House cannot work its will if the legislation is not brought to the floor by the House, which can only be done by the Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, as you know. So they keep that bill from being considered, although CBO says it will help the economy, grow jobs, and fix a broken system.

□ 1300

There are 6 full days left to go on the schedule in 2013. And yet the farm bill, which was reported out of the committee 2 years ago in a bipartisan fashion in the last Congress but was never brought to this floor, while we twiddled our thumbs while Rome burned—the farm bill lies languishing in conference committee because a bipartisan bill, passed by the United States Senate, was not considered in this House.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. But a partisan bill with almost no Democratic votes, and the second piece of that farm bill, the nutritional part, receiving not a single Democratic vote, lies languishing in the conference committee because it was passed in an extraordinarily partisan fashion, where the gentleman from Oklahoma's (Mr. LUCAS) bill, reported out in a bipartisan fashion. The American public, Mr. Speaker, says, Let's act bipartisanly. We did. With Democratic and Republican votes, the farm bill came out of the Agriculture Committee and was turned into a partisan bill on this floor by my Republican colleagues. So it languishes with 6 days left, with the farm bill expiring on December 31, no action, no progress.

We need to pay our doctors a proper compensation for the services they give. I am sure the gentleman from the Rules Committee, who, himself, is a medical doctor, understands this necessity. We need to fix the sustainable growth, but it languishes somewhere out in the netherworld while we have 6 days left. Unfixed, unscheduled. I have asked the majority leader numerous times: Is that going to be brought to the floor? It has not been brought to the floor.

Discrimination in the workplace, passed by the Senate in a bipartisan fashion, ENDA, is not going to be brought to this floor. The Speaker says he is opposed to it, so the House will not be able to work its will again on a piece of legislation that, in my opinion, would have a majority of the votes on this floor. There is no doubt in my mind, and I am the whip. I count votes, Mr. Speaker, as you know. It would have the majority of votes on this floor, but the Speaker and the majority leader will not bring it to this floor.

Unemployment insurance for 1.2 million people ends on December 31, and we have 6 days of full work left and two partial days when we come in at 6:30. Yet unemployment insurance has not been brought to this floor to be extended for those 1.1 million people, with still 7.2 or 7.3 percent unemployment. Unemployment insurance is a critically important issue. It is somewhere out there, but it is not on this floor. This, while we have considered legislation this entire week that the majority knows will not pass the United States Senate and, even if it did pass, would not be signed by the President of the United States.

But they send a message, perhaps, to their base: politics. With the budget conference, immigration reform, the farm bill, the sustainable growth rate, doc reimbursement for Medicare patients, discrimination in the workplace, unemployment insurance, and, yes, I would add to that tax extenders—none of it on this floor.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. No one ought to ask themselves why the American people hold this institution in such low regard. None of us who have served in this institution for any period of time are proud of what we are doing in this Congress. We lament the unwillingness of the leadership of this House to have us do the work that the American public knows we must be doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the previous question. This is not just an ordinary previous question. What this previous question says is, We will not adjourn, American people. We will not adjourn on December 13, as is projected by the majority to be the date on which we adjourn. We will not adjourn until such time as we have done the important work that the American people expect of us, the responsible work that the American people expect of us, the work that we ought to expect of ourselves until we consider this bill.

I would hope that we would defeat the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, then we will bring to this floor a resolution which will say, We shall not adjourn until we have done a budget conference that precludes fiscal crisis, shutting down government, a refusal to pay America's debts; that we pass an immigration reform bill that fixes what everybody knows is a broken system; until we bring a farm bill to the floor which will preclude farmers and consumers and those who need nutritional help from being put at risk.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter. This is not a letter from Democrats. This is a letter from 13 Republican leaders, chairs of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, who say to the budget conference committee: Bring a solution to the floor before the Thanksgiving break and no later than December 2. Yet, ladies and gentlemen of this House, Mr. Speaker—and yes, Mr. Speaker, all of us speak to the American people, who ought to be asking us, Why? Why? Why do we waste time when so much important work remains to be done?

Defeat the previous question. Allow us to offer a resolution which will say to the American people, We will continue to work until we get your work done.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, November 18, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Budget Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,
Ranking Member, Budget Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
Chairwoman, Budget Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JEFF SESSIONS,
Ranking Member, Budget Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN, CHAIRWOMAN MURRAY, RANKING MEMBER SESSIONS, AND RANKING MEMBER VAN HOLLEN: We call on the Budget conference to reach an agreement on the FY 2014 and 2015 spending caps as soon as possible to allow the appropriations process to move forward to completion by the January 15 expiration of the current short-term Continuing Resolution. We urge you to redouble your efforts toward that end and report common, topline levels for both the House and Senate before the Thanksgiving recess, or by December 2 at the latest.

If a timely agreement is not reached, the likely alternatives could have extremely damaging repercussions. First, the failure to reach a budget deal to allow Appropriations to assemble funding for FY 2014 will reopen the specter of another government shutdown. Second, it will reopen the probability

of governance by continuing resolution, based on prior year outdated spending needs and priorities, dismissing in one fell swoop all of the work done by the Congress to enact appropriations bills for FY 2014 that reflect the will of Congress and the people we represent. Third, the current sequester and the upcoming ''Second Sequester'' in January would result in more indiscriminate across the board reductions that could have negative consequences on critically important federal programs, especially our national defense.

In addition, failure to agree on a common spending cap for FY 2015 will guarantee another year of confusion.

The American people deserve a detailed budget blueprint that makes rational and intelligent choices on funding by their elected representatives, not by a meat ax. We urge you to come together and decide on a common discretionary spending topline for both FY 2014 and FY 2015 as quickly as possible to empower our Committee, and the Congress as a whole, to make the responsible spending decisions that we have been elected to make.

Sincerely,

Harold Rogers, Chairman, Committee on Appropriations; Jack Kingston, Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies; Tom Latham, Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies; Kay Granger, Chairwoman, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies; John Abney Culberson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies; John R. Carter, Chairman, Subcommittee on Homeland Security; Tom Cole, Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch; Frank R. Wolf, Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice Science, and Related Agencies; Rodney Frelinghuysen, Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense; Robert B. Aderholt, Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies; Michael K. Simpson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies; Ander Crenshaw, Chairman, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government; Ken Calvert, Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished whip. It is frustrating to serve in the people's House and watch as this leadership purposely tries to avoid doing the people's business. It is frustrating when you go home and you talk to farmers, and they want to know where the farm bill is. It is frustrating when you talk to people about immigration, and they look at what happened in the United States Senate, where it passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support, and we can't even get anything scheduled here. We can't even get anything scheduled here.

It is frustrating when people are still reeling over the fact that the Republicans shut the government down, and they want to make sure we don't repeat it. Yet we have no budget resolution, no budget conference that has been put together to make sure that we are on a road where we don't have any more of these Ted Cruz-led shutdowns around here. So it is very frustrating.

I think the gentleman from Maryland said it very clearly—that the American people are frustrated. It is not just Democrats. It is Democrats and Republicans that are frustrated.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURGESS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURGESS. Is it in order to refer to Members of the other body by name?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not provide an advisory opinion.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So we don't want another Ted Cruz-led shutdown here in the House of Representatives. I think the American people are fed up with that.

Then, as the distinguished minority whip pointed out, I mean, we are not even in session more than 6 full days from now until the end of the year, which is absolutely unconscionable.

You say to yourself, Well, maybe the Republicans are planning to do something in the future; maybe they have an agenda for the future. Then we read in Politico that last Thursday, a group of House Republicans filed into Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR's Capitol office suite and received a blank piece of paper labeled, ''Agenda 2014.'' This is their agenda for 2014. A Republican political aide put it more bluntly by saying, ''What we have done so far this year clearly hasn't worked.''

This is their agenda for next year. It might as well be the agenda for the rest of this year. It is nothing, nothing that is improving the quality of life for the people that we represent. Again, it fuels a cynicism all across the country that the majority party here doesn't seem to care about what happens to regular people, and that is very, very disconcerting.

I guess they could go back and say that their big accomplishment was that they complained about the Affordable Care Act. Over 40-something times, they brought bills to the floor to try to repeal it, never once offering an alternative to improve it, never once giving an alternative idea that would help address the fact that tens of millions of our citizens don't have health insurance. Millions do have health insurance, but it is really not health insurance because when they get sick, they realize they have been paying for a policy that provides them nothing. There is no alternative agenda to try to address those issues; it is just that they are against it. I guess it is easy to say ''no,'' but the bottom line is, I think the American people are looking for us to say ''yes'' to some things.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up House Resolution 424, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER's resolution prohibiting an adjournment of the House until we adopt a budget conference report.

What that means is that we should not adjourn until we do our job. That shouldn't be a radical idea. I would like to think there is bipartisan consensus that we ought to do our job, and that is what this would require.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and on the underlying bills which, to be honest with you, are a waste of our time. They are going nowhere in the Senate, and the President has already issued a veto threat on them.

With one last urging of my Republican colleagues to stay here and do your work, Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

You know, Mr. Speaker, it was a little over a year ago that the American people went to the polls, and in their wisdom, they elected a divided government. They knew what divided government looked like. They had seen it for the 2 years prior.

The President came to town in 2009 and promised a lot of sweeping changes, and he delivered on those sweeping changes during the first 2 years of his administration. He had a health care bill passed. The health care bill passed without a single Republican vote. You talk about a partisan vote—the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was a partisan vote. Unfortunately, we are seeing now, as we have convulsed the country with these changes that are occurring within the insurance system, we are seeing the changes that are going to occur to our providers, our doctors, our hospitals, our nurses in the months ahead. This is a serious situation, and it requires serious action to be taken.

I won't apologize for any action that has been taken by the majority in this House to try to rein in the excesses of the administration and the previous Democrat-controlled Congress when they took over one-sixth of the Nation's economy in a partisan fashion without a single Republican vote.

The sequester was passed in August of 2011. It was passed at the request of the President. The gentleman has talked about shutdowns and defaults of the government. Do you remember that the sequester was a compromise

proposed by the President and the Office of Management and Budget at the White House in order to prevent defaulting on our debt? It was a very difficult vote for many of us in this House.

What has the sequester delivered? The sequester delivered what no one had been able to deliver in the 4 years previously, and that is a Federal budget deficit that is below $1 trillion. It doesn't sound like a big ask that the American people had: We want you to stop spending so much money. The sequester delivered on that promise.

I find it strange now for the gentleman from Massachusetts to impugn the integrity of people who voted in favor of that sequester when the President and the minority leader of the House of Representatives now want to take credit for the fact that the deficit was cut in half over the last 4 years.

□ 1315

The only reason it was cut in half was because they raised it to unsustainable levels, and now the sequester has reined that back in. It is quite likely that the deficit at the end of fiscal year 2014 will in fact be lower if we don't do something to damage the trajectory that we are on.

I don't think the immigration bill passed by the Senate is here at the House. I think it has got an origination problem, and it is unconstitutional. If there is a bill at the desk, I will be happy to look at it, but I don't think that has occurred. The gentleman knows that.

This bill that we are considering today would lower the price of natural gas delivered to consumers in the State of Massachusetts. I have a table prepared by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The national average for natural gas is $9.19 per thousand cubic feet. In Massachusetts, it is $13.18.

So this is a bill today that could deliver product to the gentleman's constituents in Massachusetts at a much more reasonable price. This sounds to me like a bill that will help the economy. This sounds to me like a bill that may provide jobs for the American people.

The minority whip talked about the doc fix. Our committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, did pass, in a bipartisan fashion, the repeal of the sustainable growth rate formula. I think it is a good bill. I think it is a bill where we had participation from both sides of the dais and not a single dissenting vote when we voted on the bill in committee right before the August recess.

There is another body here in the Capitol Building. They are considering their own version of a similar bill in the appropriate Finance Committee over in the other body. I don't want to prejudge or preclude what they will or won't do. I am anxious for them to do something that would give us a negotiating point where we could consider moving forward with a final repeal of this problem, but in fact, the legislative branch consists of two bodies—this body and the body on the other side. Until the Finance Committee acts, there is little more that the Energy and Commerce Committee can do to push that bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of a critical bill to ensure our energy infrastructure needs are being met. Mr. POMPEO has done a good job. I applaud him and our committee for the thoughtful legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

[From the Energy & Commerce Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Nov. 19, 2013]

H.R. 1900 NEEDED TO DELIVER AFFORDABLE AMERICAN ENERGY TO CONSUMERS

HOUSE TO VOTE THIS WEEK ON LEGISLATION TO SPEED UP NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS

This week the House of Representatives will consider H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. Authored by Energy and Commerce Committee member Rep. MIKE POMPEO (R–KS), the bill will help ensure consumers have access to affordable and reliable energy by modernizing the permitting process for interstate natural gas pipelines. It is a critical part of the committee's efforts to build the architecture of abundance, and will allow American families and businesses across the country to enjoy the benefits of the U.S. shale gas boom.

America is experiencing a surge in natural gas production but right now we simply don't have the infrastructure to accommodate this increased supply and deliver this low-cost energy to consumers and manufacturers. And as gas gains a greater market share of the nation's electricity portfolio, many regions of the country do not have the pipeline capacity to support this conversion, leaving consumers vulnerable to price spikes. We saw this play out last January as areas of the country, particularly along the East Coast, faced gas shortages and high prices. According to a recent blog post by the Energy Information Administration, ''The increased use of natural gas for electricity generation has raised concerns about fuel diversity, as the Northeast is also reliant on natural gas for part of its heating needs and has limited pipeline capacity to bring gas to market. The winter of 2012–13 saw spikes in wholesale electricity prices in New England and New York as demand for natural gas from both electric generators and natural gas distribution companies taxed the capacity to bring natural gas into these markets.''

The chart below highlights those states that suffered the most last winter from high natural gas prices and the lack of adequate infrastructure, with natural gas prices reaching up to 68% higher than the national average:

Residential Natural Gas Prices for January 2013: National Average: $9.19*

Alabama	$14.44/57%
Arizona	$11.07/20%
Connecticut	$13.07/42%
Delaware	$12.32/34%
Florida	$15.43/68%
Georgia	$12.92/41%
Maine	$15.33/67%
Maryland	$10.73/17%
Massachusetts	$13.18/43%
New Hampshire	$11.99/30%
New Jersey	$10.81/18%
New York	$11.42/24%
North Carolina	$11.07/20%
Pennsylvania	$10.48/14%
Rhode Island	$12.58/37%

Residential Natural Gas Prices for January 2013: National Average: $9.19*—Continued

South Carolina	$11.88/29%
Vermont	$14.73/60%
Virginia	$11.10/21%
Washington	$10.47/14%

*Dollars per Thousand Cubic Feet
Source: U.S. EIA

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the rule governing debate on this bill, H.R. 1900, the ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Act.''

Mr. Speaker, as I stated yesterday when we debated the other energy bills, I am not anti-energy exploration. I am not pro—or anti-fracking. I am, however strongly ''pro-jobs,'' ''pro-economic growth,'' and ''pro-sustainable environment.''

As a Member of Congress from Houston I have always been mindful of the importance of, and have strongly advocated for, national energy policies that will make our nation energy independent, preserve and create jobs, and keep our nation's economy strong.

That is why I carefully consider each energy legislative proposal brought to the floor on its individual merits and support them when they are sound, balanced, fair, and promote the national interest.

Where they fall short, I believe in working across the aisle to improve them if possible by offering constructive amendments.

Although I believe the nation would benefit by increased pipeline capacity to transport our abundant supplies of natural gas, the legislation before contains several provisions that are of great concern to me.

Pursuant to Section 2, paragraph (4) of the bill, a permit or license for a natural gas pipeline project is ''deemed'' approved if the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission (FERC) or other federal agencies do not issue the permit or license within 90–120 days.

I have three concerns with this regulatory scheme.

First, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have a problem with ''deeming'' something done that has not been done in fact.

Thus, the provision is unwise.

Second, this provision is a remedy in search of a problem. There is no lengthy or intolerable backlog of neglected natural gas pipeline projects awaiting action by FERC.

The provision is unnecessary because FERC has, since fiscal year 2009, completed action on 92 percent (504 out of 548) of all pipeline applications that it has received within one year of receipt. And the remaining 8% of decisions that have taken longer than one year involve complex proposals that merit additional review and consideration.

Third, the provision is irresponsible because would require FERC to and other agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

Compounding the problem is that the fact that FERC like virtually every federal agency is operating under the onerous and draconian provisions of the disastrous sequestration which has caused so much misery and disruption across the nation and to our economy.

FERC, for example, with a budget of $306 million faces a $15 million reduction in spending authority this fiscal year, according to OMB. That sum amounts to 5% of FERC's budget.

So the likely impact of this bill if passed is to put FERC in the position of having to work faster to issue decisions with fewer experienced employees and a reduction in resources.

Given the inherent dangers involved in the construction and operation of a natural gas pipeline, does anyone doubt that this state of affairs is likely to lead to FERC to err on the side of caution and deny applications that may otherwise been approved if it had more time and more resources to carry out its responsibilities?

Mr. Speaker, we should not take that chance. That is why I offered an amendment, which the Rules Committee made in order, to suspend the effectiveness of this legislation so long as sequestration is in effect. I urge all Members to support the Jackson Lee Amendment when it comes to the floor later this week.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 420 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 424) prohibiting the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment unless the House has adopted a conference report on the budget resolution by December 13, 2013, if called up by Representative Slaughter of New York or her designee. All points of order against the resolution and against its consideration are waived.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 195, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
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
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
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)
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
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—195

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
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
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
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)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
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.
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
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
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
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Ellmers
Gabbard
Herrera Beutler
Johnson, Sam
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Radel
Rush
Westmoreland

□ 1345

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mses. WILSON of Florida and SLAUGHTER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska and CARTER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 592, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to record my vote for rollcall No. 592. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on ordering the previous question.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 194, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

AYES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
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
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Andrews
Bachmann
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
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
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)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
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.
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
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Diaz-Balart
Ellmers
Gohmert
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Pittenger
Radel
Rush
Wenstrup

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1352

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 593, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 592 and 593, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MENG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 592 and 593, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

FEDERAL LANDS JOBS AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 419 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. 1965.

Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1354

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. 1965) to streamline and ensure onshore energy permitting, provide for onshore leasing certainty, and give certainty to oil shale development for American energy security, economic development, and job creation, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, November 19, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 113–271 by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) 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 A of House Report 113–271 on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 222, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

AYES—199

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
Cuellar
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)
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.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Owens
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
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—222

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
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
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—9

Campbell
Diaz-Balart
Gohmert
Herrera Beutler
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Ross
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1358

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 228, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

AYES—194

Andrews
Barber
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
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
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.
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
Matheson
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)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
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
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
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
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
Diaz-Balart
Gohmert
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Ross
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1402

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall Nos. 594 & 595 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted, "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY TEXAS (MS. JACKSON LEE)

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 225, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

AYES—198

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
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
Cuellar
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)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
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
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)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—225

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
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
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
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
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra
Campbell
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Rush
Wolf

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR.

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

□ 1406

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 221, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 597]

AYES—202

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
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
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
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
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
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
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth

NOES—221

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra
Campbell
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Rush
Visclosky

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1411

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 226, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]

AYES—195

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
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
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
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
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
Matheson
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)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
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
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
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)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
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—9

Becerra
Campbell
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Owens
Radel
Rush
Shuster
Vargas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1416

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, 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. 1965) to streamline and ensure onshore energy permitting, provide for onshore leasing certainty, and give certainty to oil shale development for American energy security, economic development, and job creation, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 419, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1965 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 7, strike the close quotation marks and following period at line 18, and after line 18 insert the following:

''(F) ENSURING A FAIR RETURN FOR TAXPAYERS.—Subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) shall apply with respect to a permit application submitted by a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) only if the company agrees not to claim the domestic production activities deduction under section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986''.

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. __01. PROTECTING NATIVE AMERICAN SACRED AND CULTURAL SITES.

Nothing in this Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to allow energy development that would negatively impact land that is identified by the Secretary, in consultation with affected Indian tribes, as a Native American sacred site or cultural site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee.

If it is adopted, this bill will immediately proceed to final passage. The Big Five oil companies are making record profits. They have made $250 billion in profits in just the last 2 years. At the same time, they are receiving $4 billion in oil and tax breaks every year.

U.S. oil production is at a 24-year high, with the United States soon projected to be the top oil producer in the world. Before these big oil companies get even more drilling rights on public taxpayer lands, they should give up these unneeded subsidies. Otherwise, this is another giveaway to Big Oil.

It expands drilling on public lands at the expense of public uses like hunting, fishing, and recreation. It also goes far beyond the reforms for tribal self-determination in energy development.

It limits community input on projects that may affect the environment, and it bars the door to justice for claims from victims of environmental disasters caused by energy development projects on Indian lands.

This bill has real threats to our tribes, so we need to amend H.R. 1965 to remedy this, and we need a fair return for taxpayers. This amendment is a way to lower the deficit so that it is a win-win for taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle, who care so much about our tribes, to vote to close this massive tax loophole and giveaway.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle to side with the American people, especially the Native American people, instead of Big Oil and support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, first, when we talk about taxes on energy, what we are talking about is raising taxes on the American people and the goods that they would buy because the cost of energy would rise because of that. That is the first point to the gentlewoman's argument. This motion to recommit is nothing more than raising taxes on energy in this country.

Second point: I find it absolutely ironic that here we are with another, I would say, political amendment supposedly dealing with our Native American friends. In all the time that my friends on the other side of the aisle were in charge, they never brought up anything in energy policy that would secure the rights in Indian Country for them to take advantage of their own lands. We have a title in this bill. Title

V allows American Indians to develop their lands as they see fit with American energy.

This motion to recommit is wrong. Vote ''no.'' Vote for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 599]

AYES—189

Andrews
Barber
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
Ellison
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
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
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
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Fincher
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
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
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
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)
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
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
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Engel
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Rush
Shuster
Van Hollen
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1432

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 599 I was at a meeting in the Rayburn Room and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted, "yea."

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. HOLT. 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 228, noes 192, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 600]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
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
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—192

Andrews
Barber
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
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
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.
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
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
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bilirakis
Campbell
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Rush
Shuster
Tiberi
Whitfield
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1441

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, November 20, 2013, I missed rollcall vote No. 600 for unavoidable reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 600: "aye" (On passage of H.R. 1965.)

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 600 (final passage of H.R. 1965) I was unavoidably detained and did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted, "yea."

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, November 20, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, 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 House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 20, 2013 at 11:51 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 3304.

That the Senate passed S. 381.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROTECTING STATES' RIGHTS TO PROMOTE AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY ACT

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 H.R. 2728.

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 419 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. 2728.

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

□ 1444

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. 2728) to recognize States' authority to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in section 2 of House Resolution 419 and shall not exceed 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

□ 1445

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

Mr. Chairman, the Obama administration is once again attempting to block new energy production, keeping energy prices high and hurting middle class families. The Department of the Interior is proposing new regulations on the practice of hydraulic fracturing on Federal and tribal lands. These regulations, once implemented next year, will in all likelihood add new layers of red tape and lower energy production even further on Federal land.

For over 2 years, the Natural Resources Committee has conducted extensive oversight of the Obama administration's proposed regulations. We have held multiple hearings across the country and have heard from energy experts, tribal leaders, and State officials who have all had the same message: these are bad regulations that potentially destroy jobs and stifle American energy production.

According to one study, these new Federal regulations would cost nearly $350 million annually. As a consequence, the 1.7 million jobs that are currently supported by shale oil and natural gas production—a number, I might add, Mr. Chairman, that is expected to increase to 2.5 million by 2015—these jobs would be put in jeopardy. Even worse, these proposed regulations duplicate efforts already being carried out by States across the country.

Hydraulic fracturing has been safely and effectively regulated by States for decades. So the Obama administration's proposed regulations are unnecessary, they are redundant, and they simply waste precious time and money duplicating what is already being done successfully.

That is why two of our colleagues from Texas, Mr. FLORES and Mr. CUELLAR, introduced the bipartisan H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, before us today. This bill prohibits the Interior Department from enforcing duplicative hydraulic fracturing regulations in any State that already has regulations or will adopt regulations in the future and recognizes

States' authority to regulate this type of activity.

The bill acknowledges that States are doing a good job and an effective job regulating this activity. And ironically, Mr. Chairman, officials from the Obama administration, itself, have admitted that there has not been one known case of groundwater contamination from hydraulic fracturing. The reason I mention this, Mr. Chairman, is because groundwater contamination is the argument most frequently used against this process.

The bill also recognizes that States are able to carefully craft regulations to meet the unique geological and hydrologic needs of their States. A one-size-fits-all regulatory structure, like this administration is trying to impose, will not work and is certainly not the answer.

I want to be very clear: this bill does not prevent the Federal Government from implementing baseline standards in States where none exist. This bill simply prevents the Federal Government from wasting time, money, and resources by imposing duplicative red tape on a process that is widely regarded as being properly regulated by the States.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this bill. Apparently, Mr. Chairman, the Republican majority believes that the greatest threat that Americans face from hydraulic fracturing today is too many regulations. They don't seem to be concerned about the danger posed to our drinking water supplies or the impacts of industrialization on our rural landscapes or the increased risk of earthquakes from wastewater injection or the emissions of methane or other noxious chemicals into the air or the identity of the mystery chemicals being pumped underground nor the disposal of waste safely. Americans are concerned about these things, and so should we be.

The House Democrats are trying to do something about that. My colleagues and I have introduced an entire series of bills designed to address the very real impacts that fracking has on American communities: the BREATHE Act, by Mr. POLIS; the SHARED Act, by Ms. SCHAKOWSKY; the CLEANER Act, by Mr. CARTWRIGHT; the FRESHER Act, also by Mr. CARTWRIGHT; and the FRAC Act, by Ms. DEGETTE. These are attempts to protect the air, the water, the land, and ensure that people know what is being injected into the ground under their homes. The Republicans will not bring any of these bills to the floor, and I doubt they will because, according to the Republicans, the real threat is too many regulations.

This is preposterous, Mr. Chairman. Tell the people who want to know what chemicals are being injected under their homes that the real danger is that the Federal Government wants them to know. Tell the people who are seeing elevated levels of methane in their drinking water that the real danger is that the Federal Government wants to ensure that the wells are built better so they will not leak methane. Mr. Chairman, tell the people living next to the huge open pits of wastewater that the real danger is the Federal Government wants to make sure that States have minimum standards.

Mr. Chairman, I am astonished that the sponsors of this bill and the leadership would even bring the bill to the floor. It will do nothing, absolutely nothing, to address any of the concerns that families have legitimately about the impacts of fracking in their communities. Worse than that, the bill will strip existing protections in place across the entire Nation.

It would eliminate the ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service to regulate oil and gas operations on their own lands. It would prevent the Fish and Wildlife Service from enforcing wildlife protection regulations under the Endangered Species Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act—oh, yes, I know my colleagues will say, That is not true; read the bill—and any number of other laws everywhere across the country.

Now I would like to think that these are unintended consequences of a poorly drafted bill, but given past attacks on the Endangered Species Act and such, I think there is reason to suspect that this is an intended consequence.

They will say, This is about states' rights, but Democrats are actually focused on the American people's rights: their rights to clean air; their rights to clean water; to be free of hazardous waste; to know what is happening under their very feet.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill and to bring up legislation that will really deal with the health and safety of Americans across the country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the author of this legislation, who is a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, this bill will put the House on record in support of the shale energy boom, more American jobs, and lower energy prices, all of which are a direct result of hydraulic fracturing technology.

For the average American family last year, the shale energy boom meant $1,200 per family in lower energy bills. During our slow economic recovery, it has been the lone bright spot responsible for creating the most new jobs, both in energy and in manufacturing.

States have been effectively regulating fracturing on Federal, State, and private lands for over 50 years, and the States oppose the Federal Government trying to overrule their expertise. There is no demonstrated need for the Federal Government to waste taxpayer money by duplicating and complicating State efforts. The only reason for the Federal Government to get involved is to placate those who oppose the shale energy revolution and the jobs boom that has come from it. I hear the arguments:

First, they will say that States might have insufficient regulations. The facts are that all States that produce oil and gas have comprehensive rules and regulations to ensure that hydraulic fracturing is done safely. Moreover, there are many Federal laws that will continue to apply to energy development, and this bill will not change those.

Second, they argue that the Federal Government should be able to apply any rules and regulations it wants on Federal land. Well, for instance, States already effectively manage the wildlife and the water on Federal lands. Yet the environmental concern surrounding fracturing is water protection, and water protection authorities have always been the purview of the States.

Third, the proponents of Federal regulation argue that the administration will not expand the Department of the Interior rule to State and to private lands. Instead of embracing the booming shale energy production, this administration has directed over 10 Federal agencies to look for ways to override State rules in this regard.

Energy is a key economic input to a more prosperous future for all Americans. H.R. 2728 stops the Federal Government from more Federal regulation encroachment on State water authorities and potential infringement on State and private lands.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for his assistance in moving this legislation through his committee and the bill's co-lead, Mr. CUELLAR.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2728 and support the American manufacturing renaissance, lower energy costs, and American jobs.

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the senior ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, now here, a group has done an assessment of the various State regulatory regimes, and as you can see, they vary tremendously. They think that the best is Maryland. There are others gathered toward the top, the middle, and then way down here at the bottom, you have Virginia.

Some States require comprehensive pressure testing of the casing. That is essential, particularly if you are going through the water table to get to the gas. If you get the leaks, then you destroy the water table. Some States don't require that.

Some States require that you contain the fluids that come back up, the waste products laden with toxic materials not only from the fluids but from the ground itself. Other States allow it to be in open pits.

Some States require disclosure of the chemicals that are used. Now how can you say there has been no contamination when there are contaminated wells in many places across the U.S.? Some of it has to do with baseline contamination with arsenic or other things, but if you don't know what they are sticking into the ground near your well or water table, you can't track what it is that was a baseline before and/or what is pollution that has resulted. We don't know that. So why not require disclosure of the chemicals?

We are having a gold rush right now for fracking. It is not exactly like this is going to have an impact if we put in place a reasonable floor of Federal regulations. One Macondo, just one Macondo in this industry, one well that blows out in a large aquifer or some other disaster, and this whole thing is going to come grinding to a halt, and then you are going to see a strong push-back for strong regulations.

Quite frankly, I don't think that the regulations being proposed by this administration are stringent enough for a floor. They are probably above maybe some of these people on the bottom, but they are way below some of the best-performing States here.

Why should it be different State to State to State? What is it? Do we want to protect the above ground resources and not have open pits? Well, under this bill, if you have an open pit, it is on a flyway, migratory birds land there and die quickly, the Federal Government can't do anything about it. If that State allows open pits, we can't do anything about that. That is up to that State, and that is a fact. A number of States allow open pits.

We should have a regulatory regime where the Federal Government, on its lands, which belong to all the people of the United States, sets a reasonable floor for regulations. If a State like Maryland wants to go above good, solid regulations, well, then, good. But if someone else is a bad actor, and they want to drag it down, and they want to have open pits, they don't want to test the casing, they don't want to do other things that are absolutely essential to protect resources, then they can do that on Federal lands?

It is bad enough that they are allowing people to do it on private lands and do it on their State lands. But these are Federal lands. We are going to require and should require a higher bar to protect the public, to protect the environment, to protect these precious resources and do this responsibly.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to ask the distinguished ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee if he could tell me who did that study.

I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for him to tell me who did that study.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for the question.

It was done by an advocacy group called Resources for the Future. It is kind of like your study that says it will cost $350 million, which was done by industry. It is an advocacy group. You have an industry advocacy group. We have an environmental advocacy group.

□ 1500

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

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), chairman of the subcommittee that dealt with this legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2728, which came through the subcommittee I chair and which I am pleased to cosponsor.

This bipartisan legislation requires the Department of the Interior to defer to State regulations regarding hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands within the States.

These proposed Federal regulations will lead to more bureaucratic red tape that will further discourage energy producers from developing on Federal land.

The time period for approving a simple application for a permit to drill has only increased under President Obama. An energy producer can wait for nearly a year for a permit to be approved on Federal land, while in my home State of Colorado, it is only an average of 27 days.

The Federal regulations being proposed by the administration will add an entirely new layer of regulations to the already cumbersome Federal process. This will increase the cost of producing energy and does not help working American families.

The proposed Federal regulations also ignore the extensive work done by the States to regulate hydraulic fractures within their borders. Our committee has heard from numerous witnesses from Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and other States who have testified to the extensive process these States went through to draft their regulations, regulations that are very successful. No one can show where States are dropping the ball.

My home State of Colorado has been safely using hydraulic fracturing for over 40 years and has the toughest disclosure rule in the Nation. Even our Democratic Governor, John Hickenlooper, to his credit, believes that it is the State's responsibility to regulate the industry. The States know their own geology and water better than bureaucrats in Washington do.

This bill will eliminate Federal regulations that are unnecessary, burdensome, and expensive. Please support H.R. 2728.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and someone who is as expert as anyone in this Chamber on oil and gas industry and regulations.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague. Although, I have to admit, sometimes I feel a little awkward listening to my colleagues' statements, but I am glad that report showed Texas is one of the more tougher States that regulates hydraulic fracturing.

Mr. Chairman, in the State of Texas, hydraulic fracturing has been a common practice for many years. The technique, combined with horizontal drilling, has made the idea of energy independence in the United States almost a reality.

Across the United States, the development of natural gas continues to power our economic engine and is the foundation of a manufacturing renaissance. Thus far, State agencies have done a great job of regulating hydraulic practices on State and private lands.

In Texas, the Railroad Commission—inappropriately named—has set a variety of standards that aim to protect the environment and allow for the development of this vital natural resource.

I am a firm believer in property rights and that whoever owns that land should have the right to regulate that land.

I would not support the Federal Government regulating the development of natural gas or the practice of hydraulic fracturing on State and/or private lands. More importantly, I cannot support the idea of legislation that would prevent the Federal Government from regulating Federal lands. Unfortunately, that is what this bill is asking us to do.

I understand and support the desire to develop our natural resources in the most economical way possible with as little bureaucratic red tape as possible. I know the significant advantage that the shale gas boom has provided our domestic petrochemical industry, various manufacturers, and a whole host of end-users.

Let's make sure, though, that the Department of the Interior does their job and does not have to transfer oversight of Federal lands to State lands. We need the Department of the Interior to allow resource development under Federal law.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill. Hopefully, we will bring up a bill that will make the Department of the Interior actually let us produce on our Federal lands.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in my good friend from Texas' comments, especially in light of the fact that there are a significant number of jobs in his district and in

Texas that are powered by natural gas that comes from the shale energy revolution.

My friend from Texas undoubtedly knows that the Federal Government takes 10 times as long to issue a permit as does the State of Texas for energy activities, and I wouldn't want to have the Federal Government add another layer of complexity to that.

We are not plowing new ground with my bill. The Federal Government already defers to the States on the management of wildlife and water on Federal lands.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2728 with my good friend, BILL FLORES, and, of course, our chairman also.

The U.S. has become the world's largest producer of oil and natural gas, surpassing Russia this year. The transformation of our energy production has rejuvenated our middle class by reviving core American industries and bringing blue-collar jobs back to U.S. soil.

In light of this new American energy revolution, we must ensure that we have a smarter and more focused approach to energy regulation.

This legislation would prevent the Interior Department from enforcing Federal rules related to hydraulic fracturing in States that already have existing oversight rules, like my State of Texas, and the Railroad Commission in my home State.

This legislation is not about more or less regulation. This bill helps our Federal Government work in a smarter and more cost-effective manner. We need to enable States to regulate their own lands—because they know it better—and not try to create a Federal one-size-fits-all approach.

This bill would untangle redundant regulation in States that have created their own regulations that address well design, location, water quality, emissions, wildlife protection, and health and safety.

I represent the Eagle Ford Shale area in Texas, which is one of the largest production areas in the United States. That shale has transformed my area, whether it is Webb County, LaSalle, Atascosa, Wilson, or McMullen County. The other counties there have been transformed by Eagle Ford.

I also worked at the State for many years as a legislator, and I understand the Railroad Commission. I understand they also do a good job.

Therefore, the State of Texas has passed smart regulations by working directly with our communities and with our counties, with our industry, and is leading the Nation in establishing FracFocus, which informs all Texans what materials are used in the fracking activities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. CUELLAR. Our State governments know their own land best. Let us improve how our government functions, empower our States to enforce their own laws on their own lands, and continue this energy growth that we have.

With that, I thank the chairman, Mr. BILL FLORES, and also the ranking member, Mr. HOLT, who allowed me to speak.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), another member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to my dear friend, BILL FLORES, and to DOC HASTINGS, chairman of our committee. I appreciate Mr. CUELLAR's comments.

The truth is, we have been working on this for a long time, and Mr. FLORES has gotten it here. This is fantastic because we need jobs in America. We need more of our own energy in America. This bill helps us do that.

I got into a discussion with one of our colleagues across the aisle who is now in the Senate, and I brought this up to him in previous years. If a State has a regulatory body that is addressing the issue, has cleaner air, cleaner water, is doing the job, then let them do it. Let's not add another layer of bureaucracy that takes away jobs. It slows the economy.

I am very grateful that it looks like we are going to pass a bill that creates jobs instead of these job-ending things that have been happening down the hall and down Pennsylvania Avenue.

So I applaud my colleague and I applaud my friends that support this bill. This is going to help America.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES), another member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act.

Hydraulic fracturing has been critical to the production of our rich Montana-Bakken oil. It is key not only to our State's economy but also to unlocking a valuable source of revenue for the Federal Government and our State. This helps fund our schools, our teachers, and our infrastructure in Montana.

Montana has smart, environmentally sensitive regulations of this process already in place. Like most Montanans, I love to hike, I love to hunt, I love to fish. We are the safeguards of the environment in Montana. We do not need bureaucrats in Washington telling us how to protect our lands in Montana. Yet the Obama administration has put more senseless barriers in place by stiffening the Federal restraint and red tape on this process.

Do you realize that Montana Indian tribes face over 50 percent unemployment? This rule could deny our Native Americans the independence that energy development on their lands can make possible. H.R. 2728 would ensure the Federal Government does not get in the way of responsible energy development on tribal land and throughout Montana. Washington, D.C., needs to look more like Montana, not the other way around.

The people of Montana and our country need a responsible energy plan that protects our environment and creates a better future for our kids. That means jobs and lower energy prices.

I urge passage of H.R. 2728.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), a former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, natural gas is revitalizing American industries. It is revitalizing the middle class. That natural gas is being produced because we do a process called hydraulic fracturing.

My background is in oil and gas. I have seen the process my whole life. I have seen new technological innovations that keep us more safe, keep the process safe, protect the well bores, and protect the water.

So who would be against a process that is rebuilding American industries, that is rebuilding the job base of this country?

Sand sales you would not seem to identify with this particular process, and yet that is exactly why sand sales are soaring in the country and the production of chemicals is soaring—because of the use of this process called hydraulic fracturing.

It has been around for decades. New Mexico has safe drinking water, but we have also got plentiful jobs, and American consumers have lower costs of living, all because of a process.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PEARCE. New Mexico knows how to regulate its own industry. Do not force us to live by some cookie-cutter mold that has produced an Affordable Care Act that is killing jobs across the country. Give us our freedom and we will protect the environment.

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

It is traditional and appropriate in this country that matters dealing with health and safety, clean water, and clean air are handled at the interstate level, at the Federal level. This legislation would remove all sorts of regulations. Best practices that are designed to minimize the environmental impact

of oil and gas legislation for Bureau of Land Management practices would be gone.

It gets rid of requirements to protect sacred sites and historic properties. It would throw out the regulation that prevents occupancy within a quarter of a mile of designated fisheries. It would remove the regulation that you can't do any of these activities in the floodplain of the Yellowstone River, and on and on.

My colleague a moment ago talked about the booming industry in chemicals because of fracking. Yes, that brings up an interesting point about the difference in State regulations. We would hope that anybody in the drilling area would have access to the chemicals that are being injected into these wells under their very feet, under their homes.

□ 1515

But if you look at what some States allow now, they allow chemicals that are confidential, proprietary, undisclosed to be used, and they number in the dozens. Let's see. We have got here oxyalkylated phenol resins; we have terpenes and terpenoids; we have quaternary amines. These are all items that are held confidentially, proprietarily; and under this legislation that we are considering, a State could make sure that they are not disclosed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a State that is booming because of this activity.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Mr. FLORES for bringing H.R. 2728 to the floor for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind everybody that, although they might say, Why do we do this? Why is the rhetoric important? I mean, if we don't counter the kind of alternate reality that the other side often touts, people will think that that is reality. I will remind everybody in the room that the Federal Government and every State government has said that there has been not one accident—zero—referring to the aquifer regarding hydraulic fracking—not one.

People in Washington have never been to Dimock; they have never been to Renovo or to Tidioute or to Warren, Pennsylvania. They don't know anything about these places and what happens here, but yet they want to regulate us. The people who live there are the ones who are working there, and they have the greatest stake in protecting the environment.

Let me tell you what it has done for Pennsylvania: $750 million in road and infrastructure and improvements since 2008 has been provided by the gas industry. The average income is up $1,200 because of it; $1.8 billion in tax revenue has been generated by responsible shale development.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PERRY. Ninety-six percent of the employment comes out of the Appalachian basin. That is in Pennsylvania. That is where we live. There has been a $650 savings per household per year because of it, and there are 232,000 associated jobs with an average pay of $83,305 a year.

Mr. Chairman, there is a list of agencies that these people must comply with for every single portion of this. I am going to run out of time, but I am going to run out of time just going through them, all right: the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the County Conservation District.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds as I see he is on a roll.

Mr. PERRY. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, the Pennsylvania Game Commission, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, the Occupational Health and Safety Administration, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Pennsylvania Historic Museum Commission, and the Pennsylvania Public Utility Council.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, all of those chemicals that were noted on every job site are listed on a material safety data sheet, which is required by law.

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues say that there have been no cases of contamination from the fracking, itself. What about leakage from poorly constructed wells? What about leakage from unlined pits? Are they prepared to claim that there has never been water contamination because of this? That is what the Bureau of Land Management regulations and rules get at—well construction, wastewater management, the threats to drinking water in neighboring communities. This legislation would gut—it would remove—any possibility of such rules.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), another member from an energy-producing State.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, we are producing more energy now than we have ever produced, and it is thanks to new technologies like hydraulic fracking for making that happen.

The Eagle Ford shale in the district I represent has created over 400,000 jobs and, roughly, $2.6 billion in salaries in a 13-county area. The benefits from this are not isolated. Shale has brought back rail, steel, plastics, sand, and manufacturing; and the average U.S. household's energy costs have gone way down. I have seen numbers as high as $1,200 less for energy bills. This technology isn't new. We have been using it in Texas for over 60 years. It is regulated by the Texas Railroad Commission, and they do a great job.

All of these people with all of the scare tactics sometimes forget that, when hydraulic fracking is done, it is done a mile below or two miles below the water table. It is safe. It is well regulated by the State. It is good for the economy. It is turning the balance of trade. It is saving us money on energy. It is also creating an economic revival in this country. We have got to let States regulate it. I urge the support of this bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, let me inquire of my friend from New Jersey if he is prepared to close. We had some further requests for time, but I don't see them, and sometimes they don't get their time when they don't come down here.

Mr. HOLT. I say to the gentleman from Washington that we are in the same situation. I was expecting a few other speakers. In not seeing them, I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, here is a partial list of the Federal laws, rules, and regulations that could not be enforced were this bill to become law:

The Endangered Species Act; the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; the oil and gas operations in National Park Service units; the oil and gas operations in National Wildlife Refuges; the casing and cementing regulations, such as should have been applied in the Deepwater Horizon case; the wastewater management regulations; the plugging and abandonment regulations, in other words, when pits or wells are abandoned; the best management practices for oil and gas drilling on public lands; the timing limits of when operations could be conducted with the least disruption to wildlife; the protections for sacred sites, historic trails, fisheries, and wetlands; and much more.

It has been sold as a states' rights bill that would only block the Bureau of Land Management's fracking rules, but it would strip agencies on Federal lands of the authority to enforce almost every regulation on the books because any State that has any regulation that affects these activities means that none of these regulations could apply, that they would all be superseded by the State regulations. That is what the bill says.

As for whether there is any damage done, I would point my friends to this

picture. Maybe you have a little trouble seeing it, but, essentially, it shows burning tap water. No, this is not a staged picture. This happened in a residence. This is methane flaming because the water is full of methane.

Now, I know my colleagues will say, Oh, but that is not because of fracking. There must be some other reason. There must be.

They haven't found it. They have blamed it on all sorts of other things, but it happens where the fracking is occurring.

So this is a case in which the practice has gotten ahead of the science, in which the practice has gotten ahead of our regulations, in which it has gotten ahead of our understanding; and the idea to reduce regulations and understanding so that we could do it faster is preposterous. This is not the way you protect public health. This is not the way you protect public safety. It is not the way you stimulate the economy. It is false economy to proceed in disregard for the protection of the environment.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2728.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time the gentleman from New Jersey has left if he is going to yield back.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would advise the gentleman to reserve his time because one of our speakers came, which we didn't think was going to happen. So I would advise the gentleman to reserve his time so that he has time to respond.

Mr. HOLT. I appreciate the advice. It is possible that some of my speakers will arrive. I urge that we vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader, who is from a State that would like to do more offshore even though we are talking about onshore.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act.

Over the last 10 years, America has been experiencing a shale energy boom; and because of new technology in hydraulic fracturing, the development of energy resources has been environmentally friendly. While the technology that has made this boom possible is truly impressive, I want to take a moment and focus on the impact this boom is having on hardworking middle class families.

Many of these families are living paycheck to paycheck. Many have gone years without a meaningful raise, but powering their lights or heating their homes is not an optional expense. An unexpected rise in the monthly utility bill means less money for new school clothes, the college savings account, or even a night out at the movies. That is why it is so important that we pursue policies that lower energy costs. Hydraulic fracturing is one such policy.

A recent study found that, absent hydraulic fracturing, a family's home energy bills and other costs for goods and services would have been $1,200 higher last year. The study concludes that the continued production of our domestic energy resources could increase disposable household income—principally by lowering costs—by $800 over the next 2 years. This is the type of relief American families deserve.

But lower energy costs for working families is not the only benefit of hydraulic fracturing. The same study showed that the natural gas and shale oil industry contributed over 1.7 million jobs in 2012 alone. Going forward, it is predicted to add a total of 2.5 million jobs by 2015. These are good, well-paying jobs right here in America. For those who have been struggling to find work for months or, in some cases, for years, this kind of advancement in energy technology could allow these folks to find work, to get back on their feet, and to provide for their families. It is no coincidence that areas of our country with active domestic energy production from hydraulic fracturing are experiencing lower levels of unemployment.

These benefits to working families are now under threat. They are under threat from newly proposed Federal regulations by this administration that would cost our economy jobs, keep energy bills from falling, and hinder our cause to become more energy secure.

State governments and local regulators have been very effective with implementing environmentally sound regulations to meet the specific geologic requirements of their States for over 60 years. This act will keep the Federal Government from imposing redundant regulations and needless red tape that will only raise the monthly utility bills of millions of American families and cost America new jobs.

The States and local regulators should be allowed to do this job without any Federal interference. I saw firsthand, when I accompanied my colleague from North Dakota, KEVIN CRAMER, to Williston, wellheads that were being drilled, and the last thing they need in that State, in that area, are the Federal regulators coming in to tell them how to drill a well.

This bill is an opportunity for the House to act in a bipartisan manner and show our constituents that we are serious about creating jobs, that we are serious about easing the burden of high energy costs, and are serious about strengthening our energy security.

I want to thank all of those involved and the chairman of the committee, as well as Congressman BILL FLORES and the rest of Chairman HASTINGS' Natural Resources Committee, for their hard work and dedication to this issue for working middle class families. I also want to thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH and the Science Committee for their important contribution to this legislation.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. This is Groundhog Day, Mr. Chairman. I would say to my friend, now I have no more speakers whom I can foresee at all, so I am prepared to close if the gentleman doesn't repeat his last statement.

Mr. HOLT. Then I will take just a moment.

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

□ 1530

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, when I showed the picture of the burning tap water, I saw expressions of incredulity from the other side of the aisle. Surely that can't be true; or if it is true, surely it is not because of fracking.

A Duke University study found that methane contamination was in 115 of 141 shallow residential drinking wells that they studied, six times higher than wells greater than a mile from the fracking operations. Now, it is hard to tell when you are deep in the ground where that methane is leaking and what other chemicals, undisclosed chemicals, are leaking with that methane.

There is something here that should be regulated, and this legislation would prevent such regulations. I urge a ''no'' vote, and 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 has 3 minutes remaining.

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

The underlying bill, as has been mentioned several times, is about American jobs and American energy security.

Just last week, the International Energy Agency released its World Energy Outlook. In that report, they predicted that the U.S. would surpass Saudi Arabia and become the top oil producer in the world in only 2 more years. Now, this is great news for our economy, it is great news for American workers, it is great news for potential energy prices, and, Mr. Chairman, it is great news for our national security.

This recent boom in energy production would not be possible without the new technological advances of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing. Let me give you an example. In

the year 2000, shale gas, which is the prime area that you go after with hydraulic fracturing, provided just 1 percent of our Nation's natural gas supplies. Today, it is 25 percent. That number will only continue to grow.

While the White House is quick to take credit for this uptick in energy production, the truth is this increase is happening in spite of this administration's policies and not because of them. Because what has been well documented, all of the increase in energy production is happening on State and private lands, not on Federal lands. Currently, 93 percent of shale oil wells are located on private and State lands and only 7 percent on Federal lands. That simply means that there is a great potential on Federal lands that are currently being ignored because of the regulatory hoops.

I suggest that if the Department of the Interior goes through with their regulations on fracking that would be duplicative of those States, it would only keep that 7 percent where it is rather than increasing. It seems to me, from a standpoint of policy for our country, it is best to be as energy secure as we can possibly be because that means that we are secure from a national security standpoint.

Finally, and certainly not least, that means that American jobs, good-paying American jobs, are creating the energy for the American consumer. That is what this bill is all about.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Each week there is more good news about the benefits of the energy revolution underway across America. Whether it is the manufacturing renaissance spurred by affordable natural gas or the new opportunities for good-paying energy jobs, the benefits of the shale revolution can hardly be overstated. For that reason, I am happy to support H.R. 2728, a bill that seeks to prevent redundant Federal regulations where States already have environmental protections in place.

H.R. 2728 also incorporates legislation reported by the Science Committee—the Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act. Title II of this legislation holds the EPA accountable by requiring it to base its studies on the facts instead of worst-case scenarios that exist only in the EPA's imagination.

In its zeal to regulate, the EPA has rushed to link water contamination to hydraulic fracturing. It has made this claim in three high-profile cases, only to be forced to retract its statements after the facts have come out. The EPA's track record does not instill confidence in their ongoing studies of the relationship between hydraulic fracturing and drinking water.

The Science Committee has conducted numerous oversight hearings on EPA research. These efforts have revealed that the EPA's approach is to try to find problems without considering whether these problems would actually occur in the real world. Title II corrects this by requiring a real-world look at risk that gives an honest evaluation of probability. This will prevent the misuse of the EPA's studies by those simply looking for an excuse to scare people. Title II of this legislation will enhance our ability to ensure continued safe and responsible production of America's natural energy resources.

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

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

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act.

Title II of this act is a bill passed by the Science Committee, the EPA Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act. This is a piece of legislation that should not have been passed out of the committee.

First, title II contains provisions that designate the fracking study is a highly influential scientific assessment and requires EPA to follow its standard peer review protocols for such assessments. This language is unnecessary because EPA already considers the fracking study to be a highly influential scientific assessment.

Second, and importantly, unfortunately, this bill will obstruct EPA's ability to carry out its important work. The requirements of this bill may force the EPA to delay production of their final report on the effects of hydraulic fracturing on water quality. This bill could delay an important report that is based on a study that the EPA initiated more than 3 years ago. The study was reviewed and approved by the EPA's independent Science Advisory Board. The Science Advisory Board found the study to be both appropriate and comprehensive. The American public should not have to wait any longer before they receive a scientific analysis of whether their water has been affected by hydraulic fracturing.

What I found troubling is that the Science Committee never got information from the Science Advisory Board, which validated the study, regarding its opinion about the bill, nor did we get comments from the EPA or any other experts. In fact, the bill never had a hearing. This bill effectively attempts to micromanage the EPA without a factual basis for doing so.

The bill requires the EPA to do an ad hoc risk analysis by requiring them to quantitatively estimate the probabilities, uncertainties, and consequences of impacts to drinking water from hydraulic fracturing; however, this was never a study that was set up to determine the risk effects of hydraulic fracturing. The study was meant to examine the science to determine if hydraulic fracturing operations have any effect on groundwater. By requiring an ad hoc risk analysis on a study that was not designed to acquire the data necessary to do a risk analysis, the EPA would be forced to try to fit a round peg in a square hole.

What remains truly unclear is why this language is included when it is so unnecessary. If the current study were to find a link between fracking and groundwater contamination, then a full risk assessment will be required before the Agency can establish any regulations to address the issue.

What this bill is doing here is requiring a risk analysis simultaneously, and as part of, the very study that is meant to determine if there is a need for a risk analysis. These efforts to become involved in directing the specific details of scientific process are very troubling.

It appears that this bill is setting up the EPA to fail. If the EPA doesn't complete the study by the deadline, they have failed; and if the EPA completes the study but the ad hoc risk analysis is not as detailed as the bill's proponents expect, then they would have also failed. More importantly, their ad hoc risk analysis may taint the very accurate scientific data behind that analysis.

It is not in the public interest to have this study delayed any longer. Let the EPA complete their study. If the science shows the effects connecting hydraulic fracturing with contaminated groundwater, then we will let the EPA's long-established process of doing a risk assessment after such a study to be followed completely with all the I's dotted and T's crossed.

It is also difficult to understand how the proponents of the bill reconcile title II with title I. Title I clearly attempts to prevent the Federal Government from having oversight inspection or enforcement responsibility for hydraulic fracturing regulations. However, if the States are supposed to regulate, don't they need the science to support those regulations?

This study is designed to be the science that provides the Federal Government and the States with the information they will need to make policy choices about the effects of hydraulic fracturing on groundwater. By possibly delaying this study, we delay the ability of the States or the Federal Government to make prudent choices to protect the American public.

If you support hydraulic fracturing, delaying the study will not speed up the process of opening new areas of the country to hydraulic fracturing. Title II of H.R. 2728 will only delay an important scientific study and, ironically, may delay the development of new shale fields throughout the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on the way to yielding time to the gentlewoman from Wyoming, I want to

point out that the underlying bill, the science bill that is contained in the underlying bill, did pass by voice vote in the Science Committee.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), who is also the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee on the Science Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the right of State governments to regulate hydraulic fracturing. I am pleased that the bill before us also includes Chairman LAMAR SMITH's bill to ensure the integrity of Federal research into hydraulic fracturing.

Mr. Chairman, the EPA botched its study linking hydraulic fracturing to groundwater contamination in a 2011 report on groundwater in Pavillion, Wyoming. The report was so flawed that the EPA was forced to disavow their preliminary conclusion that hydraulic fracturing caused contamination in Pavillion.

The EPA's phoney preliminary conclusions were widely reported, altered national public perception, and the EPA did not back away until the damage was already done. Two years later, the EPA turned the study over to the State of Wyoming where it will undergo the scientific rigor it deserves.

Mr. Chairman, the question today is not whether hydraulic fracturing should be regulated. It should. But we shouldn't allow the Federal Government to regulate when States are already stepping up to the plate. My home State of Wyoming has been a leader in hydraulic fracturing regulation, so much so that even the Bureau of Land Management holds up Wyoming as a model.

What works for Wyoming might not work for Texas or Pennsylvania. The hydrology and the geology are different. Any State that assumes the responsibility of regulating hydraulic fracturing should be allowed to do so. Governors, legislators, and State regulators care about the well-being of the citizens in their State. More than that, who better to regulate the practice than those who live near the wells, who drink the groundwater, and who know the local geology, hydrology, and industries better than anyone?

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2728.

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

To clarify, there was opposition to the legislation in the Science Committee; however, there is no recorded vote.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS), who is a member of the Science Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak today.

I want to speak out about the importance of the EPA Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act, legislation that makes up title II of the act.

The EPA is currently conducting a multiyear study on the relationship between hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, and groundwater. This legislation will greatly improve the value of the EPA study by increasing transparency and requiring it to include an objective risk assessment.

□ 1545

Hydraulic fracturing has been studied over and over again. My home State of New York is a prime example of how studies can stall job creation.

In New York, a moratorium on hydraulic fracturing was enacted in 2008. Now, 5 years later, that moratorium is still in place because the New York Department of Environmental Conservation is conducting a study on the environmental impact of fracking. Yet, no details of this study have been revealed, and a date of completion has yet to be announced.

Now the EPA is trying to do a similar study, which will only further delay a practice that many States currently allow and are benefiting from.

Fracking represents one of the greatest opportunities for strengthening our Nation's energy security and spurring economic growth. If New York would allow fracking, 520 shale gas wells could sustain 62,000 new and needed jobs.

This legislation will increase transparency and accuracy in how the EPA reports on the study of hydraulic fracturing and will get rid of the need for duplicative studies, like the one being done in New York.

Additionally, the risk assessment requirement will turn the study into a useful tool for both scientists and decisionmakers. By providing decisionmakers with the data and information they need in order to become comfortable with fracking, we can help create jobs and further our Nation's energy independence.

Ms. BONAMICI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. We are prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, in 2010, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act required the EPA to perform a study on the relationship between hydraulic fracturing and groundwater contamination. The final report is currently expected to be released in 2016.

EPA's proposed study plan was reviewed by the EPA Science Advisory Board. The Science Advisory Board determined that EPA's approach was generally appropriate and comprehensive. Further, the Science Advisory Board recommended that some analysis of risks be considered in the study, but a full risk assessment could add another 5 to 7 years to the expected release date.

The proponents of this legislation mischaracterize the EPA's study plan as flawed for failing to include a comprehensive risk assessment. That position is not consistent with the conclusions of the highly qualified scientists, researchers, and industry representatives who are members of the EPA's independent Science Advisory Board, and importantly, title II could delay the release of this very important study. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we actually have two more individuals who will speak on this side, so if the gentlewoman from Oregon wants to reclaim some time after our next speaker, she is welcome to do so.

Meanwhile, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) who is a distinguished member of the Science Committee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SMITH.

Texas has produced half of all new jobs in America in recent years. Even Time magazine noted how things are good in Texas. They call it maybe the future of America. The creation of many of these jobs in Texas would not be possible without hydraulic fracturing. Fracking is reaching previously untapped shale natural gas deposits, thereby increasing our Nation's natural gas supply and lowering the cost of energy for all Americans.

Seemingly unaware of all of the economic benefits of America's energy renaissance, the Obama administration has moved to regulate fracking on Federal lands and to spend millions of dollars in studies at the EPA, despite its safe usage in Texas for over 60 years.

The EPA is zero for three when it comes to hydraulic fracturing alarmism. Their allegations of groundwater contamination in Texas, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming all struck out after proper review and analysis.

That is why I support H.R. 2728, because it will leave the regulation of fracking up to the States. We care about our States more than any bureaucrat up in Washington, D.C., and one size doesn't fit all. Texas was environmentally friendly before being green was cool. This legislation also holds the EPA accountable to taxpayers by requiring that their multimillion-dollar study of hydraulic fracturing follow basic and widely agreed upon scientific processes. We have it right in Texas. They ought to leave us alone, and we will help create jobs and get this economy moving again.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, Mr. SMITH from Texas, for his offer to reclaim. I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are now on our last speaker, so if the gentlelady wants to yield back, we can proceed.

Ms. BONAMICI. May I inquire whether there are other speakers?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. We are on our last speaker now, to respond to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), also a member of the Science Committee.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of North Dakota sent me to Washington in large part to protect our thriving economy from the overreaching regulations, often based on faulty science, from destroying that very economy. In carrying out that charge, I get the opportunity to tell the North Dakota success story in Washington, with the hope that we can duplicate it around our country.

A major part of telling that story, of course, is talking about the successful regulation of hydraulic fracturing in our State.

Lynn Helms, the director of North Dakota's Department of Mineral Resources, testified in the Natural Resources Committee on this very issue, saying:

> Our oil and gas rules are reviewed at least every 2 years through a public comment process. North Dakota regulations also address flow-back disposal, chemical disclosure, well construction, and well bore pressure testing and have reduced well bore failures from six per year to zero.

From six to zero—that is success at the State level.

In addition to the fact that any Federal hydraulic fracturing rule will be duplicative, the rules will be impractical to implement across the Nation, where environmental and geological circumstances are as diverse as the views in this Chamber.

North Dakota has gone from number nine to number two in oil production, and at the same time from number 38 to number 6 in economic success.

While the BLM is developing its hydraulic fracturing rules, the EPA is conducting studies on the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources. A stated goal of the EPA study is to ask the question: What are possible impacts—I restate, possible impacts—of hydraulic fracturing fluids on drinking water? Even the EPA's independent advisers have raised questions, with one member stating:

> There is no quantitative risk assessment included in EPA's research effort.

Despite, Mr. Chairman, no cases of hydraulic fracturing impacting drinking water resources, title II of this bill does not prevent the EPA from conducting such studies but ensures any such study done is held to the highest standards of review and risk assessment. I urge passage so that the Federal Government cannot impose its mediocrity on States' success.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, I voted no on H.R. 1965, the Federal Lands, Jobs, and Energy Security Act. I appreciate that my colleagues brought this legislation to the floor, and, in fact, have supported many of the titles contained in the measure—and continue to do so. I have a long record of supporting efforts to increase development of our domestic energy resources. However, I could not support the bill today given that two troubling amendments, specifically the Marino and Hanabusa amendments, which were adopted to the bill with little debate and Members were not given the opportunity to vote on these additional provisions.

I was particularly concerned with the Marino amendment. It calls for plans to allow the construction of new power lines "across federal lands to ensure that that energy produced can be distrusted to areas of need." Some may consider this to be non-controversial, but I have fought the impact of similar language for a number of years. I am privileged to represent Virginia's hallowed grounds, and I simply cannot support efforts to construct new power lines through our area—particularly power lines that would ship energy to other parts of the country. That's why I opposed PATH, and why I opposed TrAIL. Cedar Creek and Bell Grove National Historic Park and Manassas National Battlefield Park are just a few areas in our region that could be impacted by this amendment.

I also could not support the inclusion of the Hanabusa amendment, which I am concerned is a continued effort to classify native Hawaiians as a Native American tribe, and, as such, have lands taken into trust. That would allow for the expansion of Indian gambling in Hawaii. I will continue to fight efforts to expand gambling in America, whether it is on-reservation, off-reservation or over the Internet.

This evening, I voted for H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act. I support the development of our nation's natural gas resources, which will help our economy and strengthen our national security. Advances in technology have unlocked significant domestic reserves that were historically inaccessible, which has resulted in lower heating costs and lower prices at the pump. At the same time, I understand and recognize the real concerns expressed by those concerned that horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing in Virginia, particularly within the George Washington National Forest, could negatively impact our region's water quality, water supply and recreational resources. To be clear—environmental protections should be increased in Virginia before any potential activity of this kind is allowed within the George Washington National Forest. I fully support efforts to enact strong laws to protect Virginia's national resources and respect the wishes of local jurisdictions in making any decisions about energy exploration on state or federal lands in the Commonwealth.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–27 is adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2728

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

TITLE I—STATE AUTHORITY FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION

SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act''.

SEC. 102. STATE AUTHORITY FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION.

The Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by redesignating section 44 as section 45, and by inserting after section 43 the following:

"SEC. 44. STATE AUTHORITY FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Department of the Interior shall not enforce any Federal regulation, guidance, or permit requirement regarding hydraulic fracturing, or any component of that process, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on or under any land in any State that has regulations, guidance, or permit requirements for that activity.

''(b) STATE AUTHORITY.—The Department of the Interior shall recognize and defer to State regulations, permitting, and guidance, for all activities related to hydraulic fracturing, or any component of that process, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on Federal land regardless of whether those rules are duplicative, more or less restrictive, shall have different requirements, or do not meet Federal guidelines.

''(c) HYDRAULIC FRACTURING DEFINED.—In this section the term 'hydraulic fracturing' means the process by which fracturing fluids (or a fracturing fluid system) are pumped into an underground geologic formation at a calculated, predetermined rate and pressure to generate fractures or cracks in the target formation and thereby increase the permeability of the rock near the wellbore and improve production of natural gas or oil.''.

SEC. 103. TRIBAL AUTHORITY ON TRUST LAND.

The Department of the Interior shall not enforce any Federal regulation, guidance, or permit requirement regarding the underground injection of fluids or propping agents as part of the hydraulic fracturing process, or any component of that process, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on any land held in trust or restricted status for the benefit of Indians except with the express consent of the beneficiary on whose behalf such land is held in trust or restricted status.

TITLE II—EPA HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RESEARCH

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''EPA Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act''.

SEC. 202. EPA HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RESEARCH.

In conducting its study of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources, with respect to which a request for information was issued under Federal Register Vol. 77, No. 218, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall adhere to the following requirements:

(1) PEER REVIEW AND INFORMATION QUALITY.—Prior to issuance and dissemination of any final

report or any interim report summarizing the Environmental Protection Agency's research on the relationship between hydraulic fracturing and drinking water, the Administrator shall—

(A) consider such reports to be Highly Influential Scientific Assessments and require peer review of such reports in accordance with guidelines governing such assessments, as described in—

(i) the Environmental Protection Agency's Peer Review Handbook 3rd Edition;

(ii) the Environmental Protection Agency's Scientific Integrity Policy, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(iii) the Office of Management and Budget's Peer Review Bulletin, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) require such reports to meet the standards and procedures for the dissemination of influential scientific, financial, or statistical information set forth in the Environmental Protection Agency's Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by the Environmental Protection Agency, developed in response to guidelines issued by the Office of Management and Budget under section 515(a) of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-554).

(2) PROBABILITY, UNCERTAINTY, AND CONSEQUENCE.—In order to maximize the quality and utility of information developed through the study, the Administrator shall ensure that identification of the possible impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources included in such reports be accompanied by objective estimates of the probability, uncertainty, and consequence of each identified impact, taking into account the risk management practices of States and industry. Estimates or descriptions of probability, uncertainty, and consequence shall be as quantitative as possible given the validity, accuracy, precision, and other quality attributes of the underlying data and analyses, but no more quantitative than the data and analyses can support.

(3) RELEASE OF FINAL REPORT.—The final report shall be publicly released by September 30, 2016.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113–271. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an 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. HOLT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–271.

Mr. HOLT. 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 1, line 14, strike ''The'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), the''.

Page 2, line 4, strike ''The'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), the''.

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent quoted subsection accordingly):

''(c) METHANE EMISSIONS.—Nothing in this section limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations to require the minimization of venting and flaring of methane from oil and gas drilling operations on public lands, and to issue regulations designed to reduce fugitive methane emissions.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in support of the amendment that I am introducing, along with Mr. PETERS and Mr. POLIS, to allow the Secretary of the Interior to regulate methane.

Methane is the second most abundant greenhouse gas emitted in the United States, and the oil and gas industry is responsible for about 30 percent of all methane emissions into the atmosphere.

Methane is a super pollutant more than 20 times more potent than carbon dioxide in warming the atmosphere. Now we know that methane can and sometimes does leak from fracked wells. That is what we see here with the ignited tap water. This so-called fugitive methane also contributes to air pollution as tropospheric ozone, or smog, which threatens public health by triggering asthma attacks and aggravating the conditions of people with bronchitis and emphysema.

In fact, methane leaks have contributed to the Upper Green River basin in Wyoming having some of the worst air quality in the country, at times rivaling the worst air quality days in Los Angeles.

Although discussed as a cleaner burning and more climate friendly energy source, natural gas, which is mostly methane, leaks at every stage of production, not just into the groundwater, and hence into drinking water wells. It does leak, and it does affect the Earth's climate. It is true that burning methane releases less carbon dioxide greenhouse gas to the atmosphere than does burning an equivalent amount of coal, but the methane itself is a greenhouse gas. Fugitive methane emissions in excess of only a few percent remove the relative advantages of natural gas compared to other fossil energy sources.

Aside from issues of climate and health, leaked methane represents lost royalties for the Federal Government, lost revenue for oil and gas companies, and I know that supporting greater profits for Big Oil is something my colleagues should be eager to support.

Our amendment will help prevent the wasteful leakage of natural gas, will limit avoidable methane emissions, and will protect air quality and public health. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Holt-Peters-Polis amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the House today is designed to eliminate duplicative regulations and allow for increased energy production. That is the intent of the legislation. Yet here we are with an amendment that creates a loophole in the bill to allow the government to impose back-door regulations to restrict and block American energy production, which, of course, we know would result in lost job opportunities.

H.R. 2728 aims to give the States primacy in regulating hydraulic fracturing operations within their borders. I want to mention that again. This bill aims to give the States primacy in regulating hydraulic fracturing within their borders. So if a State regulatory body wants to implement emissions regulations, which this amendment addresses, in conjunction with their other rules and regulations, they are free to implement their own regulations beyond what is already required. Nothing in this bill prevents any State from putting emissions at the end of the regulations in place.

Further, the Secretary has the authority to manage methane emissions for production on Federal lands and, working collaboratively, we have seen significant reductions in the last 2 years because of that effort. However, attempting to cloak these regulations as fracturing regulations through a loophole that will cost American jobs and inhibit energy production in my mind is simply not the way to go.

So this amendment aims to impose controversial and political regulations into a bill that is simply about American energy production, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Let me make just one other point. I will probably repeat this again. There is nothing in this bill that prevents a State from regulating emissions within their State, which, of course, would take effect and what the gentleman is trying to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, the whole point of the underlying bill is to make it impossible for the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Land Management, the Secretary of the Interior to impose regulations. It says if the State has any regulations, then the Federal regulations don't count.

All this amendment would do is say on the important issue of what is called fugitive methane, leaked methane, methane that gets into the atmosphere by whatever means because of the drilling and fracking, should be limited. And it should be limited for several reasons. It is a potent greenhouse gas, and it is lost revenue. So I would think that everyone would be eager to make sure that none of this fugitive methane gets into the atmosphere or into the drinking water.

We know methane can and sometimes does leak from fracked wells. We should want the Secretary to be able to regulate that, because under the underlying bill, the Secretary could not.

This amendment is necessary, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

My good friend, the author of this amendment, opened his second remarks by saying, This legislation makes it impossible to regulate—fill in the blanks. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the case.

This bill says that primacy of regulation of hydraulic fracturing, which has been going on for some 60 years, if a State has it in place, that State's laws shall be the ones that we should follow. Those States that don't have it, then, of course, this legislation would allow the Department of the Interior's regulations to be there until they changed their regulations.

I want to make a point. This amendment is about the emissions from the process of hydraulic fracturing. Nothing in this bill, as I said before, prevents a State from doing what they can do. After all, keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, those States that have hydraulic fracturing rules maybe in all likelihood have some regulations dealing with the emissions that come from that. Nothing in this bill prevents that from happening.

What the amendment does do, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, is a back-door way to regulate hydraulic fracturing when, as I said just a moment ago, it has been done successfully for over 60 years in the States.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, the Holt-Peters-Polis amendment would allow the Secretary of Interior to minimize fugitive methane emissions on public lands.

Methane is a potent greenhouse gas that commonly leaks during the drilling and transportation of oil and gas. If you look at the entire production process, excess methane emissions can make natural gas energy just as dirty as coal energy. Moreover, methane and Volatile Organic Compounds emitted from oil and gas wells interact with sunlight to create ozone, another greenhouse gas.

Although national methane emissions fell between 2011 to 2012, emissions in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and other energy producing states have risen due to oil and gas operations. Colorado has approximately 50,000 wells which contribute to the state's current non-attainment status for the EPA's 2008 national ambient air quality standard for ozone. In addition, rural areas in the Upper Green River Basin in Wyoming have recorded dangerously high levels of smog that rival the worst pollution days in Los Angeles due to drilling. This is concerning since ground level ozone or ''smog'' can trigger asthma attacks and aggravate conditions of people with bronchitis and emphysema.

Earlier this year I introduced the BREATHE Act, H.R. 1154 because oil and gas wells and their associated infrastructure contribute to air pollution. Despite the overwhelming evidence that oil and gas production causes air pollution, oil and gas operators are still exempt from the basic federal protections afforded by the Clean Air Act. The BREATHE Act would close the loopholes in the Clean Air Act carved out for the oil and gas industry.

Energy companies can easily and cheaply curb methane emissions by simply fixing the leaks in oil and gas equipment. Also, methane control technology is inexpensive and readily available. Industry also stands to benefit from capturing emissions because they can sell the captured methane and other valuable hydrocarbons for a profit instead of leaking them into the air.

Reducing methane leaks will in turn reduce ground level ozone pollution and protect the quality of life for our communities and our families. Please support the Holt-Peter-Polis amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–271.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, beginning at line 9, strike ''regardless'' and all that follows through line 11 and insert a period.

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

''(c) TRANSPARENCY OF STATE REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall submit to the Bureau of Land Management a copy of its regulations that apply to hydraulic fracturing operations on Federal land.

''(2) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall make available to the public State regulations submitted under this subsection.

''(d) TRANSPARENCY OF STATE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall submit to the Bureau of Land Management a copy of any regulations of the State that require disclosure of chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing operations on Federal land.

''(2) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall make available to the public State regulations submitted under this subsection.

Page 2, beginning at line 23, strike ''the'' and all that follows through ''process'' and insert ''the process of hydraulic fracturing (as that term is defined in section 44 of the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended by section 102 of this Act)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, 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, I rise to offer a simple amendment today that makes technical and clarifying corrections to H.R. 2728. My amendment also calls on State regulators to provide their hydraulic fracturing and chemical disclosure requirement regulations to BLM for public disclosure.

States have the expertise in carefully crafting hydraulic fracturing regulations that meet the unique geologic and hydrologic needs of their States. This bottom-up regulatory relationship between the States and the Federal Government is one of the reasons that we are able to enjoy the vast economic benefits of the shale energy boom.

These changes will ensure that the cooperative and transparent State-driven regulatory approach to energy activity will continue. The energy shale boom is driving our economic recovery, and we need to keep the Federal Government from slowing down energy production on taxpayer owned Federal lands with duplicative regulations and unnecessary red tape.

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.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment goes right to the heart of what those who are opposed to this process are concerned with by disclosing the chemicals which is embodied in this amendment. This amendment does exactly what seems to be the opposition on the other side. I think it is a good amendment, and we are prepared to accept it.

Mr. FLORES. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague.

I rise today in support of the Flores amendment, which would make public States that have established efficient and regulatory programs that both encourage domestic development of our resources and protect the environment and health of our citizens.

My home State of Ohio has some of the most transparent and robust oil and gas regulations in the Nation, which in many cases far surpass Federal regulations. In fact, since 1953, over 80,000 wells have been hydraulically fractured in Ohio without a single case of groundwater contamination. At the same time, we are experiencing an energy renaissance that is estimated to bring more than 65,000 jobs and contribute nearly $5 billion to Ohio's economy by 2014. Ohio now has the potential to be a leader in domestic energy production and would bring much needed high-paying jobs and economic growth to northeast Ohio.

It is clear that prudent and responsible development of our resources that creates jobs, enhances our national security and energy independence, and impacts long-term economic growth should not be a partisan issue.

I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. FLORES. I thank Mr. RENACCI for his comments.

Again, this is a simple amendment in response to feedback I received during the past few weeks.

Again, the American energy shale revolution is completely dependent on hydraulic fracturing. Without this evolving technology, job creation, growth in manufacturing, lower energy prices, and lower greenhouse gas emissions would all stop. All the benefits our Nation is experiencing today would stop.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendment and ''yes'' on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I will not oppose this amendment because by itself it does not change anything, but it does underscore the problems with the bill itself. So I would like to speak on that for a moment.

I don't think there is anything wrong with making Interior a one-stop shopping place for State drilling regulations, although I don't know if there are any States that want to keep their regulations secret. So I don't know if that provision actually has any real impact.

Let me read a provision of the bill that this amendment strikes so that everyone understands what the amendment is trying to do. Subsection (b) of the bill says Interior shall defer to all State regulations for all activities related to any component of the hydraulic fracturing process. It then goes on to say ''regardless of whether those rules are duplicative, more or less restrictive, shall have different requirements, or do not feet Federal guidances.''

Apparently the majority, as well as the author of this amendment, recognize that the last sentence was a little excessive and now this amendment proposes to strike that. But it doesn't make any difference because in subsection (a), the bill reads that Interior cannot enforce any of its regulations or guidance for any component of the hydraulic fracturing process.

Subsection (a) strips Interior of their authority to enforce. This certainly has the same effect as the language in subsection (b) directing them to defer with respect to any regulations or requirements.

Even after this amendment is adopted—and we are prepared to accept it—the language in the bill will still require that Interior defer to the States, regardless of whether State rules are less restrictive or adequate or are inadequate or if they don't meet Federal guidelines. That is the problem with the bill. The bill remains the same.

This amendment is really superfluous. I will not oppose the amendment, but it does underscore the fundamental problem with the legislation that we are considering here today. It strips Interior of any authority to protect public health, public safety from drilling and fracking operations on public lands.

Although I will also accept the amendment, I will continue to oppose the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. I thank the gentleman for accepting the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. REED

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–271.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. ____. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study examining the economic benefits of domestic shale oil and gas production resulting from the process of hydraulic fracturing. This study will include identification of—

(1) State and Federal revenue generated as a result of shale gas production;

(2) jobs created both directly and indirectly as a result of shale oil and gas production; and

(3) an estimate of potential energy prices without domestic shale oil and gas production.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit a report on the findings of such study to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives within 30 days after completion of the study.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. REED

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–271 be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REED OF NEW YORK TO RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 113–27

Strike ''Page 4, after line 10'' and insert ''Page 2, after line 19''.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have a straightforward amendment to H.R. 2728, which I am offering on a bipartisan basis with my colleague from California (Mr. COSTA).

Our amendment will direct the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on the number of jobs created from shale development in America. In addition, the study will look at the impact that shale production has had on energy prices and State and Federal revenues.

Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward, simple amendment to quantify and document the economic benefits from shale development in America.

As I serve on the Natural Gas Caucus, as well as the Manufacturing Caucus, I can tell you that the development of natural gas in America has put us on a course to have a manufacturing rebirth and renaissance here in the United States. It is consistent with my philosophy that we need to build it here and sell it there, and this amendment will quantify on the Federal level the economic benefits that are associated with the development of this resource not only from the direct jobs of producing the resource, but the indirect and secondary jobs in the United States manufacturing sector, as well as all the other jobs that would support the development of this resource that we have been blessed with here in America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman.

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

I think this amendment will probably no doubt prove what we have been saying, that producing American energy will produce American jobs.

I think the gentleman's amendment adds to this legislation, and I am willing to accept that.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for that acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my cosponsor on this amendment.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from New York and fellow cochair of the Natural Gas Caucus, Mr. REED, for the time.

Places like the San Joaquin Valley, which I represent, are still struggling to create jobs in the wake of our Great Recession.

Energy production is a game changer not only in California, but around the country. These are exciting times with the findings in the Marcellus, the Barnett, the Bakkan, and the Monterey in California, which is estimated to be as large, if not larger, than the others that I mentioned.

Those who doubt the ability of States to regulate the oil and gas industry, I urge you to look at my home State of California which has put forth a long-term plan for responsible production of

natural gas that the Governor signed into law last month.

□ 1615

Many other States are taking their lead because we know one size doesn't fit all and, therefore, I think that is a preferred approach.

As all of us in the House are looking to determine what our next generation economy will look like, efforts like the amendment that we are proposing here, I believe, are critically important. The United States is on track to become the largest oil and gas producer in the world in the next few years. These are exciting times. The potential of the United States, Canada, and Mexico will far surpass the Middle East in the production of fossil fuels.

We should take advantage, therefore, of this opportunity, this dividend that will benefit our economy and also benefit the geopolitics of the world that we live in that is so dangerous. This shift from being importers of our energy to an international exporter will yield significant dividends for both our economy and global security. Our amendment will show that the economic opportunity cost of blocking or continuing to delay responsible—responsible—development of natural gas simply should not be the case.

The fact is that this study is more about the numbers and the dollars and how we do it safely and telling this side of the story, the human side of the story.

I support the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, at this point in time, I would just like to note, in this Chamber you have a gentleman from California and a gentleman from New York standing together to highlight the game-changing economic impact of the development of this natural resource. I believe this amendment will clearly articulate how this goes to create a manufacturing rebirth, a job renaissance here in America. I join with him in this amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to support the Reed-Costa amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member claim time in opposition?

If not, the question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. REED).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–271.

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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. __01. REQUIREMENT TO OFFER FOR SALE ONLY IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Secretary of the Interior shall require that all gas produced under a lease issued pursuant to authorities granted by this Act shall be offered for sale only in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I think will help deliver on some of the promises being made here today. This would say that natural gas produced on Federal lands, on Federal lands only, would not be allowed to be exported from the United States.

Now, the principal argument we are hearing on the Republican side is that, by adopting their standard, which they say is the states' rights standards—I have already raised concerns about that on fracking—that it will encourage yet more development on Federal lands, increase our domestic energy supply, and free us from the OPEC cartel. Okay. But that won't work if we produce energy on Federal lands and then we export it to other countries like China or Japan or elsewhere.

The Energy Information Administration has done a study. They say there will be a tipping point in the export of liquefied natural gas where we will create a world market; we will be subject to the world price. That means that there would be a dramatic increase in gas prices here in the United States both for residential, factory use, and as an input for manufacturing fertilizer or other sorts of manufacturing.

So, suddenly, we would see an advantage which we have only very, very recently developed. We have manufacturing companies bringing production back to the U.S. because of our plentiful natural gas and saying it is to our advantage, our energy is cheaper here, our feed stocks are cheaper here. This is a tremendous advantage for us, and they are producing here and exporting finished goods.

If we begin to export in great volume the raw material, the feed stock, the natural gas through a liquefied process, then suddenly it will be we are in the international market. It means a dramatic run-up in natural gas prices. We lose our competitive advantage for domestic manufacturing, and we are back where we are with oil, despite the idea that if we produce more oil we will somehow become free of OPEC or other countries around the world.

The fact is that oil is traded as an international commodity, and no matter how much we produce here, it is going to be priced internationally at the highest price being paid in the international market. That is not so today for natural gas. But if we export enough of it and create enough capacity to export it, that will become the case.

So this would have no impact on gas produced on State lands, Indian lands, private lands. It just simply says that that approximately 15 percent of the natural gas being produced on Federal lands could not be exported, must be used domestically to keep prices down here at home to advantage manufacturers here at home.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a similar amendment like this has been offered multiple times in our committee markups and they have always failed on a bipartisan vote, and similar amendments like this have also failed on the floor. This is nothing more than an effort to make production on Federal lands more challenging and less valuable.

The vast majority of the natural gas that is produced in the United States stays in North America, but that that is exported, 98 percent goes to Canada and Mexico. We ought to keep those customers.

Additionally, since 2009, the U.S. has been the largest producer of natural gas in the world, which, I guess, goes to my friend from Oregon's argument. But energy is going to be globally decided in the marketplace. Many companies operating in United States are international companies with businesses all over the world. Undercutting the basic premise of the free market and restricting the use of the resource always has real economic consequences in the future.

Now, there is one other point about this amendment, too. The amendment makes it unclear what is considered natural gas. The question arises, are products derived from natural gas also only to be sold in the United States because they are made from natural gas? It is unclear the way the amendment is drafted. But if that were to be the case, Mr. Chairman, there would be vast spin-off industries that would be affected, namely, the plastic industries.

So I tend to be one that believes that the American consumer, in fact, consumers everywhere, are benefited if we have free trade in the world. That should apply to everything, including a big resource that we are becoming a leader in, and this amendment, I think, is contrary to that approach.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. To the gentleman's point, it is absolutely clear. It says ''gas.'' It does not say products derived from gas, fertilizer, or manufactured plastic or anything else. It just says the gas must be sold here in the United States.

He admits and says that it will make it less valuable. That means he is looking at increasing the price of natural gas here to accommodate exports overseas to put us in a world market. Then we are, yet again, screwed, just like we

have been with oil for years. We are back to the point where we are competing in an international market. We lose international competitiveness. We lose more manufacturing.

This is pretty transparent here. I mean, the industry is pressuring, I am sure, on their side of the aisle, saying, Oh, my God, don't do that. Don't say that that 15 percent of the gas produced on Federal lands, belonging to the taxpayers of United States, has to be used here to help keep down our prices for our homes, for our manufacturing, to give us a competitive world advantage. Let's do it like all our other free trade, which is bankrupting the country and exported millions of manufacturing jobs over the last few years.

He talked about it again. Globally decided free market. He used those words. If we go to a globally decided free market in the export of natural gas, we lose the advantage, and their basic premise that this will lower prices for Americans is stood on its head.

If you don't adopt this amendment, if you vote against it, you are voting to increase the price of natural gas, according to the Energy Information Administration, for all consumers and manufacturers and the downstream products from those in the United States of America. So, if you really want to lower the price to consumers, vote for this amendment.

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

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, the DeFazio amendment is ill-conceived. Creating jobs in the energy sector is creating American jobs, and this amendment would, in fact, inhibit our ability to reduce our trade deficit and also affects an issue of providing natural gas to our strategic allies.

As a result of increased natural gas production, the price of natural gas has fallen over the last few years, making it competitive in the global marketplace. This presents an opportunity to export U.S. natural gas.

Many of our allies rely heavily upon a single source or unstable regions for natural gas. For example, Russia has used its European market dominance to influence other countries, cutting off natural gas supplies over various disputes. Poland is so eager to wean itself off Russia for natural gas that it plans to buy LNG from Qatar at a price estimated to be 40 to 50 percent higher than the rate charged by Gazprom, Russia's state-owned monopoly, just to be able to have some independence.

Increasing natural gas exports would provide our allies with an alternative and reliable source of energy, helping to strengthen our economic and geopolitical partnerships.

It should be noted that the boom in natural gas production has already made an impact. Supplies previously destined for our shores but no longer needed as a result of increased production have been diverted elsewhere. This increase in global supply has helped several European countries successfully renegotiate their long-term contracts with Gazprom, Russia's state-owned monopoly.

Mr. Chair, in general, when it comes to trade, we often talk about barriers that other countries have to U.S. producers, ones that we must overcome in order to export. In this case, these are regulatory burdens we are placing upon ourselves that are preventing our ability to create jobs and preventing our ability to lower our overall trade deficits. Restraining U.S. natural gas exports would only hurt our abilities to bolster strategic partnerships and create jobs right here at home.

The DeFazio amendment does nothing to decrease the cost currently of natural gas. This is an important ability to create jobs and lower our trade deficit.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

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

I would just simply say and correct my good friend from Oregon, I did not say that because natural gas would enter the international market it would become less available. I simply said that it would become part of the global market.

I dare say that, when oil was discovered in Titusville, Pennsylvania, nobody thought that that oil would become part of the world market, but it has. But unfortunately, because we in the United States have not utilized our resources like we should with crude oil and not competed as we should with past decisions, there was a cartel that was formed internationally called OPEC. They control the oil market.

The best way to beat cartels is to outsupply them. If we are going to be a leader in natural gas in the world, we ought to take advantage of that and lead when we can, but recognize that a free market gives the best services to people and recipients of that, not only in the United States, but in the world.

With that, I urge rejection of the DeFazio amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

□ 1630

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113–271.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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. _. REVIEW OF STATE ACTIVITIES.

The Secretary of the Interior shall annually review and report to Congress on all State activities relating to hydraulic fracturing.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, in just a second, I will yield to the distinguished chairman.

Just in a sentence, the Jackson Lee amendment is simple and will provide for an annual review of any and all hydraulic fracturing activity, as well as a report to be submitted to Congress.

I now yield to the gentleman from Washington, Chairman HASTINGS, for the purpose of entertaining a question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for her amendment and for yielding to me for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my friend from Texas, the text of the gentlelady's amendment requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an annual review of all State hydraulic fracturing activity. My concern is that this provision appears to be very broad.

I would be delighted to work with the gentlelady, as this bill works its way through the legislative process, to consider some additional conditions to ensure that the broad review is targeted at those areas subject to the jurisdiction of the committee and results in a report to Congress that is meaningful and productive.

To that end, would the gentlelady be willing to work with me to clarify that her amendment is intended to apply to State permitting of hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for working with me on this matter. I appreciate his willingness to work with me.

I want to achieve what the ultimate intent was, and that is, to have this amendment pertain to Federal lands. My response is that I do not object to a modification of the amendment to make clear that the review and report required of the Secretary should be limited to State permitting of hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands, which will, in fact, provide this Congress with

the necessary information on these processes.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. With the clarification that the gentlelady will work with me, that this is subject to Federal lands, with the clarification that the review and report required of the Secretary should be limited to State permitting of hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands, I am willing to accept the gentlelady's amendment. I thank her for her work on that.

I yield back to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chair, I just wanted to indicate that we have the opportunity to do a number of things: create jobs, energy independence, preserve and create a strong economy, and protect our environment.

I am interested in seeing the opportunity for low-income families to be able to be helped in the cold of the winter and the heat of the summer, to be able to find relief from the energy costs that we have talked about so often, and I would hope that as we move forward with the legislation that we will be able to work together.

I believe that the 2.1 million jobs that will be created, the increase of consumers' household dollars, and the amount of money that will be going into the government Treasury really should bring us together. My amendment, as clarified by the chairman in our discussion in the colloquy, is to give Congress that oversight pertaining to those Federal lands.

I thank the chairman for his clarification. I am looking forward to working with him and maintaining the language in the bill, however, with the understanding that we will get that review for Federal lands and that that will come from the Secretary of the Interior to the United States Congress.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–271 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

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

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 230, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

AYES—190

Andrews
Barber
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
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
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
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
Owens
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
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
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
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
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—10

Campbell
Herrera Beutler
Hurt
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Noem
Radel
Rush
Shuster
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1702

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 601, on the amendment offered by Rep. HOLT to H.R. 2728, Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HECK of Nevada). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the Committee now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given

their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 276, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 602]

AYES—142

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—276

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
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
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
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—12

Aderholt
Campbell
Chaffetz
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Noem
Radel
Rush
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1711

Mr. HECK of Nevada and Ms. DUCKWORTH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the Chair, Mr. HECK of Nevada, 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. 2728) to recognize States' authority to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation, and, pursuant to House Resolution 419, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lowenthal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2728 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 1, line 14, strike ''The'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), the''.

Page 2, line 4, strike ''The'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), the''.

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent quoted subsection accordingly):

(c) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Nothing in this section limits the authority of the Department of Interior or any State from requiring the public disclosure of chemicals in hydraulic fracturing fluids, the source and type of base fluid used in hydraulic fracturing, the disposition of hydraulic fracturing flowback fluids, and any other details of how and where hydraulic fracturing operations occur, for use by the public to study and analyze for the benefit of public health and safety.

Mr. FLORES (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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, transparency and public disclosure are critical ingredients to successful public policy and, I would dare say so, to successful democracy. My amendment would provide just that—transparency and public disclosure of the hydraulic fracturing operations that are now prolific in so many States.

Right now, our communities do not have access to reliable or complete information about fracking operations. Colleagues, our communities have a right to know.

If the public has a right to know what ingredients are in their food, don't our communities have a right to know what chemicals the oil and gas industry is going to pump past their drinking water?

If the public has a right to know where Superfund pollution sites are, don't our communities have a right to know where the oil and gas industry is going to store these millions of gallons of unknown chemicals and contaminated slurry?

If the public has a right to know about major land-use changes, don't our communities have a right to know when the oil and gas industry is going to start a fracking operation next-door—with its accompanying air emissions? its truck traffic? its noise? and its derricks?

I would hope that encouraging transparency and public disclosure would be a bipartisan issue. I certainly hear about transparency from the majority when this Chamber is talking about other Federal programs. We should be consistent and make sure the people in our communities also have a right to know about fracking chemicals injected below their backyards, their schools, their farms, and their parks.

And to those who would resist providing the community a right to know about fracking operations, I would warn that you prevent transparency at the oil and gas industry's own peril.

To develop our resources responsibly and to harness the benefits of the shale gas boom, we need the public's trust, and industry will not earn it if they hide the facts. When the oil and gas industry refuses to disclose the facts, it is natural for the public to ask then: Why won't industry tell us what chemicals they are using? What are they hiding?

When the oil and gas industry hides the facts, it erodes the public's trust and breeds suspicion.

□ 1715

Hiding the facts prevents first responders and health workers from understanding how to appropriately treat exposed individuals after a fracking accident.

Hiding the facts prevents emergency officials from understanding how to properly contain and clean up a chemical spill after a fracking accident.

Hiding the facts prevents the public from knowing which chemicals to test for in their drinking water before, during, and after fracking.

Hiding the facts prevents researchers who conduct chemical transport studies from understanding the prevalence, the movement, and the longevity of fracking chemicals in the subsurface environment.

Hiding the facts prevents the public from verifying the oil and gas industry's assertion that hydraulic fracturing is safe.

Don't hide the facts. Our communities have a right to know. Vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, this should be pretty easy.

In my earlier amendment that was approved by voice vote today, we addressed the concerns raised by the gentleman from California, so let's move on down the road and vote for American jobs and American energy.

A vote today for H.R. 2728 is a vote to regain our Nation's position as the world's leading energy producer, a product of the shale energy boom.

Thanks to shale energy, middle class manufacturing jobs are returning to the U.S. after generations of decline. Thanks to shale energy, our Nation's production is a huge blow to unstable and unfriendly areas like Russia and the Middle East, who previously dictated the world supply of energy.

Just last year, shale energy supported 2.1 million jobs. Turning our backs on the shale energy boom now would cause the Federal Government to lose up to $1.6 trillion in revenues over the next decade and a half.

I would repeat: the issue that was raised in the motion to recommit was already in my amendment that was passed by voice vote earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, lower energy costs for American families, a cleaner environment, an increase in American manufacturing jobs, and domestic energy security would all be lost without the underlying bill.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and to support abundant, safe, and clean energy through the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act. Vote ''yes'' for American jobs.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 603]

AYES—188

Andrews
Barber
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
Cuellar
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)
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
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)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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 (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)

Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
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
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
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
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—10

Campbell
Chaffetz
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Noem
Radel
Rush
Shuster
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman

□ 1728

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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 187, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 604]

AYES—235

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
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
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
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
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
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—187

Andrews
Barber
Bass
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)
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
Foster
Frankel (FL)
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
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
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
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)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Chaffetz
Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Noem
Radel
Rush
Shuster
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1739

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JIM HOLDEN

(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 celebrate the life of Jim Holden, a resident of Franklin, Venango County, Pennsylvania.

An outdoor enthusiast who tirelessly promoted recreation and tourism in Pennsylvania, Jim passed away on November 9 at the age of 73.

As cofounder of the Allegheny Valley Trails Association, Jim was instrumental in the Rails-to-Trails movement, an effort in the early 1990s to rehabilitate abandoned railways into

multipurpose recreational trails for the public to access and enjoy.

Franklin's newspaper stated the following upon Jim's passing:

> Largely unrealized were how Holden's efforts impacted the overall economy of a region hard-hit over the years by the loss of blue collar manufacturing jobs that once made the oil region one of the most prosperous in all the country. His passing will leave some mighty big hiking boots to fill.

Jim Holden knew that our region's recreational resources could be better utilized to the benefit of the community and its economy. He spent his life making this vision a reality.

Our thoughts and prayers are with Jim Holden and his family. He surely did leave big boots to fill but also an enduring legacy for us to cherish.

GOOD THINGS HAPPENING WITH HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues want to go back to the old way of doing business on health insurance. We can't go back to the days when people with preexisting conditions were denied coverage and women were asked to pay more simply because they are women.

We know the ACA rollout has not been perfect. We knew all along a reform of this magnitude would require some adaptive management. It happened with Social Security and Medicare, but we worked together to improve those cornerstones of our social safety net, not tear them down.

So let's work to fix the problems of the ACA, but let's tell the whole story, including the good parts of this law. In California, we are on track to meet our enrollment goals—tens of thousands of people already enrolled. I am hearing countless good news stories about the ACA: a mom whose son was hospitalized with a brain tumor who would have hit a lifetime cap, but now they have coverage and they can focus on that child's recovery; a constituent in Trinity County who just emailed me—he and his wife are buying a car with the savings they are achieving thanks to the ACA. There are dozens and dozens more success stories because of this law.

I hope my Republican colleagues will join in fixing the problems with this law and give it a chance to work. There are too many good things happening because of health care reform to go back to the old way of doing business.

□ 1745

NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the month of November, we celebrate and promote the wonderful and selfless commitment to adoption, as it is National Adoption Month.

Last year, American parents proudly adopted over 135,000 children at birth, in foster homes, and from overseas. However, I would like to bring special attention to the many American families that are no longer permitted to adopt children from places such as Guatemala and Russia.

I have signed on to two separate letters with bipartisan support from Members of both the House and the Senate to urge the Guatemalan and the Russian Governments to once again resume intercountry adoption cases for American families.

Mr. Speaker, every child deserves to grow up in a loving family. We should not be limited by the country they are born into. Let's refresh our commitment to creating more effective strategies and opportunities to work towards a day when every child has an opportunity to be in a safe and loving home.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(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, recently someone said to new EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy that she was not living in the read world with regard to climate change.

My question today is if those who are questioning whether she lives in the real world would say the same thing to the survivors of the typhoon of Biblical proportions that just devastated the Philippines where 4,000 people have been impacted. This was the strongest land-falling typhoon on record.

And I am wondering if they would tell people whose homes were hit by the unusually late Mid-Western tornados this past weekend that they are not living in reality. Sixty tornados were reported, eight people were killed, and the damages are estimated to be at least $1 billion.

Weather-related losses and damages have risen from $50 billion to almost $200 billion annually over the last decade.

Putting our heads in the sand will not stop the reality that our climate is changing and that human beings are a part of the reason.

GEORGIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, I was honored to observe the recent presidential elections in the Republic of Georgia in which Giorgi Margvelashvili was elected.

It was characterized by the International Republican Institute as ''calm and . . . with a substantial reduction of complaints filed with the election commission.''

The President was elected with a 62 percent vote in an election that was described also as an important milestone in Georgia's democratic development.

In keeping with this promise to step down following the election, Prime Minister Bidzina Ivanishvili appointed a successor, Irakli Garibashvili, on November 2. He was most recently the Minister of Interior appointed by the Prime Minister after the Georgia Dream Coalition's victory in the 2012 parliamentary elections. Prior to his work in government, he headed Mr. Ivanishvili's charitable organization Cartu. He holds a graduate degree from the University of Paris, Sorbonne; and I was pleased to visit the country, the Republic of Georgia, and be involved in the democratic process and principles.

TRIBUTE TO BARRY SULLIVAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, tonight, several Members wanted to come to the floor to discuss the retirement of a very good friend of ours who deserves our recognition. Because there are so many people with busy schedules, I am going to go right into it and yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. CAPUANO represents a famous area of America, south Boston, a wonderful area of our country.

As every Member of this House knows, we who serve here in the Chamber rely on an outstanding group of professionals who manage the floor and the party cloakrooms. This is true for both Democrats and Republicans.

On the Democratic side, we have been incredibly fortunate to have been served with great ability by a devoted public servant with a wonderful sense of humor, a sense of this House, a sense of history, a sense of decency, and a sense of how to help Members greatly. He has managed our cloakroom for the past 33 years.

That man, devoted to the smooth running of the people's House day in and day out, is Barry Sullivan. As he prepares to retire from service, I want to join not only those from Massachusetts who are justifiably very proud of him as a brother from their own State, but also all of those in the House on both sides of the aisle, but particularly on our side of the aisle, who have been advantaged by his service, by his good humor, and by his caring.

Barry, a native of south Boston, first came to Washington in 1980 to work for the Sergeant at Arms as a doorkeeper. In 1987, Tip O'Neill appointed him to manage the Democratic cloakroom, and he has been reappointed ever since.

Barry had grown up around politics; and his father, Leo Sullivan, had been a Massachusetts State senator and a Boston police commissioner. He never thought he would stay in Washington for more than a couple of years, but the call to serve this House and his country proved too strong. His country and each of us and this institution have been advantaged by his staying.

Barry brought a lot of Boston to the Capitol. He set up a desk in the cloakroom that is very much a shrine to the Boston Red Sox and a place of homecoming for Massachusetts Members. And every time our Members' beepers would announce votes, it was Barry's mellifluous Boston accent that came across the airwaves to tell us what was going on.

Even more so, Barry has made the cloakroom feel like a home, a home away from home for all of us who serve here, and he will be missed dearly and greatly by all who came to cherish his friendship and his comradeship.

Barry, who sits on the floor with us, Mr. Speaker, we wish you all the best in retirement, both to you and to your lovely bride, Barbara, whom I had the opportunity of knowing very well almost as long as I have known you. She was a special person and had a special connection to this House because she was the daughter of our former colleague, Bill Hughes of New Jersey. Bill Hughes represented the people of New Jersey well, and I was honored to serve alongside him on the Financial Services Committee for a while.

As the sunny shores of Cape Cod beckon him, we bid farewell to an extraordinary public servant whose legacy will continue to be felt in the Halls of Congress both on and off this floor for many years to come.

Barry, thank you and Godspeed.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the dean of the Massachusetts delegation.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank MIKE CAPUANO for organizing this event on behalf of Barry Sullivan.

Barry Sullivan is a reminder of the men and women who serve this institution day in and day out to make sure that it runs as efficiently as it possibly can.

We depend very much here on accurate data and accurate information; and to call Barry Sullivan at any time of the day or night, you could depend on getting the best information that was available at that moment.

Beyond that, he was an individual of great humor. He had the ability to laugh at himself. He had the ability to chuckle with all of us. I recall with some humor one day that he was in a great state of duress, and that was that he had only been able to deliver one blueberry muffin to Chairman Moakley. Chairman Moakley wanted two blueberry muffins, or as he would say at the time, Chairman Moakley wanted two blueberry muffins. I saw Barry in the hall, and I said, What have we got going today? He said, I don't know, but I am getting that second blueberry muffin if I get nothing else accomplished.

It is these individuals that day in and day out make us look good here. That is the reminder. They oversee a very complex process in that cloakroom of trying to adhere to the rules of the House and at the same time making sure that the Members of Congress are well positioned not only in terms of time, but in terms of time management.

Barry welcomed me here in 1988. He is one of the first people I met. There was Brian Donnelly and Joe Early and a number of others in the Massachusetts delegation. Nick Marvroules, Gerry Studds, and others come to mind. Of course, there was Barney and members of our delegation. We were always very proud of Barry Sullivan, and I thought that one of his great champions here had been Brian Donnelly in those years. That is how we got to know Barry as well as we did.

I wish him well. I also would say that we can take great confidence from the fact that he was a student of this institution. He held the highest regard for it. He was an acolyte of Tip O'Neill and Joe Moakley, who revered service in this institution.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), a former head of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank MIKE CAPUANO for organizing this Special Order. Both STENY and RICH have said it well.

Everything that is rich about public service is embodied in the service provided by Barry Sullivan. As RICH pointed out, to have come here with Tip O'Neill and Joe Moakley puts you in the pantheon of stars in New England. I point out to Mr. CAPUANO that RICH NEAL is not only the dean of the Massachusetts delegation; he is the dean of the New England delegation, as well.

Barry Sullivan is New England through and through. He is Irish. He is Catholic. He is the Red Sox. He is the Celtics. He is the Bruins. He is the Patriots. He gets us through the day.

My first encounter with him came over in the Pennsylvania corner where he would be summoned on a regular basis. I thought for a while he was Jack Murtha's personal valet. I did not realize that there was one of those little white buttons that they press. But automatically, Barry would appear out of the backroom and immediately assure Mr. Murtha that things were all right, how things would be done for the day, what time we would get out of here, et cetera. All of the essentials that Members need.

The wonderful thing about Barry, his three sons, and Barbara is that they epitomize class. He is such a gentleman, even among the most tense of situations, he is there for all of us—most notably to remind you that you forgot to vote, to stick your card in, and adhere to the rules of the floor here. It is that class and the professionalism that he brings to the job.

The elevation of public service is something that another man from Massachusetts provided to all of us. To elevate public life, whether as an elected official or whether in the service of your country, whether it is being a Clerk in this House, whether it is running the Democratic Caucus, or whether it is being in the Peace Corps, John Fitzgerald Kennedy made it elevated, the whole notion of public service. Barry, you exemplify the nobility that Kennedy ushered in and gave credence to a life of public service.

Well done, a son of Boston, a son of Ireland, and, of course, a Red Sox fan. God bless you, Barry, and your entire family.

□ 1800

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) will control the remainder of the hour.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the nominal representative of Mr. Sullivan, who will be joining countless people, as we have already seen from representatives from Maryland, representatives we will hear from from Vermont and New York and California and New Jersey, all envious of being associated with Massachusetts officials and Mr. Sullivan.

We understand their humility, and in that humility I would like to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my colleague.

When I first heard that Barry Sullivan was retiring, my reaction was, Say it ain't so.

I have been in this body for 5 years, and one of the first people I met in orientation was Barry Sullivan. And as a son of Boston myself, as an Irish Catholic myself, as somebody whose family vacations in Cape Code periodically, in Falmouth, where Barry also vacations, I felt I was at home. I felt that there was a human face to this institution who cared about it passionately, who had ties to Tip O'Neill and Joe Moakley, two great heroes in my family's household back in Boston.

I think Barry has provided incredible service to the people's body, to this House, and has tried to ease stress, has tried to make our lives more comfortable. I cannot imagine what we are all going to do when our pager goes off and we don't hear that Boston staccato: There will be four votes; this is the last series of the day. That is Barry Sullivan. And if you come from New England, those are comforting tones.

Barry has contributed 33 years to this institution. I don't think he ever lost a sense of reverence for what this institution is all about; and I think, in showing that reverence, he reminds those of us who hold elective office here just how privileged we are to serve in the people's body. He never lost

sight of that, and I hope none of us will either.

Barry, I think that is your lasting legacy. Thank you to you and your wonderful wife, Barbara, and your three kids. Enjoy retirement. God bless.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce now for comments about Mr. Sullivan a person who shared the same mentor in many respects, a person that we all admire so greatly, that is the late Congressman Joseph Moakley, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

It is a real privilege to be here with my colleagues to honor Barry Sullivan. And when I heard about his retirement, I couldn't help but think that this is the end of an era.

As my colleague BILL KEATING mentioned, both Barry and I came here under the mentorship of a great man, Joe Moakley, who understood what public service meant in the best tradition. And I think one of the things that I admire about Barry is that he has been a public servant in the highest tradition. He has been the go-to guy for everything and anything.

You know, a lot of people don't understand who don't work here about all the people who kind of work behind the scenes, who work longer hours than we do, and Barry is amongst that group of people, always here, early mornings, late nights, separated from his family at times when we couldn't get our act together here in the Congress. He has just been incredible.

So we are going to miss you, Barry, for a whole bunch of reasons, and I am going to miss you also because of your friendship. You and Barbara have been great friends to Lisa and me. You have given us advice on how to raise our kids and where to send them to school, and we appreciate that very, very much.

But I want you to know that there are so many of us here who have high regard for you and who value your service and your friendship. And I will just close by saying that I am grateful, but I want you to know that we are going to be friends for life.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Sullivan has had this position as manager of the Cloakroom on the Democratic side since 1987, and he has served different leaders in that capacity. I am sure one of the highlights of his career has been having that position when history was changed and we had our first woman who was Speaker of the House.

I would like to yield to our esteemed leader from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you, Mr. KEATING. I thank you for yielding. I thank you and Mr. CAPUANO and the members of the Massachusetts delegation for bringing us together to honor a wonderful friend to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, in late 1979, the legendary Congressman Joseph Moakley, a colleague to many of us who had the privilege to call him ''colleague,'' ran into the son of a friend and former colleague, Leo Sullivan, in Boston. He knew that the young Boston State College student had served as a page on Beacon Hill and had an interest in public service. He suggested that it was time for this young man to travel to our Nation's Capital to serve in Congress, led by another Massachusetts legend, Speaker Tip O'Neill. That young man was and is Barry Sullivan.

When he arrived in Washington the following March, he thought he would spend just a few years here before returning to his beloved South Boston. Thirty-three years later, he will finally leave his post in the Democratic Cloakroom, an institution in its own right, a source of information for Members. He leaves as a committed public servant to the Congress and to our country.

As one of Barry's former colleagues once said, ''Down here, Members are looking for somebody who knows what's going on.'' And Barry always knew. He was the trusted source, has been the trusted source, of what was happening on the floor, what bill was up for a vote, what issues Members were tackling on any given day. Barry always knew what was going on, in addition to the floor agenda, what was important for Members to know.

Public service is in his blood, as the son of one of the central players of the mid-20th century in Massachusetts State government. So prominent was Barry's father, Leo, in local politics, that he escorted then-President-elect John Kennedy from Logan Airport to the Boston Garden on election night, 1960, a great honor for a great Massachusetts leader and family.

Barry would come here and be escorting Presidents, Prime Ministers and Kings over and over again, and he did so with grace and commanding respect.

Boston is in his blood. As a proud native of South Boston, a devoted Red Sox fan—did I say that they won the World Series? But of course everybody knows that.

Okay. You can cheer for Barry as well as for the Red Sox, okay? I was at the game. All right.

A devoted Red Sox fan, I repeat, a father and husband who takes his family back to his hometown and to Cape Cod every year without fail. And now, with his career in the Capitol coming to a close, we all know that Barry looks forward to spending as much time as he can on the Cape with his beloved wife, Barbara, and their three sons.

Barry Sullivan has been an integral part of our team and our system. He has been a clearinghouse of information from his first day in the Cloakroom to his last, as the man in charge. His service has proven invaluable. His contributions have been incredible, just remarkable. He gives you the answer before you ask the question. He anticipates our every need.

To Barbara and the whole Sullivan family, thank you for sharing your husband and father with the United States Congress for so long.

To Barry, you have earned the respect of Members of Congress and the gratitude of countless Members of Congress who have served in this Chamber. Thank you for taking a chance, for coming to Washington to serve Tip, at the invitation of Joe Moakley—what legends—and for serving us all with grace, good humor, and dedication throughout your tenure in the House of Representatives; though you are leaving us on a day-to-day basis, I hope you will be no stranger to us and that you will return on many occasions.

Thank you, Barry Sullivan.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Madam Leader.

We all know that it is no secret that in this House there are often great divisions, and probably the most profound schism that exists in this House is between Red Sox fans and Yankee fans. But to show you the esteem that Mr. Sullivan has held with our Members, I have the privilege of yielding whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman. And you are correct. You stuffed my first line.

I live a few blocks away from Yankee Stadium, and so, for a Yankee fan to honor a Red Sox fan shows the kind of love and respect that I have for him. I don't know if I will survive or be able to sleep tonight, but I will say congratulations, Barry, on the Red Sox winning the World Series.

You notice that didn't come out too well, but it is not that easy.

Barry Sullivan. When I first came here and I found out that Barry Sullivan was running the Cloakroom, I expected to see Barry Sullivan, the movie star of the 1940s in the black-and-white movies. Instead, I found a class act and a person who really cared about the membership. And that is what is important, that he always took care of the membership.

One of the things that always amazed me about Barry was his ability to put up with us. After all, how many times does a person get to answer the same question 200 times in a row to the same people?

When are we getting out tonight, Barry?

When do you think votes will end?

Do I have time to go to dinner?

Well, Mr. SERRANO, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, and he would do it. And then you would show up and you would show up and he would do it. By the third time, I would have told everybody to come in the Cloakroom and I will make one speech to everybody, and then you can all get out of here and leave me alone. But there was always that ability for him to understand the needs we had, the information we needed, and the fact that he provided that for us.

But he also had a sense of humor. I gave him a hard time for so long. I have been here 23 years, and I had running lines with him. One of them, walking into the Cloakroom, was, Are the Red Sox still in the league? That was one of the ones. The other one was, What is the loudest noise in September? And he would actually go along with it and say, What? I would say, The Red Sox falling apart. And this went on and on and on.

But through it all, Barry, you showed more than just being a sports fan, you showed that you were a class human being, that you were a person who cared, a person who cared in terms of how we got here. I think you, as much as anyone else, understood that none of us get appointed here, that we have to go beg in front of a Legion hall or in front of a subway station or in front of a supermarket for a vote, and you understood that, and that is how you treated us, and that is how I think we treated you.

You were the one who told us if there were peanuts coming to that basket in front of you when we were looking for peanuts or chocolate or whatever. You were the person who made sure everything ran well, and I am going to miss you. I am really going to miss you, because I think you are one of the classiest acts around here. I hope you stay in touch. And I will just end this way. We have in Spanish—and I will apologize to the stenographer, and I will translate it later.

We have a saying in Spanish: Dime con quien andas y te dire quien eres.

(English translation of the above statement is as follows:)

Tell me who you walk with and I will tell you who you are.

We walk with you. We are you. Let's hope that we have learned from you how to be as classy and as humane as you have been for so many years.

Thank you, Barry.

□ 1815

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) who represents the town of Falmouth, the Member who, I guess, will represent Barry in different ways, possibly officially at some point.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, after the kind words of the gentleman from New York, I just want to say, after hearing him pay tribute to Mr. Sullivan, I just will tell you that I do hope that the Yankees sign Robinson Canó, and I hope they go way over the luxury tax threshold to do it.

Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I want to tell you, when I came to this House not knowing much, I asked for advice from a lot of people, and I can't tell you how many people told me, Just seek out Barry Sullivan for whatever you need, whether it is a personal need, whether it is the knowledge of the city, whether it is the knowledge of legislative practice, whether it is the knowledge of what to do in the formal or informal structure. They all told me to seek out Barry Sullivan. I will tell you that no better advice was ever given to me.

I want to congratulate him on his 33 years, and I want to say that it has been an amazing career because, as the leadership has changed over his 87 years, he has maintained that position despite who was in the Democratic leadership, and that is a tribute to the job that he does.

I also have felt a kinship with him as I began to know a little bit about him. I saw that we have a lot in common. He comes from a police family. His father was police commissioner. My father was a police officer. My brother was a police officer. His father was a State senator, and I served in the State senate for part of that time, representing the city of Boston as well.

We both shared the great privilege of having a mentor. Joe Moakley was the Congressman in my district in my days when I was in the State legislature, and I called upon him time and time again for advice. I realize that both Barry Sullivan and I profited greatly from that knowledge, not only of the institutional knowledge that he had but the good character and type of person that Joe Moakley was.

Barry and I both had an early interest in politics. We both studied and majored in political science when we were in college. Even our own sons went to the same college of St. Joe's, and we both paid those tuition figures to have that occur.

A lot of people will be saying goodbye to Barry, and they will be saying that they are sorry they won't be seeing him as much. I think I am probably in the minority, where I will be able to say, I probably will see you more because I am sure that as he has more time to spend on his own to recreate, to be with his family, I am going to see him on the beaches in Falmouth Heights. I am going to see him fishing. I am going to see him watching the Falmouth Commodores in the Cape Cod league, enjoying probably one of the best places in the world to retire to.

I just want to wish him well. I wish Barbara well. Good health. Enjoy those years. And thank you, Mr. Sullivan, for a job well done.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), another Member with a special relationship with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

With a sense of real mixed emotions, I join this discussion tonight, certainly with gratitude and pride for Barry's 33 years of service but also for a real sense of regret that he will not be a part of our everyday lives and work the way he has been for all these years.

The House is very often a very chaotic and noisy place. The bell rings, and hundreds of people descend upon the floor. They all have their demands. They all have their ideas. They all have their needs. In that sea of chaos, you look for a person who stands tall and strong and is unflappable no matter what. Barry, for all of us, for all those years, you have been one of those people.

Nothing flusters Barry Sullivan. There is no problem too great. There is no controversy too bitter. He is always the same optimistic, friendly, honest, cheerful, strong person, no matter what. And your strength has been an inspiration to all of us.

When you know from whence Barry comes, his strength is easy to understand. I did not have the privilege of sharing the heritage that he has from Boston, but I know his family very, very well. I know that his beloved father-in-law, former Representative Bill Hughes, Ambassador Bill Hughes, served here. Perhaps his greatest gift was Barbara. I think that is probably the reason Barry stayed in Washington, because he met her, and they started a beautiful life together. They have three wonderful sons that they have educated and raised, and I have the privilege of working with his son Brendan, who is here with us tonight, representing the people of our First Congressional District of New Jersey.

So, Barry, nothing you do surprises us because of your inner strength and your qualities and your optimism.

The one thing about Barry that did surprise me, however, was that he did not start growing his beard in the middle of the summer and let it go until the end of the World Series, like his beloved Red Sox. There was some discussion that he might do that.

But I do admire the fact that he was nice to everyone—even to the Yankees fans, as Mr. SERRANO just said. He showed real equanimity.

Barry, on behalf of our country, our party, my constituents, and my family, we thank you for your strength and your goodness and your inspiration. We know we will see you many times in the future. We wish you Godspeed. Congratulations.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Barry, we are going to miss you. Everyone has been rightly singing your praises.

I will tell you the couple of things I noticed right away. When I came, it was 2007. Many of the Members who have spoken have been here many years longer. When you went into the cloakroom, you were treated like you had been here forever. Everybody was treated the same. The goodwill, the good sense of humor, the good judgment, the sense that we are all part of

something larger than ourselves—that was something that Barry really conveyed.

The other thing I noticed, we used to have pages here. Remember that? We had these young people full of hopes and dreams about how they could make a contribution in this country, how they could make this a better country, how they could be better people.

Barry, it was amazing to watch you with those kids because you had to get them organized. They had to learn all of our names. They would be sitting there in the cloakroom studying the Congressional Pictorial, and these young kids from all over the country would be coming up, and they would be saying hi to Mr. MILLER, to Mr. WELCH, to Mr. CAPUANO, and it was such a reassuring observation, such a wonderful scene there where these kids—boys and girls—felt that they had a big job in a big institution. You could see them getting excited about public service, and you could see them taking seriously the responsibilities that go along with it, which at that moment, for them, was learning the names and matching them to the faces of the people who were here.

Barry, you were a great teacher. It wasn't just that they got our names right. It was that you inspired them to find in themselves the discipline and the strength to take that next step and to aspire to achieve their dreams.

It is a life well lived when you can treat the people in it with love and respect, when you can commit yourself to the building of an institution, that you can help leave it behind in better shape than you found it.

So, Barry, for all of us who served with you, seeing all the good deeds you have done for so many, thank you very much.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Also, I want to say that as a freshman Member here several years ago, Barry made me feel very special, and I thought that it had to do with the fact that I was from a place called south Buffalo, which is very much like South Boston but without the edge or the accent.

This favorite son of South Boston defined this institution with a sense of order, most certainly, but with a sense of pride and purpose and humor as well. An avid Boston Red Sox fan and Boston Bruins fan, and just an all-around wonderful person who made everyone here, hundreds of Members that have served, feel very special, as you did that first day that I arrived.

So, Barry, I thank you, as a Member of this House, and I want to commend you for your years of service and wish you well in the years ahead of you.

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for organizing this tribute to Barry and, I think, to his family, because we know the time he takes away from them on our behalf for his service here.

I am one of the few people who can say that I was here before you were, Barry, but I thought everybody here was from Boston or something like that when I first got here from the west coast.

I want to join my colleagues here. I think we all have very strong and deep feelings about the service you have rendered to us. Sometimes when we were pleasant, and sometimes when we weren't so pleasant, sometimes when we were harried, and sometimes when we were relaxed, you always seemed to be very stable in terms of the answers that you could provide us, even when you couldn't possibly know the answer to the question, ''When are we getting out?'' You would just kind of look and say, Well, and you would give your best guesstimate because you didn't have a clue what was going to take place on the floor, given the turmoil that happens from time to time. But it was more than just about getting out; I think it was also an assessment, your sense of what was really taking place on the floor. Yes, there were 50 amendments filed, but you had a handicap system. You figured 30 were going to go by the wayside by noon. Another five would drop out later. You heard somebody else might have been leaving. So now we are down to a handful of manageable amendments. So don't give up your early reservation. That kind of handicapping was worth a lot when you come from the west coast and you have got to do it every week. So thank you for that.

Your service here overall to us, the dignity with which you have treated the Members of Congress—as I say, sometimes we can be rather demanding because we are harried. It has just been a wonderful, wonderful relationship to have you on our side in our cloakroom, taking care of us and answering questions from our families when they call and want to know what might they expect in terms of our service and our time here.

I think Joe Moakley picked a good guy. He did right by you, and you did right by us. And I just want to thank you.

I want to join Mr. WELCH also. I was a big fan of the experience that the pages were able to garner here, and all of us have met people who were pages who now live in our districts and remember that experience, or it was key to their actions, and it was unfortunate that we weren't able to hold onto that program. But your management, your care, and your kind remarks to them sometimes when they were being youthful and exuberant about something that may be taking place, to remind them what was going on in the House, I think, was one of the lessons of their lives that they will never forget. So thank you very much for that management and oversight of those young people who have gone on in so many instances to make major, major contributions in our communities and in our country. Thank you so much for your service.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Barry, I just want to say that there have been a lot of kind words here tonight, and I think a lot of the words are very appropriate, but I have got to say, I don't even like you.

You are full of bad news all the time. We want to go home. You won't let us. We want to come in later. You won't let us. We want to go home a day early. You won't let us. Barbara, I don't know how you put up with him.

As a young boy, I used to go to church with my grandfather. He was an usher at the church. He wasn't the priest. He wasn't the head of the parish council. But he was the guy who made everything run. He helped run the festival. He was the top usher, so he had to handle all the money. He scheduled everybody. I grew up really watching him with an appreciation of how many people that you may not see in that instance on the altar or here speaking on the floor, how many people work to make things happen.

□ 1830

Barry is in that cloakroom making things happen, making things run smoothly; not in the newspaper, not getting the headlines. And I just want to say thanks.

I worked for a Member of Congress 20 years ago, and he had the old things you used to have to slide on. It was huge, it seemed like, back then, and I remember as a staffer hearing Barry's voice, and I knew it was Barry. I just heard this voice, Two bells, three bells, four bells, 15 minutes, 5 minutes. For 2 years, I would hear that.

Then, when I finally became a Member and I got my little clip and I started hearing that voice and I got to meet Barry, it was like I thought I had made it. I get to respond to what Barry has been telling people to do for so many years. It was a great honor.

Then-Minority Leader PELOSI started the 30-Something Working Group with Kendrick Meek and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and other Members, and I would come to the floor sometimes two or three nights during the week and stay very late—sometimes until 10 or 11. And I knew Barry was here, slogging away. He would say, Are you going to go tonight, Mr. RYAN? Yes. Sorry, Barry. He would sit in that room and wait until that was done. But that is the kind of dedication that you had.

We love you. You are the best. Always with a smile and something nice to say, no matter how bad the situation got or how tough things were.

Barbara, thank you. I know there are a lot of late nights here.

Barry, you are the best. Have a great retirement.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Boston (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I want to thank my friend, Mr. CAPUANO, for reserving this time on our behalf to recognize our great friend.

Mr. Speaker, Barry Sullivan has been here a long time.

I know that the title ''cloakroom manager'' has a rather antiquated sound to it. As a matter of fact, there is a rumor around here that Barry Sullivan actually was the manager of the cloakroom back when they still wore cloaks.

I am not sure he has been here that long, but I do know the beginning of his service started with marching in the St. Patrick's Day parade in South Boston with Joe Moakley, our dear departed friend. Now, after 33 years, our friend has decided to retire from his position. I think it is a truly bittersweet moment for a lot of us.

Barry has been an extension of our staffs. I will miss the daily contact that I have with Barry, because most of the time he is reminding me to make all the votes. But he is also an extension of our families, in many ways. So many of us travel back and forth from our home districts—mine, in South Boston, and around the city of Boston—back here to Washington. And Barry is an extension of that.

I have had the good fortune to call Barry my friend since I arrived here in Washington, D.C., shortly after the attacks on September 11. I came in in a special election. I was the only Democrat elected at that time. I was given one bit of advice by my friends. They said, Make sure you get to know Barry Sullivan in the cloakroom. That is some of the best advice that I have ever received in coming here.

Barry may not know it, but to a new Member of Congress, his assistance is immeasurable, especially when you are first getting used to understanding the rhythm here in Washington, D.C., and the importance of the whole process here.

Barry has been in D.C. all these years now—at least 33 years—but he has never lost his connection to his hometown of South Boston. As a matter of fact, Barry may not know this, but he is actually still voting in South Boston each and every election. There is an old South Boston rule that if someone moves away or even if they pass away, as long as you know how that person would have voted, you are allowed to vote on their behalf.

I am actually kidding on that.

Barry has never lost his connection to his local community in South Boston, as well as his love for Cape Cod. A true son of South Boston, Barry and his family still make their annual trip to Falmouth, Massachusetts. Of course, they always stop at Sullivan's at Castle Island for a couple of hot dogs.

While there is no doubt that Barry loves to get back to the Cape, there was always the rumor that Barry traveled back home simply to work on his Boston accent. While I may have had trouble when I first got here in talking to some of our colleagues from the Deep South, I never needed an interpreter to talk to my friend Barry.

I still remember how proud we were back in 2007, standing right in this Chamber, in this aisle, at the State of the Union address. It was Barry Sullivan who made the announcement: Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States. While most of the country didn't know what he was saying, a lot of people back in South Boston in our district were very, very proud of that moment. The phone was ringing off the hook.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of Members here who are the face of the Congress. We are up here at the microphone on a continual basis, sometimes much to the chagrin of the people we represent, but behind the scenes it is people like Barry Sullivan who make things work. His manner and respectful way of dealing with everyone, whether it was a page, the Speaker of the House, or whether it is a Democrat—he's even nice to the Republicans. I think it helps the camaraderie and the way this body works, and I think it goes beyond what people would rightfully expect. Barry conducted his job with that level of respect and dignity and efficiency in guiding us in our jobs and in our responsibilities.

On a personal level, I am proud to call Barry a friend. I have also come to know his wife, Barbara—Saint Barbara, we call her—and his sons Barry, Brendan, and Brian.

We do regret that he has decided to move on to other endeavors.

I just want to say that the job that you have done here, Barry, and the dignity and professionalism that you have lent to this Congress and to your country is something that we are enormously proud of. I cannot think of a better compliment and recognition of a job well done. You have been a blessing to this Congress—both sides of the aisle—and to your country.

Barry, we all wish you well in your future endeavors. We wish the best for Barbara, your sons, and your family. I thank you for all the kindness you have shown towards me and towards all the other Members and their families during our times in this Congress.

God bless you and thank you. Godspeed.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. MICHAEL, thank you for putting this together tonight.

I come tonight not only to talk about Barry, but to talk about all the staff. Please understand what I am saying tonight. If you feel that there is an injection in my words of politics, so be it.

First of all, I never understood what Barry said at any time, so it is not a question of having a translation.

Thank you for your service to your country and thank you for your service to this Congress—every Congressperson. The entire membership has been so fortunate to have you here.

You know what I mean when I say Barry, Location, location, location. You were right: you fit, and you did what you said you were going to do.

I do not speak to you in terms of your title, because titles come and go. I speak to your character. You are a person of character. Your word is always your bond.

We joked and we kibitzed back and forth. We joked about sports. We joked about life. You are an example for all of us, as you move forward. And you may be on—as some might say—the down side of the mountain, but you are really not.

I say this to all the staff members.

I have been here for close to 17 years, and Barry, you are leaving at a time of most interest to me, since I always made it a habit, whether I was a teacher or whether I was in the mayor's office, whatever, to talk to everybody—the secretary, the administrator, the young lady on the elevator, the maintenance man, the guy who took care of the boiler. When I was the mayor, in the middle of the winter, the temperature in the council chambers was 80 degrees. I would tell him to go down and stoke the fire and make it so hot so we could get the meeting over with.

You have got to know who to talk to. You don't talk to the mayor, you don't talk to the superintendent of the schools, you don't talk to the Speaker. You talk to the Barry's of this world that make the place run. If you don't learn that, then you are in for a sad awakening when you get here.

Public servants have been maligned in this very institution. Public servants have not been appreciated. I want to speak—and I have done it many times on this floor, Barry—for public servants. They can speak for themselves. I guess I am a public servant, too.

But the disrespect shown, with a pat on the back and then a spit in your eye, doesn't belong here, because if we are really grateful for what you do, Mr. Barry, Mr. Police Officer, Mr. Firefighter, Mr. Teacher, Mr. Congressman, if we really appreciate it, we are straight with you. We respect you. We want to make sure you get fair compensation for your pay so you don't have to feel like you have your hat out.

You have raised this institution. You have made it a better place—all of you.

So, Mr. Speaker, to go back to those who aren't here right now, I will tell them that when we lose the appreciation for the staff people who serve every day, serve our country every day, we are the worse for it, not the better.

Barry, I have never heard an evil word spoken about you because there was nothing to say of negativity. Thank you for who you are. I hope I see you again. You have made an impression on all of us.

God bless you, and God bless your beautiful family. God bless America.

Mr. CAPUANO. Thank you, Mr. PASCRELL.

Barry, I wanted to save this until last because, honestly, stuff about life is just stuff. It is all interesting.

You have had an interesting life. Great. For me, I wanted to do this because I consider you a friend, and I don't make friends that easily. I make a lot of acquaintances. I don't consider a lot of people close friends.

□ 1845

To me, friendship is based on whether I think somebody will go through the fire for me like I would go through the fire for them. My judgment on you is that you would. It has a lot to do with the way you were raised. I don't know much about it, but I do. When you were raised in South Boston, I was being raised in Somerville. There was only one place in the world tougher than South Boston at that time, and that was Somerville.

I will tell you that an awful lot of people come out of those situations bitter, with a lot of difficulties, not knowing what to do and angry at the world. A lot of good people come out of it, though, just the opposite—understanding, okay, life can be tough; life isn't fair; make the best of it you can. It is better to go through life with a smile and take yourself a little less seriously than it is to be bitter. You have done that. You have done it with grace. To me, that means an awful lot.

I will tell you that it was always comforting for me to hear the voice on the machine. I think it is a joke. I think it is hilarious. I have actually enjoyed having to catch you up on your proper pronunciation of words. I love the fact that your friends at home called you and told you that the word ''speaker'' isn't spoken the way you have got it. It has been twisted after all of these years. You have got to get it right. Get back up to Boston, and get it straight. I think that is great.

I will tell you that, for me, the relationship started before I even knew it, and that was at St. John's Prep. You are the only person I know who went there besides me. The only difference between you and me is you finished it, and I got kicked out, but in those days—and I have no idea. I never asked why you were there. I know why I was there. I was there to be plucked out of a difficult situation with the hope that things would go a different way. Now, of course, you couldn't take the Somerville out of me, and it didn't quite work out the way my parents had thought it might. The Xaverian brothers mostly were from Somerville at the time, and their beatings were nothing to me—just natural life.

But, to me, that tells me something—you had it right from the beginning. You had a good upbringing. You treat people with respect. You understand the needs of the Members here, and you treat us like human beings. To me, that is more important than anything else. For me, that friendship doesn't go away.

I hate the fact that you are retiring. I hate it. I hate it because I don't take change too well. I like certain, stable things in my life. I love STEPHEN LYNCH, but I hate the fact that Joe Moakley is not with us anymore. I know that life changes, and I know and I hope to God that you have a great retirement. I hope you enjoy yourself. I hope you learn to say your wife's name properly. My wife is also a ''Barbara,'' and there are no ''ah's'' in there. You don't need that letter. It is an extra letter. Just get rid of it.

I hope you have a great retirement. I hope you realize that you are always, always, always going to have friends here. I don't care where I am or where you are. If there is ever anything I can do to help you or your family or if there is anything I can do to ever help—I don't even have to say it because I know you know it. It is what we do. It is what we enjoy doing.

You are my friend. I don't come to this well very often, as you well know. It is a unique experience for me. I think most of what is said here is insincere and read off papers. I just wanted to take a minute to sincerely tell you that I have enjoyed our relationship. I consider you a good friend, and I wish you the best of life wherever you go, whatever you do. It has been a joy working with you, and I am proud of the fact that I can call you a friend.

Thank you for your service, Barry. Thank you for your friendship.

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

THE HEROES OF NORTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

IN PRAISE OF THE PATH PROGRAM

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Larry Woods, a constituent of mine from Winston-Salem, is accomplishing groundbreaking work in service to local North Carolinians.

Under Larry's leadership, the Housing Authority of Winston-Salem is transforming the template for North Carolina's housing programs through a program called PATH, or Projects for Assistance in the Transition from Homelessness.

Through PATH, the housing authority works with community groups in service to families and individuals who are proactively seeking to reduce and eventually end their dependence on government support.

PATH's community collaborations provide specialized job skills, education, employment preparation, and career placement services to equip families as they turn their dreams into reality. The PATH concept, championed by Larry Woods and his team, has capitalized on community resources, has eliminated duplication and gaps in service, and has reduced service costs.

Participants in the PATH program soon will also be able to benefit from access to special ''step-up'' housing at the housing authority's new, modern facilities.

In the near future, some individuals working to improve their lives through PATH will be able to move into the Oaks, a new 50-unit development located in Winston-Salem. The Oaks will feature a variety of apartments to fit residents' unique needs and provide a valuable incentive for participants as they move forward in their personal journeys toward self-sufficiency. An open house was recently held at the Oaks, where two completed units were shown to the public, and I would like to congratulate all involved on that accomplishment.

Larry and his team's forward-thinking approach to public housing has changed the lives of many North Carolinians. The PATH program is just one component of their efforts to advance their mission of direct service in a fiscally responsible way.

Communities throughout our country that are looking to overcome the challenges of homelessness can find new ideas to meet the needs of their citizens by looking to the great example of Winston-Salem's PATH program.

THE SPIRIT OF SERVICE AND VOLUNTEERISM: DEWEY'S BAKERY AND FORBUSH HIGH SCHOOL BAND BOOSTERS

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, community spirit is alive and well in North Carolina's Fifth District.

The Forbush High School Band Boosters are creatively working toward the goal of replacing decades-old band uniforms and equipment. Booster volunteers have been fund-raising for this project for years because the $30,000 price tag goes well beyond a single year's budget.

In their effort, they reached out to Dewey's Bakery in Winston-Salem, and the two have teamed to open a special Dewey's fund-raising store in Yadkinville, North Carolina, much like fund-raising stores operating for other schools in Clemmons and Boone. Mr. and Mrs. Clate and Josie Wingler of Yadkinville graciously donated a storefront, and right now Band Boosters are there, selling wonderful Dewey's products, as they will be until Christmas. The entire Yadkinville store is run by volunteers—band members, parents, grandparents, and community supporters; and more than one-third of the store's profits will go directly to the Forbush High School Band.

This level of teamwork, spirit of volunteerism, generosity, and commitment to local communities is a testament to the wonderful people living in the Fifth District.

75TH ANNIVERSARY: NATIONAL INDUSTRIES FOR THE BLIND

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, National Industries for the Blind celebrates its 75th anniversary this year, and I congratulate NIB on this achievement. The work NIB, its team members, and affiliates do every day in service to

blind and visually impaired Americans is deserving of national attention and thanks.

NIB teams with 91 associated nonprofit agencies to extend opportunities for economic and personal independence to men and women throughout America who are blind. NIB goes about this goal primarily by connecting visually impaired individuals with good jobs—jobs they can be proud of.

In my home State, Winston-Salem Industries for the Blind has worked on behalf of visually impaired North Carolinians since 1936. Last year, under the leadership of executive director David Horton and executive chairman Dan Boucher, Industries for the Blind connected 309 local residents with fulfilling job opportunities at manufacturing facilities in Winston and Asheville.

As a visually impaired person myself, I have great appreciation for NIB's commitment to help those with severe sight challenges acquire what Winston-Salem Industries for the Blind describes as the ''confidence and independence to contribute to society and fulfill personal dreams of having a job.''

To the folks at NIB and at local industries throughout the country, congratulations on 75 years of faithful service, and best wishes for many more years to come.

SAMARITAN'S PURSE AND TYPHOON HAIYAN

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the prayers of the American people remain with Filipino people as they struggle to recover in the wake of Typhoon Haiyan.

Haiyan claimed thousands of lives, displaced millions and left widespread devastation throughout the Philippine Islands. The gravity of the crisis is heartbreaking. The United States and many international aid organizations have been quick to help our friends in the Philippines.

Samaritan's Purse, an international Christian relief organization headquartered in Boone, North Carolina, is among them. Members of the Samaritan's Purse Disaster Assistance Response Team are on the ground in the Philippines right now, providing medical support and basic survival supplies, such as food and hygiene kits, temporary shelter items, and clean drinking water.

As part of the international response team, Samaritan's Purse is living out its mission to provide ''spiritual and physical aid to hurting people around the world.'' Its team members on the ground are also obeying, vividly, the Biblical directive to practice faith by visiting orphans and widows in the midst of their distress.

Knowing full well the enormity of the struggle and depth of pain before them, we commit to keep a prayerful vigil for the Samaritan's Purse team in the Philippines, United States aid workers and their international partners, and for the millions whose lives have been changed by the tragedy of Haiyan.

A NOBLE CALLING: HICKORY'S FALLEN HEROES MINISTRY

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, with the recent honoring of our Nation's venerable veterans, it is appropriate to mention a group of my constituents who have accepted an ongoing mission to help our military heroes and their families. Started 3 years ago by ex-marine Mike Beasley, the Fallen Heroes Ministry operates out of Sandy Ridge Baptist Church in Hickory, North Carolina.

The ministry has spread its influence across the State and even the Nation by honoring families who have experienced the tragic loss of a family member in combat. Through this noble undertaking, members of the Fallen Heroes Ministry have reached out to many families who have experienced the loss of a loved one in Iraq or Afghanistan and even to a family in Hickory who lost a son long ago in Vietnam. The Fallen Heroes Ministry serves as a reminder to congregations nationwide to remain engaged in service to America's heroes and their families, since the loss of American soldiers brings real heartbreak to communities back home.

□ 1900

The Fallen Heroes Ministry abides by a noble vision: striving to bring together families of our fallen with the support of home communities to foster an environment to help with their collective healing process. Their work is deserving of praise and their calling—in service to our heroes and our loved ones—shows just a bit of the spirit that sets America apart in the world.

CHARLES CHURCH, A MOST DESERVING RECIPIENT OF THE TUCKWILLER AWARD

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Boone Area Chamber of Commerce recently recognized the late Charles Church of Valle Crucis as the recipient of the 2013 Tuckwiller Award for Community Development.

What a way to honor his legacy, for Charles could not be more deserving. He was a farmer, a teacher, a visionary, and a friend of folks well beyond Watauga. Charles was instrumental in building Watauga's local organic farming community and is known for establishing a broad food network in the Boone area.

Charles understood the interdependency of the farm and city. He valued cooperation above competition and possessed the spirit of innovation that has always characterized great North Carolinians.

A successful farmer, Charles selflessly mentored both young and experienced growers. His pioneering ideas and dedicated spirit continued to guide many throughout our community. Without his vision, energy, and dedication, organic farming and the entire locally grown food network in Watauga wouldn't be what it is today.

The Tuckwiller Award remembers Charles as a kind, generous, and tireless advocate for farmers, and, above all, an honored member of our North Carolina community.

And though the community still very much misses his presence and his counsel, the example set by Charles Church—ever the optimist—continues to inspire.

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from visiting with hardworking Americans down on The National Mall, including Tom Weiss from Colorado, who are camped out and fasting in front of the Capitol on The National Mall. It is called the ''Fast for Families,'' a call for immigration reform and a pathway to citizenship.

Fasting this month are many fine Americans using their own suffering to send a clear message to us here in Washington—to their elected leaders—that the moral and economic toll of Congress' failure to pass immigration reform is simply too great. This is an economic cause, yes, a security cause, yes, but it is a moral cause to unite families, to allow people to give back to our country to make it greater.

Men and women from all corners of the country are pleading with us to pass comprehensive immigration reform. H.R. 15 here in the House reduces the deficit by close to $200 billion, creates over 100,000 jobs for Americans, secures our borders, unites families, makes sure that we have people with the skills we need to build a 21st century economy, and all that it requires is action here on the floor of the House.

There are many others in States, including Arizona, Nebraska, California, New York, and Pennsylvania, who are also fasting and depriving themselves of food to demonstrate their passion for fixing our broken immigration system.

I want to share with you the words of Jesus Ramirez, a 16-year-old high school student from Indianapolis, whose parents brought him to the United States when he was just 7 years old to escape the violence that was gripping his home country of Mexico. He says:

> My family and 11 million families out there who are undocumented are living in the shadows and living with a fear that one day they will come home and not see a loved one.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, every day until Congress acts, Jesus' worst fears come true for the 1,100 men, women, and children who are forcibly deported from the United States because our broken immigration system provides no recourse, provides no way under current law to get right with the law, no remedy, no line to get in for people for whom we say ''get in line.''

Immigration reform is about creating that line. The people who are here illegally will go to the end of the line behind people who are in process under our current immigration system.

Clara Cuesta of Philadelphia, who is also fasting, said that she has friends who deal with hostile and exploitive conditions in the workplace, but are afraid to report it or to change jobs because they are worried about being asked to produce documents that they don't have and, again, have no way to get under current law. According to Clara, she has friends that are yelled at and treated less than equal simply because there is no way for them to get right with the law.

There are women across our country, Mr. Speaker, who are victims of domestic abuse but don't seek the help they desperately need from authorities because they fear the risk of deportation from those very same authorities that should be there to protect them from harm.

Since 1994, there have been more than 6,000 reported deaths on the U.S.-Mexico border. Comprehensive immigration reform will finally secure our southern border. Let's heed the call of the fasters, of those who pray passionately for comprehensive immigration reform. As Reverend Jim Wallis, the president of Sojourner, said:

> For people of faith, this is not a political issue, but a moral one; and for Christians, how we treat 11 million undocumented people, the strangers among us, is how we treat Christ himself.

I am sad to report, Mr. Speaker, it has been 145 days since the bipartisan Senate immigration bill passed with two-thirds of the Senate. It is rare, Mr. Speaker, here in my time serving in this body, that two-thirds of the Senate can agree on anything. But to agree on something of the importance of immigration reform, more than two-thirds of the Senate, sends a message that our friends on the other side of this building have heard the call of the people of this country to restore the rule of law, have heard the call of law enforcement to get real and enforce our laws, have heard the call of employers who want a highly skilled workforce, have heard the call of families who simply want to be safe in their homes as they work hard to make our country stronger.

That is why I am proud to be part of a coalition of House Members that introduced a bill similar to the Senate bill, the bipartisan bill, H.R. 15, the Border Security Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act, which creates jobs, reduces our deficit, provides a pathway to citizenship, and unites families. Immigration reform will provide significant economic growth as immigrants will be able to contribute substantially to economic growth, increased wages, and productivity.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the Senate immigration reform bill will lead to significant economic growth. Over the next decade, comprehensive immigration reform will increase our GDP by 3.3 percent. That means raising wages for Americans by $470 billion. That means creating an average of 121,000 jobs a year for Americans. Immigration reform also means that immigrants will pay more than $100 billion in additional taxes, including to State and local government, to support the services that they have been using all along.

It is not fair to our fellow Americans for people who are here without paperwork illegally to be using our public services without contributing with their taxes, and yet they support paying taxes. It is rare to meet people in this country who want to pay taxes, but, to a person that I have met with, they are ready. They are ready. They are patriotic. They are ready to contribute to our country, if only we will let them.

The bill also expands the number of H–1B citizens from 65,000 to 110,000 and allows the cap to rise as high as 180,000, depending on the U.S. economy, to ensure that businesses don't have to compete for oversubscribed visa slots and can access the workers they need so we can grow the next great generation of companies here. When a company is hiring in the technology field or a computer programmer, they are going after the person. If they can't bring the person that they want here to fill that job, they will fill that job in India, they will fill that job in England, they will fill that job in South America. It is a global economy. As Americans, we want those jobs and that economic productivity here.

The House refusal to take up immigration reform has cost this country over $5.3 billion in potential revenue so far. The cost continues to go up every day that we fail to act.

One of the issues in the contentious budget discussions about restoring fiscal solvency to our country is how we can repair our entitlement programs, make them secure for the next generation of retirees. Take the solvency of the Social Security trust fund, for example. The Social Security trust fund is already paying out more in retirement benefits than it receives in taxes. From an actuarial perspective, that is scheduled to get worse as baby boomers age.

But as the Social Security Administration estimates, close to two-thirds of the 8 million people who are here illegally currently work in an underground labor economy where neither their employers nor they are declaring their earnings or paying payroll taxes. Imagine that, 8 million more people paying into Social Security to make sure that it is there for Americans who have worked hard all their lives. We owe that to so many Americans who have paid in that it is there for them, and comprehensive immigration reform will ensure that that happens.

Today, only about 37 percent, it has been estimated, of people who are here legally pay into Social Security with payroll taxes. Experts are estimating that our Nation loses about $20 billion a year in payroll taxes. I want that number to be 100 percent. I want people who are working here in this country to pay their fair share to ensure that Americans who have worked hard and paid into Social Security their whole lives are able to retire with the benefits that were promised to them and that they planned their lives around.

While people who are here illegally are already helping to support Social Security to the tune of $12 billion a year, we are foregoing $20 billion a year, which is what it has been estimated they would pay in if only we let them. If we can provide a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million people who are here illegally, they will contribute hundreds of billions of dollars more to our Social Security system—$606 billion over the next 36 years. That funds a lifetime of retirement benefits for almost two and a half million Americans just from those.

We are not talking about letting new people into the country. We are not talking about changing the way that people get here. We are talking about people who are already here and working. We are just saying, Pay your taxes. Pay your taxes like other Americans do.

Let's talk about health care costs. While people here illegally pay into some of the health care programs to the tune of $115 billion for Medicare—again, we are foregoing the revenue—health care costs will continue to rise for American families because of the cost of the uninsured.

As the Center for Immigration Studies estimates, the current cost of treating uninsured immigrants who enter this country without documentation is $4.3 billion a year, mostly at emergency rooms and free clinics. So again, costs are being shifted to American citizens to pay for the health care of those who are here illegally.

The answer is simple. Make them pay for it themselves. H.R. 15 does that. Let's bring it to the floor. How much longer must we continue to subsidize the health care for people who haven't even followed our laws in working in our country?

If we can pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill that brings our underground economy out of the shadows, many of these immigrants, some of whom have been here for decades, who are currently receiving benefits without paying for them, will be required to pay for their benefits. They will be required to purchase health care or get insured through their employer.

□ 1915

In doing so, our labor market will be healthier, more productive, and generate economic growth. The people who are here illegally will no longer be able to undermine wages for American workers because they are willing to work under the table and take public

benefits from others rather than paying for it themselves, and that is why it is time to pass H.R. 15.

There are only 10 legislative days left in 2013 for the House of Representatives to pass immigration reform. Thousands of men and women across the country who are fasting should send a strong message to this body. We need to ask immediately to pass comprehensive immigration reform that provides a pathway to citizenship and helps rebuild our economy.

The average work week is an example of many of the hardworking immigrants in our country. On the farm worker side, it is 53 hours a week. The average wage of a noncitizen worker is $318 a week. Until we can find a way to bring the underground economy out from the shadows, illegal immigration will continue to exert a downward pressure on wages for American workers, reward businesses that skirt the law, that hire people illegally, and provide a drag on our overall economy and job creation.

There is no other bill that I know of that will create over 100,000 jobs for Americans, reduce our deficit by close to $200 billion, improve our national security, decrease the terrorist risk to our homeland, and unite hardworking families. Immigration reform will do that.

The economic case is compelling. We have gone through some of the numbers here tonight. The security case is compelling in terms of making sure that people in our country cooperate with law enforcement investigations, that we know who is here, and they are accountable for following our laws.

The moral case for immigration reform is what is driving this to national prominence. Moral issues always trump our day-to-day concerns. When something is right or wrong, Americans know that. They know that in their minds. They feel it in their heart, and Americans are good people, Mr. Speaker, and they want a country, they want to live in a country and be part of a country that reflects their values as Americans. Americans know that the way we handle immigration today does not do that.

It is not moral to take a hardworking mother who plays a critical role supporting her family away from her American children and put her in indefinite detention. It is not right to allow thousands of people to die at our border rather than secure it, and not let people who shouldn't be here through. It is not right to force millions of people to live amongst us in a secret and underground manner, risking exploitation, risking being found out at any turn.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, the faith-based community—from the evangelical coalition for immigration reform to the Catholic bishops to the Jews and Muslims to nonbelievers—has joined together not just to support immigration reform but to be the strong, moral voice for comprehensive immigration reform. It is simply the right thing to do by our people, for our values.

We are a Nation of laws, and we are a Nation of immigrants. We need those two to be consistent. We need to reflect our American values as a Nation of immigrants, in our laws that welcome those who want to work hard and play by the rules to our shores. Yet today we have people who have worked hard every day for years, for decades, who have American kids who have gone through our schools and are as American as you or I, while their parents or their uncles or aunts are still forced to live underground and in secrecy. Despite being American in fact, they are not yet American in word.

Again, there is no pathway, there is no line for people to get right with the law. Many people face what is called a lifetime bar, meaning that if they even try to come forward, they would have to live in some other country they might not have even been to for decades, and don't have a job and don't have any family there, and very likely never be able to return to where their kids are. When you ask that of people, they are not going to self-deport. That is not a good deal. What parent is going to want to leave their kids for the rest of their life and go to a country that they haven't been in for decades and don't have a job and might not even have family or friends there. It doesn't meet the real life needs of people in our country.

What does is making sure that we hold people accountable for following our laws. Let's create provisional status so that eventually they can earn a green card. It is also important to know that H.R. 15 and the Senate bill don't grant citizenship to anybody. There is nobody who is granted citizenship under any of these immigration reform bills we are talking about. It is about creating the line, creating the pathway, creating the way that people can get behind in line those who are already in line, a minimum of 13 years before they are even eligible to take the test or become a citizen.

I have had the opportunity in Estes Park and in Centennial, Colorado, to be at the new citizenship ceremonies where we administer the oath of citizenship to new Americans from across the world. It gives me great pride as an American, as a great grandchild of immigrants, as a Member of Congress, to be able to participate in welcoming people from Holland, Kenya, Israel, Brazil, from Mexico, to name just a few of the many countries represented at the two ceremonies I got to be a part of. There are many more that would like to work hard beside their American brothers and sisters to make our country stronger.

Through acting on immigration reform, we can create jobs, reduce our deficit, improve our security, and most importantly, reflect what we know to be right and our values as Americans.

I have been speaking every week on the floor of the House since the passage of the Senate immigration reform bill and since we introduced the House immigration reform bill about the need to pass immigration reform in the House. I believe we have the votes, Mr. Speaker. I believe H.R. 15, which has strong bipartisan sponsorship, if it was placed on the floor of the House, I am confident it would pass. I am confident that the Senate would accept the improvements that the House has made to the border security provisions. We have moved to an outcome-based model to hold border security accountable, and I am confident that President Obama would sign that bill.

There are 2 more weeks here, Mr. Speaker, 8 more legislative days. I think America would like to see Congress work a little harder here. We have 40-some days left in the year. Most Americans have to work more than 8 days out of 40. I think Americans would like to see us work 10 days, 12 days. I mean, God forbid, 25 or 30 days out of 40. That is what most Americans do. If we do that, I know we can pass immigration reform, whether it takes a day, a week, a month. We owe it to our country to try.

I have been disappointed to see the types of bills that we have been spending days debating here on the floor of the House these last few weeks. While these are, of course, issues that people care about—last week we talked about asbestos torts; this week we talk about BLM fracking regulations, certainly an issue that affects Colorado near and dear to my district—I can tell you that the number of people from my district who have written in or called in on immigration reform has been, I think, 100 times. We were talking about asbestos reform last week. I didn't have a single constituent who had called in saying what I really want Congress to tackle is asbestos reform. I haven't had one in the years I have been here saying this is an issue they want us to deal with.

Fracking, frankly, my constituents have asked me to take action on, but it is not the action that the House considered with the BLM. It is more like the bill that I sponsored, the Breathe Act which we offered as an amendment, and was not allowed in the Rules Committee. Even that, even though my district is home to fracking issues and BLM lands, the numbers of letters and calls we have gotten to act on that issue is dwarfed by the overwhelming demand for immigration reform. There has never been an issue like it in the public's desire and passion for Congress to act. It is an issue that our municipal governments can't fix, our State governments can't fix. Only our Federal Government can secure our borders. Only our Federal Government can require workplace enforcement. Only our Federal Government can determine who is here legally and who is here illegally. These are not things that cities or States can do.

With a void of Federal leadership, States are around the edges trying to do what they can. They are talking

about in-State tuition. They are working with deferred action kids. The President has moved forward with deferred action programs that provide a 2-year respite for young de facto Americans who know no other country, but only Congress, only the lawmakers, can address this issue and actually replace our broken, immoral, nonsensical immigration system with one that works and is enforced to restore the rule of law to our Nation.

This problem won't go away until Congress acts. It won't resolve itself. We can wait. We can wait, and in 5 years, maybe there will be 14 million people here illegally instead of 10. Maybe there will be a whole new generation of people who are here working illegally because we refuse to enforce the laws, refuse to require that employers verify that people who work at their companies are here legally. We don't do that in this country. We have a program, it is an optional program. So guess what? Most employers don't do E-Verify. You are an employer, why would you do it if it is optional? I think under 10 percent of companies use E-Verify, so it is not a burden on small business, but we need to make employment verification required, which H.R. 15 does. I mean, if we are ever going to get serious about ending the demand side of illegal immigration, which is people coming here for jobs—if they can't get the jobs, they are not going to be here. We need to be serious about that. H.R. 15 does that.

We need to be serious about securing our border. Now, another important thing for Americans to know is securing our border is very important, but it is only about half of the issue. About half of the people who are here illegally came legally and stayed and worked illegally. So locking down that border, you are never going to get 100 percent, but 99 percent, whatever you get down there, that can reduce illegal immigration by about half. But the other half came here legally, meaning they were on a student visa and they stayed illegally and worked illegally, or they flew on a tourist visa and they stayed and worked illegally. There are a number of different ways where it is perfectly legal to arrive here, but then they stay illegally.

So we have to deal with both sides of that, which is why border security is great, but it is not enough. In the best cases, it reduces the number of people who enter our country illegally by about half. It doesn't do a darn thing about the fact that there are 11 million people already here illegally, it doesn't do a darn thing about people who will keep entering illegally because they actually enter legally and stay illegally.

There are a lot of moving parts to this immigration boondoggle that the country will continue to find itself in until Congress has the courage, the integrity, and the desire to act.

□ 1930

If there are other ideas, we are happy to hear them. We put H.R. 15 on the table. There have been many ideas from the Senate bill. I know there are a number of bills that have passed out of the Judiciary Committee. There might be a way to bundle some of those together in what has been called ''piecemeal reform,'' if we can create a holistic system that works.

If there is a piecemeal approach, Mr. Speaker, we need to start having a meal of the pieces and seeing what the pieces are. I was in the software and Internet industry before I was elected to office, and we used to have a word for products that were much hyped and never delivered upon. We called it ''vaporware.'' I fear that this piecemeal approach could become vaporware if we don't start seeing some action soon.

God forbid we work more than 8 days out of 40. If we don't see action by the end of the year, I know we are here in January for 3 weeks. What an excellent time to take up immigration reform, something that I feel can unite this body, the good and proud men and women who make up this body, who care deeply about restoring the rule of law, who care deeply about ensuring that our Nation has a prosperous future, reducing our deficit and creating jobs for Americans on both sides of the aisle, which is why more than two-thirds of the Senate joined in a rare bipartisan vote of support for immigration reform and has challenged this House to take similar action.

We can do it, Mr. Speaker. We need to schedule the floor time to do that. We need to get the ideas that Members from both sides of the aisle have on the table. We think H.R. 15 is an excellent bipartisan vehicle. If the leaders of this body have other solutions, we are happy to talk about them. But the most important thing that the American people already know about immigration, and I hope the leadership of this body recognizes, is that it is not an issue that solves itself, and it is not an issue that goes away. It is an issue that only becomes more salient year after year that Congress fails to act.

I call upon this body to bring forward H.R. 15 and to pass commonsense immigration reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1848. An act to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3204. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 252. To reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant morality caused prematurity, and for other purposes.

S. 1545. An act to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 21, 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:

3768. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Energy Conservation Program: Request for Exclusion of 100 Watt R20 Short Incandescent Reflector Lamp From Energy Conservation Standards [Docket Number: EERE-2010-BT-PET-0047] (RIN: 1904-AC57) received November 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3769. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—2014 Edition Electronic Health Record Certification Criteria: Revision to the Definition of ''Common Meaningful Use (MU) Data Set'' (RIN: 0991-AB91) received November 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3770. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Rules under the Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008; Technical Amendment to External Review for Multi-State Plan Program (RIN: 0938-AP65) received November 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3771. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Three Synthetic Phenethylamines Into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-382] received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3772. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Port Lions, Alaska; De Beque, Colorado; and Benjamin, Cisco, Rule, and Shamrock, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 13-156] received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3773. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting

the Commission's final rule—Promoting Interoperability in the 700 MHz Commercial Spectrum. Requests for Waiver and Extension of Lower 700 MHz Band Interim Construction Benchmark Deadlines [WT Docket No.: 12-69] [WT Docket No.: 12-332] received November 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3774. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Accessibility of User Information, and Apparatus Requirements for Emergency Information and Video Description: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 [MB Docket No.: 12-108] [MB Docket No.: 12-107] received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3775. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Transmission Planning Reliability Standards [Docket Nos.: RM12-1-000 and RM13-9-000; Order No. 786] received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3776. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Freedom of Information Act (FOIA); Miscellaneous Rules; Redelegation of Authority to Determine Appeals Under the FOIA received November 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3777. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Revisions to Design of Structures, Components, Equipment, and Systems [NRC-2013-0041] received November 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3778. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility; Maryland: Howard County, Unincorporated Areas; [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8303] received November 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3779. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Plattsburgh, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0276; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-5] received November 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3780. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0617; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-354-AD; Amendment 39-17533; AD 2013-15-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3781. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0615; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-352-AD; Amendment 39-17529; AD 2013-15-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3782. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Corrections Relating to the Procedures for the Production or Disclosure of Information in State or Local Criminal Proceedings [CBP Dec. 13-18] received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MOORE, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3543. A bill to permanently extend the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009 and establish a private right of action to enforce compliance with such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 3544. A bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 3545. A bill to protect the academic futures of collegiate student athletes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3546. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 3547. A bill to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3548. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 3549. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 3550. A bill to stabilize the housing and banking sectors by eliminating policies that distort markets and facilitate risky lending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3551. A bill to require the periodic inspection of certain railroad facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3552. A bill to improve emergency response activities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3553. A bill to allow a credit against income tax for employers who pay their Federal contractor employees compensation lost by reason of the Federal Government shutdown; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3554. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to designate certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs as health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BARBER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3555. A bill to amend the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012, including making changes to the Do Not Pay initiative, for improved detection, prevention, and recovery of improper payments to deceased individuals,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 3556. A bill to establish a program to assist in the importation and care of abused, injured, or abandoned nonhuman primates; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3557. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide increased protections for consumer or subscriber password information, and to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may not access password information pursuant to an order under section 501 of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. GRAVES of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JONES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Ms. FOXX):

H.R. 3558. A bill to provide the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department of the Treasury with authority to more aggressively enforce customs and trade laws relating to textile and apparel articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

H.R. 3559. A bill to establish a program to accelerate entrepreneurship and innovation by partnering world-class entrepreneurs with Federal agencies; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 3560. A bill to mandate the basic educational, regulatory, and management actions necessary for the prevention of racial profiling practices by law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3561. A bill to prohibit Department of State approval for the Russian space agency to build or operate a ground monitoring station in the United States unless such station does not raise counterintelligence or other national security concerns; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3562. A bill to clarify the application of all laws, including the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to the Federal Government and Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and House Administration, 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. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 3563. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a corporate responsibility investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 3564. A bill to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 3565. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to establish a biennial commission to develop a comprehensive energy policy for the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 3566. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for a grant program regarding firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 3567. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for additional coverage options for beneficiaries under the original Medicare fee-for-service program through a Medicare Link program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3568. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish the STEM Education and Training Account in order to enhance the economic competitiveness of the United States by providing funding for STEM education and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. WALZ (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 3569. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to add a definition of spouse for purposes of veteran benefits that recognizes new State definitions of spouse; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 424. A resolution prohibiting the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment unless the House has adopted a conference report on the budget resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 425. A resolution expressing disapproval of the failure to satisfy the constitutional duty to ''take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed'' and the usurpation of the legislative authority of Congress by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 3547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

and

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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 3549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, I, Section 8, Clause 18, (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.)

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 3550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Federal credit programs such as loans, loan guarantees, and insurance are purported to be authorized under the Constitution as ''necessary and proper'' (U.S. Const. art. I, §8, cl. 18) extensions of Congress's powers ''To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to . . . provide for the. . . general Welfare of the United States'' (U.S. Const. art. I, §8, cl. 1) or ''to regulate Commerce . . . among the several States'' (U.S. Const. art. I,§8, cl. 3).

Some provisions in this bill repeal existing sections of statute. Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

The bankruptcy reforms requested from committees of jurisdiction are authorized by Congress's power ''To establish . . . uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States'' (U.S. Const. art. I, §8, cl. 4).

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 3555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 3556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;''

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment IV: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 3558.

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 exercise authority to regulate trade with foreign nations pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.''

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 3560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Clause: Article I, sec. 8, cl. 1.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 3, and 18:

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;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 3563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 3564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 3567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §1; and

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 1.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 3569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 50: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 207: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 241: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 503: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 610: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 647: Mr. DAINES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 664: Mr. HOLT and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 685: Mr. CAMP, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 721: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MESSER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 915: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GARCIA, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 919: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 924: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 938: Mr. YOHO and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 946: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1010: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1024: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1098: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1146: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1179: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 1209: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1310: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1318: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1339: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1354: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1474: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1507: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. VELA, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1509: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1528: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1563: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1701: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1732: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1750: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1763: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1795: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1814: Mr. MICA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1869: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1905: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1918: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2012: Mr. MORAN and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2016: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2066: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2085: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2146: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2199: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2237: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2285: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2288: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 2362: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2376: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2377: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 2430: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2510: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2560: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2575: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 2591: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2638: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2672: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2691: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2697: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2738: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2866: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 2906: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2918: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 2928: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2935: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2939: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PITTENGER, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2959: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2998: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3031: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 3040: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3047: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3094: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3135: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3177: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 3279: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3303: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3305: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3323: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 3327: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3335: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 3360: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3361: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3367: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3370: Mr. WOLF, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3374: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3387: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 3408: Mr. ENYART, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3410: Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 3413: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 3416: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3419: Mr. JONES and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3429: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3450: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 3453: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3465: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3474: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3479: Mr. HULTGREN and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 3485: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 3488: Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 3508: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3521: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 3530: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3535: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3538: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3541: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.J. Res. 43: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BASS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. WATT.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. SCHRADER.
H. Res. 109: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H. Res. 147: Mr. ROYCE.
H. Res. 254: Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 281: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H. Res. 284: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H. Res. 396: Mr. JOYCE.
H. Res. 417: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H. Res. 418: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. CROWLEY.