United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2014 No. 38

# House of Representatives

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

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We come to the end of a short week. For many, the winter has outlived its welcome and the longing for spring and its warmth is palpable. May the longing for comity and good will in the fashioning of policies benefiting our Nation be equally manifest in the actions marking these days.

Now we approach a weekend during which many Members of this assembly will gather to remember a historic event in Selma, Alabama. Forty-nine years ago, brave men and women, Americans of all races, colors, and faiths, walked together to help guarantee freedom still denied the descendants of those who were slaves.

Bless the Members of this assembly and us all, that we would be worthy of the call we have been given as Americans, to nurture and guarantee democratic freedoms to all who dwell in our great Nation. Help us all to be truly thankful and appropriately generous in our response.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

## AMERICAN-ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE POLICY CONFERENCE

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, this week in Washington we welcome representatives from across the country attending the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee Policy Conference, the largest gathering in our Nation of friends of the Jewish State. Representatives come to the Nation's Capital to highlight the importance of the partnership between the United States and Israel and work together toward common interests and goals.

I have the honor of serving as cochair of the House Republican Israel Caucus, where protecting, strengthening, and promoting the U.S.-Israel relationship is the top priority.

Just this week, under the leadership of Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the House passed legislation designating Israel as a major strategic partner of the United States. I commend Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN on her leadership in expanding U.S.-Israel cooperation in defense, energy, and science.

As the Iranian regime continues to advance its nuclear ambitions and current events continually demonstrate that we live in a dangerous world, it is important that Congress reaffirm our support for and commitment to our close friend and ally, Israel.

## OLNEYVILLE NEW YORK SYSTEM

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I stand to congratulate Olneyville New York System, an iconic Rhode Island restaurant which last week received the James Beard Foundation's America's Classics award—a prestigious national award.

The America's Classics award honors ''restaurants that have timeless appeal and are beloved for quality food that reflects the character of their community.''

Despite its name, this restaurant is a uniquely Rhode Island culinary treasure and is beloved by Rhode Islanders and visitors alike.

This national recognition confirms what Rhode Islanders already knew: we have some of the best food and restaurants in the country, and Olneyville New York System is a classic.

Every Rhode Islander knows the distinctive smells and sights of this local business. As mayor of Providence, I was proud Olneyville New York System played a leading role in my Main Street initiative to improve Providence's commercial districts.

Indeed, for nearly 70 years, three generations of the Stevens family have run this local establishment at the same location in Providence. Although the neighborhood has changed over time,



Printed on recycled paper.

only the Olneyville New York System has remained an iconic part of this community.

So I am saying congratulations to Greg Stevens and his sister, Stephanie Stevens Turini, on the well-deserved honor. I know that their dad is looking down on them very proudly today. Congratulations.

## IMMIGRATION COVERAGE BIASED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the issue of immigration continues to simmer, but it is not because of any substantive news in Congress. It is driven by the media and the coverage is slanted.

In the last 3 months, the three Capitol Hill publications have run over 30 stories about immigration. By a 10 to 1 ratio, they promoted amnesty for illegal immigrants over the need for border security.

Articles in The Washington Post and The Wall Street Journal reflect the same media agenda. These publications also published over 30 pro-amnesty articles, but not a single pro-enforcement article.

The national media should give the American people the facts, not tell them what to think. We need more objective news stories and fewer opinion pieces masquerading as news reports.

## TEAM 26'S RIDE ON WASHINGTON

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Team 26 for continuing the call for commonsense gun violence prevention.

This Saturday, Team 26 begins their second Ride on Washington. This courageous group of men and women will be biking 400 miles from Newtown, Connecticut, in my district, to Washington, D.C.

Team 26 is made up of parents whose children attend or attended Sandy Hook Elementary School and folks who have lost loved ones to gun violence. They ride to honor the victims of gun violence from Newtown and from across the country, and they ride to urge Congress to act.

Team 26 rides to bring the message of peace, hope, and love. Let's listen to Team 26 and put politics aside.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote to enact meaningful gun violence prevention legislation this year.

## NATIONAL FROZEN FOOD MONTH

(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 acknowledge National Frozen Food Month, and in doing so, one of my home State's own frozen food companies, Better Baked Foods.

Headquartered in North East, Pennsylvania, in the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, with facilities in Erie, Pennsylvania, and New York, Better Baked Foods is currently celebrating its 50th anniversary.

Over the years, Better Baked has built a reputation as an affordable option for nutritious snack foods. Today, the company proudly employs over 300 associates who produce over 325,000 pieces of frozen French bread pizzas, flatbreads, and breakfast sandwiches.

By devoting the necessary resources to its people, equipment, and facilities, Better Baked is continually working to ensure that it meets consumer demand and grows its operation.

I am proud to honor a company that is constantly innovating to improve its products while also recognizing the hard work and the efforts of its employees.

Mr. Speaker, in celebration of National Frozen Food Month, I wish to applaud Better Baked Foods and the entire frozen food industry for their hard work and continued contributions to strong local economies, through jobs and quality, affordable meals for our Nation's consumers.

## BOYS 2 MEN

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Obama's new initiative, My Brother's Keeper, and to highlight one organization in our district doing outstanding work to mentor young men.

Boys 2 Men was created in November 2002 by Clayton Muhammad, with the mission of bringing young Black and Latino men together to build a bond of brotherhood and to redefine manhood. The organization has been a phenomenal success.

The members of Boys 2 Men are graduating from high school, going to college, and serving our country in the military.

Boys 2 Men has produced outstanding young men like Gilberto Chaidez, a graduate of West Aurora High School and a senior at the University of Illinois majoring in civil engineering. Gilberto was named the National Star Student of the Year by the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers.

Jamario Taylor is a graduate of East Aurora High School and a senior at Western Illinois University. Jamario is a record-holder in the high jump and a top-ranked NCAA athlete.

Alexander Sewell is a graduate of Roosevelt University in Chicago. Alex went on to work in the office of Leader PELOSI; for the Secretary of Energy, Steven Chu; and now in the office of Senator LANDRIEU.

Initiatives like Boys 2 Men and My Brother's Keeper are invaluable resources to help young men get their lives on the right track, even if, despite everyone's best efforts, some of them end up working for the United States Congress.

## LET'S RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, once again, to call for this body to bring H.R. 1010 to the floor and raise the Federal minimum wage.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will falsely claim that this will kill jobs. They misrepresent the findings of a recent CBO report. The important takeaway from that CBO report is that raising the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour will raise the wages of more than 16 million Americans and bring nearly 1 million Americans out of poverty.

In the 1990s, when the Clinton administration raised the minimum wage, the Republicans also argued that doing so would kill jobs, but the exact opposite happened. What we saw following the minimum wage increase in the 1990s was the greatest number of jobs created in a 4-year period.

A rising tide lifts all boats, Mr. Speaker. Let's raise the minimum wage. Let's grow our economy, and let's put people back to work.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2824, PREVENTING GOVERNMENT WASTE AND PROTECTING COAL MINING JOBS IN AMERICA; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2641, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 501 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 501

*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. 2824) to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to stop the ongoing waste by the Department of the Interior of taxpayer resources and implement the final rule on excess spoil, mining waste, and buffers for perennial and intermittent streams, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on

Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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 113–41 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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 part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. 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. 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. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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 113–39. 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 part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 6, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure addressing loan guarantees to Ukraine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 0915

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. WEBSTER of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bills.

House Resolution 501 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2641, the Responsibility of Professionally Invigorating Development Act, known as the RAPID Act. The resolution also provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2824, Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America.

Lastly, the resolution provides suspension authority for legislation to provide much-needed financial relief to the government of Ukraine.

The resolution makes in order all of the amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules regarding the RAPID Act. It makes in order half of the amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules regarding the coal jobs bill.

Of the amendments made in order, more than half are sponsored by my colleagues across the aisle. The resolution provides for a robust debate in the House of Representatives.

In July, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law held a hearing on H.R. 2641. The subcommittee reported the bill favorably, without amendment, by voice vote. On July 31, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 2641 favorably reported without amendment.

In August, the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held hearings on H.R. 2824. In November, the Committee on Natural Resources, by a bipartisan vote, voted favorably for the bill and reported it out.

Mr. Speaker, the bills before us today garnered majority support and bipartisan support for one simple reason: they ensure the regulatory process works for Americans, as intended by Congress.

Across the Nation, energy and infrastructure projects are being significantly delayed. In some cases, the environmental reviews have continued on for a decade or more. According to a study by the Chamber of Commerce, current delays are costing more than $1 trillion in economic development; and those delays are also prohibiting the creation of 1.9 million jobs.

As our country continues to struggle through a lackluster recovery, ensuring these beleaguered studies are completed would help generate jobs and create economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, in 2011, President Obama's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness recommended action to simplify regulatory review and streamline project approvals to accelerate jobs and growth.

Just this year, in his State of the Union, President Obama called for permit streamlining. He said action must be taken to ''slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process for key projects so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.''

News reports like to highlight our disagreements. In fact, it often seems that there is nothing that we can agree on. That is not true. Earlier this term, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. That bill passed by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 417–3.

The RAPID Act is nearly identical legislation to streamlining provisions contained in H.R. 3080 and the streamlining proposals from the President.

The House-passed WRRDA provided a process for Army Corps of Engineers-led studies to be concurrently reviewed in more of a parallel, as opposed to a linear fashion by multiple agencies. The President initiated a similar proposal, where studies had to be completed within 3 years.

The President and each Member of Congress who supported WRRDA should support this bill. The RAPID Act is simple. It allows multiple agencies to study the environmental impacts of a project at the same time. Because the agencies will have a better process by which to study a project, the RAPID Act establishes a reasonable and efficient timeline for completion of the study.

That is it. The RAPID Act provides a better process and a better timeline. The RAPID Act does not alter or weaken any of our environmental laws. The RAPID Act does not require that environmentally sensitive areas be developed.

The RAPID Act does not force agencies to approve projects. It simply reforms our permitting and regulatory

process to allow our Nation's most important infrastructure projects to move forward in a timely manner.

The President has asked for this to happen. 417 House Democrats and Republicans have supported this already. The bill should pass the House overwhelmingly with bipartisan support. This bill will get Washington out of the way of our economic growth and put unemployed Americans on a pathway back to work.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2824, Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America. H.R. 2824 stabilizes the out-of-control regulatory scheme involving the Department of the Interior.

In 2008, after a 5-year exhaustive process, the Office of Surface Mining finalized a rule to protect our streams from excessive coal waste. The rule was supposed to go into effect on January 12, 2009.

However, the process was sidelined by a sue-and-settle gambit that the OSM, under President Obama's administration, used to attempt to rewrite the already finalized rule.

Since that settlement, the administration has spent 5 additional years and billed hardworking American taxpayers an additional $10 million attempting to rewrite the rule.

H.R. 2824 is simple. It tells OSM to put in place the 2008 rule, study the results, and report to Congress. If the study reveals a need to draft a new rule, then a new rule should be drafted. By putting in place the already finalized 2008 rule, H.R. 2824 ensures that our streams are safe while further study is conducted.

It is easy to see why these underlying bills should garner strong bipartisan support. They are measured and balanced in their approach to our project study and regulatory processes. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Florida, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Just last week, I found myself standing here, managing a rule for two very similar bills. At the time, I thought we were on a merry-go-round, aimlessly moving in useless circles. I will stand by that analogy again today.

When similar bills came before Congress last session, the Senate didn't pass them. The President said he would not sign them, as he has this particular legislation. It seems to me that these measures are a foregone conclusion.

Ultimately, the same tired talking points might be a fun ride for some, but they will never actually take you anywhere. This kind of spinning in circles is a favorite tactic, it seems, of my friends on the other side of the aisle.

For example, this Congress has already taken 109 antienvironmental votes. Last Congress, it was 247. These were votes against clear air, against clean water, and to destroy our planet for future generations.

Under Republican leadership, we have also voted to repeal, as we did a day or so ago, the Affordable Care Act 50 different times, a law that, in many respects, has led to millions of Americans signing up for health insurance that didn't have it before.

And I will continue to ask my colleagues: If you don't like that particular measure, where is yours that would replace it? And apparently, nothing is forthcoming, at least until this time.

Based on the frequency of these quixotic votes, it is obvious that my friends across the aisle have given up or are not interested in governing or addressing any of the issues that are most pressing to this Nation.

Consider, for instance, that there are 2 million Americans relying on Congress to extend unemployment insurance, with close to 200,000 of them being unemployed veterans who have sacrificed time and again for our country.

Last week, I said the following:

> We should be spending the House's time on extending unemployment insurance, working on comprehensive immigration reform, and raising the minimum wage.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have continued to ignore the plight of middle class and working poor Americans, immigrants hoping for a better life for their families, and denying the undeniable impact of climate change, just to name a few.

We should be raising the minimum wage in order to give millions of hardworking Americans the pay they have earned. Nearly 5 years have passed since the last increase in the Federal minimum wage. Currently, a full-time minimum wage worker makes less than $16,000 per year, which is below the poverty line for a family of two or more.

My friends did not take my suggestions last week, and I doubt they will take them this week. Instead, we are considering two more pointless bills that will go nowhere. One of them, the acronym for it is RAPID. That is correct. Rapidly and fastly, it will go nowhere.

The first of today's bills, H.R. 2641, ignores the fact that, for more than 40 years, the National Environmental Policy Act has provided an effective framework for all types of proposed actions that require Federal approval pursuant to a Federal law, such as the Clean Water Act.

□ 0930

H.R. 2641 is based on the assumption that the NEPA environmental review and permitting process results in project delays.

However, when we considered this measure last Congress, the Congressional Research Service reported that delays in construction project approvals ''are more often tied to local, State, and project-specific factors.'' These factors include ''primarily local/State agency priorities, project funding levels, local opposition to a project, project complexity, or late changes in project scope,'' not to mention the litigation that goes on surrounding these measures.

CRS goes even further, reporting that even most environmental project delays are not the result of NEPA, but actually due to ''laws other than NEPA.'' The measure undermines current regulatory protections and could jeopardize public health and safety by prioritizing speed over meaningful analysis.

Now, turning to H.R. 2824, the other measure included in today's rule, which, like the 50 times that we voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, my Republican friends have done that, they have also offered 50 rules which are not open rules in spite of the fact that we began this session by the Speaker of the House saying that this would be the most open House that we have had.

H.R. 2824 included in this rule is no more productive than the previous legislation offered. The legislation would overturn a court decision in order to block a buffer requirement designed to prevent damage to waterways from surface coal mining operations. These are protections that President Ronald Reagan put in place.

The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that over 500 mountains have been destroyed by the practice of mountaintop removal mining, more than 1.2 million acres of forest has been eliminated, and nearly 2,000 miles of streams have been buried or polluted by these mining projects. I wonder what part of knocking a mountaintop off do people not understand as destruction, and if it is to be, that it should be done carefully.

These are protections for all of us in our society. As many as 60,000 additional cases of cancer in central Appalachia are directly linked to mountaintop removal, and more than 700 additional deaths from heart disease occur each year.

Last month, West Virginia University scientists published a study confirming high air pollution levels around mountaintop removal coal mines, suggesting a link to the higher rates of cardiovascular disease, birth defects, and cancer that is seen in these communities.

Instead of addressing these issues, H.R. 2824 would reinstate a George W. Bush administration rule that essentially prohibits the United States Department of the Interior from implementing any protections for streams against mountaintop removal and coal mining.

Let me lift the comment of Judge Charles Haden in a case called Bragg v. Robertson. The judge says:

When valley fills are permitted in intermittent and perennial streams, they destroy those stream segments. The normal flow and gradient of the stream is now buried under millions of cubic yards of excess spoil waste material, an extremely adverse effect. If there are fish, they cannot migrate. If there is any life form that cannot acclimate to life deep in a rubble pile, it is eliminated. No effect on related environmental values is more adverse than obliteration. Under a valley fill, the water quality of the stream becomes zero. Because there is no stream, there is no water quality.

The Bush rule in '08 was vacated by the District of Columbia District Court on February 20, 2014. The Obama administration started to draft new stream protections upon taking office, into which the minority has conducted a long, fruitless investigation. Indeed, the years of investigation have uncovered no misconduct. The only results of the investigation are wasted time and taxpayer money, sending over 13,500 pages of documents, 25 hours of audio recordings, 19,000 staff hours, and costing the United States Department of the Interior and Office of Surface Mining approximately $1.5 million.

We saw an example yesterday in one of our committees investigating the Internal Revenue Service for something that just simply has not occurred in any partisan fashion. And I can demonstrate that because, if one believes that the IRS only went after conservative organizations within the time period that was being investigated by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, then it was not during that period that my church, Mt. Hermon AME Church in Fort Lauderdale, received the same kind of notices that are being complained about; and what we did was what everybody has every right to do, which is make the necessary appeal, and we were successful in that regard.

All of these partisan witch hunts need to stop. We are a better people than this, and we should be about the business of the people of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, today's measure exists as partisan talking points, bumper sticker talk by my Republican colleagues, rather than serious legislation to move this country forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support for this rule which will govern debate on important legislation that my colleague, DOUG LAMBORN, and I have introduced.

This legislation, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America, would stop the administration from destroying thousands of direct and indirect coal mining jobs and stop the price of electricity in places like Ohio from skyrocketing.

Since the early days of this administration, Mr. Speaker, the Office of Surface Mining at the Department of the Interior has been trying to rewrite a 2008 coal mining rule. This rewrite has been fraught with mismanagement, waste of taxpayer dollars, intimidation of contractors by OSM employees towards the contractors working on the rule, and even the Director of OSM demanding that the contractors change the job loss estimates because it would look bad politically for the administration. But, look, don't take my word for it. You can go out and read the Department's own inspector general's report that highlights the administration's problems rewriting this rule.

This legislation would put an end to this nonsense and implement the 2008 rule. It would save taxpayers millions of dollars that are being wasted on this frivolous rewrite. It also would protect the thousands of direct jobs that the administration admitted would be destroyed by this rule and thousands more indirect jobs that would also be lost.

In eastern and southeastern Ohio, my constituents are the ones mining the coal that powers the economic engine in the Midwest, not to mention that America gets over 40 percent of its energy from coal, the State of Ohio gets over 80 percent of its energy from coal. This rule would put not only those jobs at risk, but also cause electricity prices to skyrocket and endanger the low electricity rates that manufacturing in this country relies on to keep moving forward.

The rule from the Department must be stopped in order to protect hardworking coal miners across America and to stop the waste of taxpayer dollars by the Department of the Interior. I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule today and to support this legislation when it comes to the floor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my good friend from Florida that I have no additional speakers at this time and would be prepared to close. So I reserve the balance of my time if you have additional speakers.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the sages of America who is often quoted is Will Rogers. One of the things that I paraphrase that he said was: Buy land, because we are not making any more of that. And I use it as an analogy for mountaintop mining, knocking off the tops of these mountains. We ain't making no more mountains. Although I guess we can because in Florida we have what we call trash mountains. So I guess we can build something up, but I doubt very seriously that the quality of it will be of the kind that we see with the mountain ranges of this great America.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are about protecting special interests that happen to be near and dear to some of my friends across the aisle. We are here voting on tired, discredited, and destructive policies that have absolutely no chance of becoming law. This is a failure of leadership by my Republican colleagues and, quite frankly, a waste of time. We should not be considering measures that will help destroy this planet for our children and grandchildren. We need strong environmental protections to ensure that we have clean air, clean water, and clean food.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3546, Mr. LEVIN's bill to extend emergency unemployment insurance for the long-term unemployed across this country for whom it has run out.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a very sad thing that we continue to let people languish without fulfilling our responsibility to them with reference to unemployment insurance. It is a detriment to this Nation, and it serves us no useful purpose to continue delaying this particular effort.

While I do have the floor for a moment, I do wish to address legislation that I hope does come here with reference to our offering assistance to the people in Ukraine who should have an opportunity to make their own determination regarding their future and that we should stand with and, I am sure, are prepared to do so in an effort to assist them.

Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune of being the president of the Parliamentary Assembly for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. During that time, I went to Ukraine on three different occasions, and during that time, I had the good fortune to be the lead monitor after the Orange Revolution; so it is not that I don't have a clear understanding of much that is going on. But what I hope my colleagues here will do is recognize that the Baltics, the Balkans, and the near abroad of Russia and Europe are in need of clarity with reference to matters and not simpleminded, noncomplex answers to very difficult problems that Ukraine is now faced with. It is a nationwide, continuing problem for us.

Mr. Speaker, apparently, we do have some other speaker en route, so I am required to reserve the balance of my time, as I anticipated I might be.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we had someone show up, and so the gentleman from Florida has allowed the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) to speak.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of the gentlemen for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we just need to adopt H.R. 2824 and the rule supporting it. This is a good piece of legislation.

Unfortunately, this administration is waging what appears to many of us to be a war on coal. The stream buffer zone rule that has been proposed by OSM, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation, is a very troubling rule. It would have adverse effects on all kinds of coal mining way beyond what the stated intention is.

□ 0945

The stated intention is to protect the quality of streams in the Appalachian area, but this rule goes way beyond that. This would have the effect of closing down much of the coal mining in that part of the country. So it is overkill. It is way beyond what is necessary.

The whole rulemaking process, Mr. Speaker, is flawed. We had a very good rewrite of the rules that was done in the last administration. That went through millions of dollars of effort, many years of rulemaking, taking comments, and the end result was a very satisfactory rewrite of the older rule. Yet, without even letting that fully take effect, this administration is throwing that rule out and wanting to go to an overly stringent and unrealistic rule. Let's go back to the last rule that was done through the proper procedures.

So H.R. 2824 is a good piece of legislation. I commend Representative JOHNSON for carrying this piece of legislation. We have looked at this in detail in our full committee and in the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, and this is a much better approach. So I urge the full House to adopt H.R. 2824 and the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and will. I will close with what I said yesterday. When I was a child, Tennessee Ernie Ford sang a song about coal mining. It was that you load 16 tons and what do you get? Another day older and deeper in debt.

I have been in Appalachia, as have many of my friends. I went to school in Tennessee, and often had an opportunity to travel to Kentucky and other areas during that period of time, and I have been in West Virginia. I have seen the conditions that many people work in.

I would only hope that they know that there are voices here who believe, just like throughout the rest of this Nation, in spite of the awesomeness of the work that they do in coal mining—and I might add as a footnote, there has been no deterioration in the job market with reference to coal mining—all that is being sought is that coal mining be done in a safe manner, and that the people living in those surroundings have the same kind of quality air, quality water, and quality food that is desperately needed by everybody.

We need look no further than West Virginia and accidents that have occurred there. Nobody wanted that to happen. Indeed, what we saw were corporate dodges of people who had taken advantage of smaller communities. That needs to stop.

I believe my colleagues here want to see to it that we have a situation where those who are working in these environments have an opportunity for safety and have an opportunity for clean air in their regions as well as water and food.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule provides for ample and open debate. It makes in order amendments from both sides of the aisle. Further, it advances bills that were favorably reported out of committee and will receive bipartisan support.

The RAPID Act is good for our infrastructure needs. It puts in place a good process that helps our agencies conduct quality and timely environmental reviews.

This bill should receive overwhelming bipartisan support. Republicans and Democrats have supported these same provisions already in this Congress.

The Florida delegation knows all too well the impact that delayed studies have on moving our critical projects forward. Port Everglades, which is in the district of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), has been under review for 17 years. That is too long. It is too much. It needs to be completed. The study of the project at Port Everglades is a prime example of Washington bureaucracy crushing America's jobs and America's future.

The RAPID Act would make it possible to move projects forward while protecting our environment. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed a similar solution. The House passed a similar solution in the WRDA bill. We should pass this bill and give our infrastructure projects a good review process.

Our Nation's economy is sagging under an inefficient government. Our unemployed friends and neighbors are being hurt by our stagnant regulatory review system. The RAPID Act provides a better process and a better timeline. It does not change our environmental standards. It does not require agency approval of projects. It simply reforms our permitting process.

The coal jobs bill puts in place an already approved rule. It ends the regulatory limbo that has existed since 2009. It gives certainty to those who work in the coal industry.

Let's reform our review methods. Let's give our government the tools and the incentives to move America's infrastructure projects forward. When we do, we will release economic activity. We will strengthen our economy, and we will put Americans to work.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bills are good. I urge Members of this House to vote for the rule, vote for the bills, and move our country forward.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule for H.R. 2641, the "Responsible and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, or as some have termed it, the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

If the RAPID Act were to become law in its present form, a permit or license for project would be "deemed" approved if the reviewing agency does not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

Mr. Speaker, I share some of the frustrations expressed by many members of the House Judiciary Committee, which marked up this bill last summer, with the NEPA process.

There is something odd about a system in which it can take half a year or more to approve the siting plan for a wind farm but fracking operations regulations can be approved and conducted a few hundred feet from somebody's home with no community oversight process in just a few months.

Something is wrong with this picture.

But I strongly believe that this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

The bill in its current form is an example of a medicine that is worse than a disease.

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, namely automatic approval of projects with the need for positive agency action.

I expect to speak on my amendment shortly but suffice it-to-say, this bill goes out of its way to ensure that some projects might be prematurely approved.

That's because under H.R. 2641, if a federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the termination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved, deemed approved by such agency.

This creates a set of perverse incentives. First, as an agency is up against that deadline and legitimate work is yet to be completed, it is likely to disapprove the project simply because the issues have not been vetted.

Second, frequently there are times when it is the case that the complexity of issues that need to be resolved necessitates a longer review period, rather than an arbitrary limit.

So if H.R. 2641 were to become law the most likely outcome is that federal agencies would be required 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.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

Mr. Speaker, the new requirements contained in H.R. 2641 amend the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), even though the bill is drafted as an amendment to the APA.

The bill ignores the fact that NEPA has for more than 40 years provided an effective framework for all types of projects (not just construction projects) that require federal approval pursuant to a federal law, such as the Clean Air Act.

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

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 501 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3546) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3546.

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. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—219

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
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
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)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
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)

NAYS—191

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Diaz-Balart
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (IA)
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1018

Messrs. SCHRADER and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 99 I was not present due to unavoidable air travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—225

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
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
McAllister
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
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
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—190

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Roskam
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1028

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.

## ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 497 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. 3826.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1030

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. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 5, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–373, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) 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 House Report 113–373 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
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
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
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
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
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)

NOES—184

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
LoBiondo
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
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Nugent
Pastor (AZ)
Rangel
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1034

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 228, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

AYES—184

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
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
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
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)
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
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
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
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—18

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Ellison
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Pitts
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1038

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SCHAKOWSKY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) 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 190, noes 221, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

AYES—190

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
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
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
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
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—19

Cárdenas
Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1042

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) 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 178, noes 231, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

AYES—178

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—231

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
McAllister
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
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
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
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—21

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gerlach
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kuster
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Price (GA)
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1046

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 104 I was detained while meeting with a constituent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, 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. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 497, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment 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 amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was 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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3826 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Redesignate section 5 as section 6 and insert after section 4 the following:

**SEC. 5. SAVING CONSUMERS MONEY ON THEIR ELECTRICITY BILLS.**

This Act shall not apply with respect to rules that save consumers money on electricity bills, including rules that allow for or encourage energy efficiency, demand response, and other approaches to lower the cost of electricity for consumers.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 3826, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward improvement that I believe both sides of the aisle can agree is absolutely necessary, and would be overwhelmingly supported by the American people.

If my amendment passes, it will ensure that the American people and American businesses throughout our country will be protected from avoidable energy price increases.

Specifically, my amendment ensures that nothing in this act would limit

the ability of regulators to issue rules that save consumers money on their electricity bills, including rules that allow for or encourage energy efficiency, demand response, and other approaches to lower the cost of electricity for consumers.

Making our homes and businesses more energy-efficient will save Americans trillions of dollars and, simultaneously, fight climate change by reducing our country's carbon footprint.

Energy efficiency standards have already saved Americans $40 billion, and we are on track to save $1.7 trillion in energy costs by 2035. Proven Federal programs, like Energy Star, boost energy efficiency and have conserved energy by helping consumers and businesses find energy-efficient appliances and products.

In fact, commercial buildings which used Energy Star technology show an average of 7 percent energy savings. Progress in energy efficiency is a win/win that is good for our pocketbooks and good for our environment. We can do more.

If just 1 in 10 households used current technology to upgrade their home heating systems, we could keep 17 billion pounds of pollution out of our air.

A vote for my amendment is a vote to ensure that we keep every tool available to conserve energy and help consumers avoid needless energy costs.

Mr. Speaker, price increases in the energy sector are a very real and very serious problem. It hurts working families struggling to make ends meet. It hurts homeowners who struggle every month to pay their mortgage and utility bills, including many of my hard-working families in Ventura County.

It hurts small and large businesses, driving up the price of doing business and impacting their ability to invest in new equipment and hire new workers.

It hurts our military and impacts military readiness, including Naval Base Ventura County, costing more to keep the lights on and operate critical facilities at Point Mugu and Port Hueneme.

It hurts our seniors who live on fixed incomes and cannot afford an increase in their utility bills.

It hurts the specialty crop growers in Ventura County, our lemon, strawberry, avocado, and lettuce growers, as well as our cut flower producers, whose bottom line is so closely tied to the price of energy.

It also hurts our overall national economy and threatens to slow job creation and the recovery of our very fragile economy.

This is why it is so important that we allow regulators, like the EPA, to move forward with rules that can save consumers money on their electricity bills, encourage energy efficiency, and lower the cost of electricity for all of our consumers.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit to ensure a better and cleaner America for our children, our grandchildren, and many, many more generations to come.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a motion to recommit that we don't need, it is this one. The entire purpose of the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, H.R. 3826, is to ensure that America remains competitive in the global marketplace by lowering electricity costs.

The Energy Information Agency reported recently that 41 out of 50 States have higher electricity rates today than they did 4 years ago. Primarily, these electricity rates are going up because of the policies of the Obama administration.

This act specifically allows in the future the opportunity to build a new coal-powered plant in America the way coal-powered plants are being built around the world. We don't anticipate one to be built as long as natural gas prices are low, but if they go up, as they have in Europe, we want the flexibility to build a coal-powered plant in America.

The President talks frequently about an all-of-the-above energy policy, and yet, his policies, his regulations, his executive orders do not allow us to use as much coal. We simply want that flexibility. We are not mandating it, but it gives us additional flexibility.

For that reason, I would ask us to defeat the motion to recommit and adopt H.R. 3826.

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

PARTNERSHIP FOR A
BETTER ENERGY FUTURE,
*February 28, 2014.*

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Partnership for a Better Energy Future (the Partnership), a coalition of more than 100 organizations representing over 80 percent of the U.S. economy, urges your support for H.R. 3826, the ''Electricity Security and Affordability Act,'' which is expected to receive a vote in the House next week. H.R. 3826 provides a more reasonable path forward in relation to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) greenhouse gas (GHG) regulations, while also protecting jobs, economic growth and international competitiveness.

The Partnership's fundamental mission is to promote an ''all-of-the-above'' energy strategy that ensures the continued availability of reliable and affordable energy for American families and businesses while also protecting the environment. Unfortunately, the EPA's proposed GHG regulations on new power plants fail to meet this test.

The EPA has begun implementing a suite of new regulations designed to address GHG emissions from the electric power sector. By law, these regulations are supposed to be flexible and take into account cost and commercial availability; however, in practice the EPA's proposed GHG regulations have been the exact opposite. The very first regulation the EPA unveiled, which applies to new power plants, mandates technologies that are not yet commercially available—effectively banning the construction of coal-fired power plants going forward. With similar regulations on existing power plants due in June, followed immediately by regulations on other energy-intensive industries, the EPA's heavy-handed approach is not an encouraging sign for the regulated community.

H.R. 3826 provides a reasonable path forward for the EPA's power plant GHG regulations, allowing the agency to regulate while also protecting a diverse energy mix. For new power plants, the bill requires separate standards for coal and gas, with the coal standard subcategorized for coal types and aligned with the best-performing commercially available generation technologies. It provides a reasonable path forward for carbon dioxide capture and sequestration (CCS), prohibiting the EPA from mandating its use until the technology has been deployed by at least six units located at different commercial power plants in the United States—in other words, until it is truly ready. Finally, it allows the EPA to craft rules or guidelines for existing power plants, but requires Congress to review them and set a start date before they can take effect.

The members of the Partnership support regulations that are cost-effective, technologically achievable and allow for a robust ''all-of-the-above'' energy strategy. H.R. 3826 would achieve these goals by allowing the EPA to regulate in a balanced, reasonable fashion. The Partnership urges your support for H.R. 3826.

Sincerely,

Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute; Alabama Automotive Manufacturer's Association; Alaska Chamber of Commerce; American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers; American Knife Manufacturers Association; American Petroleum Institute; American Road and Transportation Builders Association; Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce; Associated Industries of Florida; Associated Industries of Missouri; Association of American Railroads; Automotive Recyclers Association; Balanced Energy for Texas; Baltimore Washington Corridor Chamber; Bettisworth North Architects and Planners; Bismarck-Mandan Chamber of Commerce; Brick Industry Association; Buckeye Power, Inc.

California Cotton Ginners Association; California Cotton Growers Association; California Manufacturers & Technology Association; Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry; Consumer Energy Alliance; CropLife America; Dallas Regional Chamber; Electric Reliability Coordinating Council; Florida State Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; Forging Industry Association; Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce; Georgia Association of Manufacturers; Georgia Chamber of Commerce; Greater Houston Partnership; Greater North Dakota Chamber; Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce; Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce; Gulf Coast Lignite Coalition; Illinois Coal Association; Illinois Manufacturers' Association.

Independent Petroleum Association of America; Indiana Chamber of Commerce; Indiana Manufacturers Association; Industrial Minerals Association—North America; Institute for 21st Century Energy; Iowa Association of Business and Industry; Kansas Chamber of Commerce; Kentucky Coal Association; Kerrville Area Chamber of Commerce; Longview Chamber of Commerce; Louisiana Association of Business and Industry; Lubbock Chamber of Commerce; Metals Service Center Institute; Michigan Manufacturers Association; Michigan Railroads Association; Midwest Food Processors Association Inc.; Minnesota Chamber of Commerce; Mississippi Manufacturers Association; Missouri

Chamber of Commerce; Montana Chamber of Commerce.

Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Manufacturers; National Cattlemen's Beef Association; National Marine Manufacturers Association; National Mining Association; National Oilseed Processors; Association; National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Natural Gas Supply Association; Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry; Non-Ferrous Founders' Society; North Carolina Chamber of Commerce; Oklahoma Railroad Association; Ohio Chamber of Commerce; Ohio Coal Association; Ohio Manufacturers' Association; Ohio Rural Electric Cooperatives, Inc.; Partnership for Affordable Clean Energy; Pennsylvania Coal Alliance; Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association.

Portland Cement Association; Printing Industries of America; Railway Supply Industry, Inc.; Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council; South Carolina Chamber of Commerce; Southwest Louisiana Economic Development Alliance; SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association; Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry; Texas Association of Business; Texas Cotton Ginners' Association; Texas Railroad Association; The Chamber of Sparks, Reno & Northern Nevada; The Fertilizer Institute; The Vinyl Institute; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; United Transportation Union; Valve Manufacturers Association of America; Virginia Chamber of Commerce; West Virginia Chamber of Commerce; Western Agricultural Processors Association; Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group Inc.; Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce; Wyoming Chamber Partnership.

---

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
*Triangle, VA, March 4, 2014.*

DEAR MEMBER: On behalf of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) and our members I want to ask you to vote for H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act introduced by Representative Ed Whitfield.

The UMWA is gravely concerned that the EPA has proposed an emission rate limit for new coal electric generation plants that requires carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) that has not been adequately demonstrated nor is commercially available at this time. Furthermore, EPA has based this requirement on federally-subsidized coal generation plants still under construction and that have yet to produce one kilowatt of electricity.

EPA has estimated that the CCS requirement will increase the cost of new coal generation by 30 to 80 percent. Adding this increased cost to building new coal generation clearly demonstrates that coal is not part of the Administration's ''All of the Above'' energy policy. Myself, along with five other Union Presidents, wrote President Obama last year with our recommendations on ways to build new efficient coal generation that would reduce carbon emissions without requiring CCS.

The Edison Electric Institute estimates that over 60 gigawatts of coal generation will close between now and 2015 as a result of EPA's final Mercury regulation and lower natural gas prices. It is important to point out that most of these plants were required to run to meet demand during the recent polar vortex.

The UMWA is very concerned about the impact the proposed NSPS regulation for existing coal plants scheduled to be released in June will have on the remaining fleet of coal plants and on UMWA members and other jobs in our rural communities. The EPA and the Administration consistently ignore the impact the loss of jobs in coal mining, utility and transportation sectors will have on rural coalfield communities.

As these well paying jobs disappear, how do we continue to provide wages, pensions, and health care benefits that miners and others have worked a lifetime to earn? How will the loss of these jobs impact the local tax base, school systems and health care facilities in these rural communities? UMWA contracts alone pump billions of dollars annually into these communities through our wages, pensions and health care. If that disappears, there will be nothing to replace it.

The UMWA urges you to vote for H.R. 3826, the Electricity and Affordability Act.

Sincerely yours,

CECIL E. ROBERTS,
*International President.*

---

AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE,
*March 5, 2014*

To: Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, House staff assigned to steel and/or energy issues.

SUPPORT H.R. 3826—THE ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

BACKGROUND

As the production of steel is energy-intensive, the availability and reliability of energy is essential to the international competitiveness of the domestic steel industry. In order to reduce costs and improve its competitiveness, the industry in the U.S. has reduced its energy-intensity by 27% since 1990. In fact, a recent Department of Energy-sponsored report concluded that the steel industry in the U.S. is the most energy efficient of any major steel producing country.

The steel industry in the U.S. is subject to substantial international competition, often from nations such as China, where the industry is largely state-owned, controlled, and subsidized. In fact, in two recent cases, the Department of Commerce determined that Chinese steel producers were receiving below market rates for electricity, which constitutes a subsidy. Given these challenges, policies enacted in the U.S. that raise energy costs on domestic companies threaten the industry's ability to remain competitive internationally.

SITUATION

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has undertaken a two-pronged approach to regulate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from electric generating utilities. It has proposed a rule to limit GHGs from new power plants that will likely be finalized soon, while the Agency plans to issue a draft rule on GHG emissions from existing power plants later this year. Although these regulations are placed directly on the utility sector, electricity customers will bear the costs associated with compliance. The rules will likely raise the cost of electricity to large industrial customers like steel producers, while potentially lessening the quality and reliability of our nation's electricity supply. H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, directs EPA to use achievable and realistic standards when setting GHG limits for new power plants and would ensure a role for Congress in determining when the GHG rule for existing plants goes into effect.

REQUEST

AISI urges all members of the House to support H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, when it is considered by the full House. Doing so will help uphold the international competitiveness of the domestic steel industry by maintaining an affordable and reliable supply of electricity.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. GIBSON.

---

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.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. 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, 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—yeas 184, nays 223, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—184

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
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
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—223

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
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
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
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—23

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
DesJarlais
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kennedy
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Mullin
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Quigley
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1104

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 105 I was not able to participate in this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 105 Motion to Recommit, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 229, noes 183, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

AYES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
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)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
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
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
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)

NOES—183

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Price (GA)
Ros-Lehtinen
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1111

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. PRICE of George. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 106 I was not able to participate in this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 2014 I was inadvertently recorded as a ''no'' vote on

rollcall 106—H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act. I support H.R. 3826 and fully intended on voting in favor of the legislation.

## NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas on March 5, 2014, during a hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Chairman Darrell E. Issa gave a statement and then posed ten questions to former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner, who stated that she was invoking her Fifth Amendment right not to testify;

Whereas the Committee's Ranking Member, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, clearly sought recognition to take his turn for questions under Committee and House Rules;

Whereas, Chairman Issa then quickly adjourned the hearing and refused to allow him to make any statement or ask any questions;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings protested immediately, stating: ''Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a Committee like this. You just cannot do this. This is, we are better than that as a country, we are better than that as a Committee.''

Whereas, Chairman Issa then returned and allowed Ranking Member Cummings to begin his statement, but when it became clear that Chairman Issa did not want to hear what Ranking Member Cummings was saying, turned off Ranking Member Cummings' microphone, ordered Republican staff to ''close it down,'' and repeatedly signaled to end the hearing with his hand across his neck;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings objected again, stating: ''You cannot have a one-sided investigation. There is absolutely something wrong with that'';

Whereas Chairman Issa made a statement of his own and posed questions during the hearing, but refused to allow other members of the Committee, and in particular the Ranking Member who had sought recognition, to make statements under the five-minute rule in violation of House Rule XI;

Whereas Chairman Issa instructed the microphones to be turned off and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement in violation of Rule XVI because he did not want to permit Ranking Member Cummings to speak;

Whereas Chairman Issa's abusive behavior on March 5 is part of a continuing pattern in which he has routinely excluded members of the Committee from investigative meetings, and has routinely provided information to the press before sharing it with Committee members;

Whereas Chairman Issa has violated Clause 1 of Rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct which states that ''A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House'': Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives strongly condemns the offensive and disrespectful manner in which Chairman Darrell E. Issa conducted the hearing of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on March 5, 2014, during which he turned off the microphones of the Ranking Member while he was speaking and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from Ohio will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

## PROVISION OF COSTS OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR UKRAINE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4152) to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4152

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

**SECTION 1. PROVISION OF COSTS OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR UKRAINE.**

From amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under ''Economic Support Fund'' in division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76), and prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, funding from unobligated balances shall be made available for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of loan guarantees for Ukraine, which are authorized to be provided in an appropriations Act, in accordance with section 504 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided*, That amounts made available for the costs of such guarantees shall not be considered ''assistance'' for the purpose of provisions of law limiting assistance to such country: *Provided further*, That none of the funds may be made available from amounts designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of H.R. 4152.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor H.R. 4152, a bill providing the authority for loan guarantees for Ukraine.

As we all sadly know, Ukraine is facing an extraordinarily difficult time. As a valued partner and friend of the United States, our Nation has a duty to provide the people of Ukraine with help when they now need it most.

This bill will provide some stability for the government and the people of Ukraine as they navigate through these troubled waters. The legislation before us will allow funds to be used to guarantee loans for the Government of Ukraine, in support of the Secretary of State's $1 billion pledge this week. This bill does not appropriate new funds, but simply allows funds to be used from existing State Department resources.

Ukraine's economy has been in a difficult position for years, but now the country faces, of course, real risks. Russia has punished Ukraine for leaning toward the West and has suspended the assistance they planned to provide.

This bill will not solve all of Ukraine's problems, obviously, but it is an important first step that will allow the country to shore up its finances and begin to make its economy more efficient.

With this legislation, Congress—and the United States—will show that we stand by those that oppose authoritarian rule. It will show that, as a nation, we will step up to help the people of Ukraine not only with our words, but with our deeds.

Ukraine is facing an uncertain economic future, Mr. Speaker, but they are choosing the right path of democracy and reform. The American people will stand with the Ukrainian people as they chart this new course, and today we will take a first step to quickly respond to their present need.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critically important bill and one that should pass the House and the Senate and be enacted into law without delay. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

We must come together today on a bipartisan basis to support the people

of Ukraine and take a stand against Russia's aggression and illegal violation of Ukraine's sovereign and territorial integrity.

Since last November, the world has watched with growing alarm as the hopes and democratic aspirations of the Ukrainian people were met with violent crackdowns against activists, harassment of journalists, and restrictive legislation limiting basic democratic freedoms. The bloody images from the city square and rising death toll are horrific.

Last month, the Ukrainian Parliament, the democratically elected institution, responsibly exercised its mandate and took action on behalf of the people of Ukraine. Within days, hope returned as the Parliament ousted the reckless and dangerous former President Yanukovych, began discussions with the IMF on a financial support package, and formed a transitional government with early elections scheduled for May.

But Russia, through its dangerous and illegal military occupation of Crimea, has imperiled this progress and unnecessarily escalated this crisis. Russia has violated international law and its own treaty obligations with Ukraine. Ukraine now teeters on the brink of disaster and bloodshed, and I urgently call upon President Putin to work with Kiev and the international community to deescalate the situation immediately.

Now is the time for us to support the people of Ukraine. I strongly support President Obama's comprehensive aid package to support Ukraine, which includes $1 billion in loan guarantees, technical assistance on trade, and recovery of stolen assets.

The IMF is working with the transitional government in Kiev and is instrumental in stabilizing the Ukrainian economy. This crisis illustrates the importance of the IMF to our national and global security interests, and I hope the final assistance package we enact for Ukraine will include support for the IMF.

In addition, I urge my colleagues in Congress to support the IMF quota reforms in the President's budget request, which would expand the IMF's capacity to respond to these kinds of crises and maintain U.S. leadership, instead of continuing to pursue shortsighted, isolationist attacks on the IMF.

In the meantime, however, we should not let the perfect stand as the enemy of the good. In the bipartisan spirit of this bill, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to stand beside the people of Ukraine in their hour of darkness.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the committee's chairman of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4152 and strongly support this bipartisan legislation before us today to provide economic assistance to Ukraine during her hour of need. This loan guarantee will help stabilize the Ukrainian economy during a time of political transition and when this country's sovereignty is being tested by Russia. Now, more than ever, the United States needs to demonstrate bold leadership and stand up for those who choose democracy over tyranny.

This bill does not mean the end of Ukraine's serious challenges, but it is an important first step that will allow the government to begin to repair the economic damage caused by the former leadership and will help bring stability back to a nation that values freedom.

This legislation also sends a clear signal to Ukraine and the world that the United States stands by our friends. The Ukrainian people want democracy, justice, reform, and peace. The American people will stand with Ukraine as they chart a new course forward.

I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for their immediate, bipartisan response to this crisis in Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation at a very important time. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' so we can send this bill to the President's desk for his signature without delay.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4152, legislation that would provide the Government of Ukraine with urgently needed funds to address pressing needs at a critical moment. The Ukrainian people bravely confronted a brutal and corrupt regime and stood up for democracy and justice. They need our help now. This bill is a first step in answering their call.

The bill authorizes the United States to provide repayment guarantees for bonds that the Ukrainian Government plans to issue to raise cash. These guarantees will make it easier for Ukraine to sell the bonds at the lowest possible price and at the longest term. Our guarantees would be backed up by reserves, using existing appropriated funds that the Congress provided for exactly this type of emergency.

This bill is the initial contribution to sustaining Ukraine's new government as it seeks to restore stability and return Ukraine to political and economic health. It is part of a larger financial commitment from the EU and other states, and will also help Ukraine's efforts to reach agreement with the IMF and to implement needed reforms.

Without this support, Ukraine's progress could stall in the face of unrelenting pressure from Russia, which has illegally occupied the Crimea, is encouraging separatism and conflict, and which has substantial leverage on the Ukrainian economy.

Our country has a long history of answering the call of people who have chosen freedom and democracy. Ukraine is now making that call as its people are seeking to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity and build a more democratic, prosperous, and just future for themselves and their country. We must answer. This bill is our first step.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4152.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the distinguished chairman of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations.

□ 1130

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to provide critical loan guarantees to Ukraine as it struggles against Russian oppression.

A large and proud Ukrainian community has been part of my congressional district for well over a century. Initially, Ukrainians came to New Jersey in waves of immigration because of persecution under the czars, then later after the Soviet Union crushed an independent Ukraine in the 1920s.

Yes, from the days of my youth I have come to understand that Ukrainians have always cherished freedom almost more than any descendants of other Nations, peoples, and cultures. Even after living in America for decades, they remain devoted to their homeland, to independence.

Fiercely proud of their independent Nation, my constituents are now watching history repeat itself as Vladimir Putin occupies Crimea, and seems to be threatening other parts of eastern and southern Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, the people have the right and obligation to decide what they feel is best for their Nation—either closer ties to the EU, the European Community, and the West, or shift back to Russia. That is their choice, and it cannot and must not be decided through the force of arms.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am pleased that the President has proposed and the House will soon approve these loan guarantees for Ukraine. This measure is not enough. The Ukrainian people need strong leadership from the United States.

This bill sends the right message, it sends the needed loan guarantees, and I urge strong support for its passage.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I stand today with the people of Ukraine and in strong support of this legislation, which will provide the administration with additional and immediate flexibility to assist Ukraine. I look forward

to working with the gentleman from Kentucky and my good friend from New York on further ways to assist Ukraine in the appropriations process.

This effort cannot be just about helping Ukraine. It must also be about reversing Russian aggression, curbing Vladimir Putin's revanchist policies in Russia's ''Near Abroad.'' President Obama's action this morning to cut off access to assets and place travel restrictions on those involved in the violation of Ukraine's sovereign is a positive first step. The pressure must be increased in the coming days if Russia fails to reverse course.

I support a slate of economic sanctions led by the United States and Europe to isolate Russia's economy and its leadership, so that Putin is made to understand that his violation of international law and the sovereignty of his neighbors will not be tolerated.

The collapse of the Soviet Union was one of the seminal events of the 20th century. The Cold War is over. Territorial aggression by Russia will not resurrect its empire but only diminish its standing in the world and the future of its people.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me time to speak on this bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Ukraine is important to all of us, but for me it has a personal aspect. My mother, now 90 years old, escaped from Ukraine and the Communists after World War II. She understood firsthand how Joseph Stalin suppressed freedoms and liberties in Ukraine—much as Mr. Putin desires to do likewise now.

We are faced with a situation in which a new Government of Ukraine is being threatened with Russian expansion into its sovereign territories. It is as if the Budapest agreement of 1994, which involved both Russia and the United States, had not guaranteed Ukraine safe borders from invasion. It is as if the Cold War never ended. Perhaps to Mr. Putin and other Russian nationalists it never has.

Ukraine, situated between Russia and the rest of Europe, is of obvious strategic and economic importance, not only to Russia but to the United States and Western Europe.

That is why this bill is so important. It allows Ukraine to be allowed access to ESF funding. The ESF was established to, ''provide assistance to allies and countries in the transition to democracy.''

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the situation in which Ukraine finds itself today—in need of our help to advance democracy and resist the invasion, economically and physically, from Russia, attempting to relitigate the Cold War. We can't let that happen. They desperately need these loan guarantees. For the sake of freedom, democracy, and international justice, I urge passage of this bipartisan effort to help our friends in Ukraine.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in fervent support of this legislation. This bills comes at a clearly crucial time. The people of Ukraine need to be able to preserve their Nation. We need to help.

The people of Ukraine fought for their long-desired independence. We need to help them keep it. In my capacity as cochair of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, I have had many chances to dialogue with the Ukrainian American community and members of the current Ukraine Parliament.

They have outlined in detail their determination to maintain and sustain one Ukraine against Russian aggression and any other force. The President has taken strong steps to support that endeavor.

We today should join together in unison with the President, and with, I believe, the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4152, which provides loan guarantees for Ukraine. I am deeply concerned about the crisis in Ukraine. Vladimir Putin is clearly the aggressor, but the United States and our European allies have not done enough to support freedom, self determination, and human rights in Ukraine. When America does not provide strong and reliable leadership, bad things are more likely to happen.

Unfortunately, President Obama's foreign policy of leading from behind is a failure. Even the liberal Washington Post this week said that, ''President Obama's foreign policy is based on fantasy.''

We in Congress must do all we can to restore missing American leadership on foreign policy, and that starts with Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine should not be pawns in Vladimir Putin's hands. We must stand with our European and our other allies and do all we can to support freedom, self determination, and human rights in Ukraine. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 4152.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for bringing this bill to the floor in a very timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is coming together today to support loan guarantee authority for Ukraine that will be instrumental in stabilizing its economy and showing Ukraine's people that the United States stands with them.

I view this as a first step in what, hopefully, will be a series of actions to support the people of Ukraine, including IMF ratification authority.

I also support, Mr. Speaker, President Obama's action this morning to impose sanctions again Russian and Crimean officials who are exacerbating the crisis and put in place visa restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I chaired the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe from 1985 to 1995. The final act says that borders cannot be changed other than by political means. The Russians need to comply with that admonition. I commend the administration's efforts to broker a diplomatic process that can resolve this dangerous situation in Ukraine.

The steps taken today are integral to that effort. We will stand hopefully as one in this Congress on behalf of this bill.

Russia has violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine in its unlawful and unwarranted military occupation of Crimea and its threats against the government in Kiev.

I do not purport to say this is a simple situation that we confront. I would commend to my colleagues an article by Henry Kissinger in today's Washington Post.

The complexities of this situation are real, but the actions of the Russians are an unacceptable response and we must take action. As a former chairman of the Helsinki Commission during the waning days of the Cold War, I have seen firsthand the yearning for freedom by the people of the former Soviet Union.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. There are deep linguistic and political divisions within Ukraine. Frankly, that is true of many other countries as well. Democracy by its nature provides an avenue to overcome those differences through peaceful cooperation and dialogue. That is what must prevail in Ukraine, and what must guide all parties forward. Not force, not intimidation, and not separatism. The United States remains committed, Mr. Speaker, to standing with all of the people of Ukraine as they seek the better future they deserve.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly support this resolution and again thank Mr. ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY for bringing this to the floor so quickly and decisively.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Rules Committee and the ranking member of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support

of this legislation, which is a beginning step, and which I hope we will follow with all that we can to assist those Ukrainians who are courageous and forward leaning to be about the business of determining their own fate. I had the good fortune of being an election monitor immediately after the Orange Revolution, and I spent a lot of time talking to the people there. What I learned, if nothing more, is that they do have the courage of their convictions.

What I want us to do, and what I beg my colleagues that speak about this matter to understand, is that it is extremely complex. It is nothing that you can put on a bumper sticker, and it is unfair to President Obama for people to take to this floor and allow that he is ''leading from behind,'' as I just heard a Member say. What that Member needs to understand is that it is not easy to make a determination in these kinds of matters. Whereas Putin is a dictator, Obama is in a democracy.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mrs. LOWEY, for yielding me this time.

I am very proud of the Appropriations Committee at this moment for bringing the first bill to the floor that stands with freedom-lovers in Ukraine and around our world. We know a threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere, and I rise in heartfelt support of this loan guarantee legislation to allow Ukraine time to stabilize and secure its liberty.

This money will be repaid, and I commend the bipartisan leadership of this House in acting with dispatch. President Obama and Secretary Kerry have been working overtime on Ukraine's crisis to exert every effort to bring the nations of the free world together in their mutual self-interest, and that interest is liberty.

There are some Russian violations of international law in treaties that are so abhorrent they demand the strongest action. Russia's invasion of its undefended neighbor, Ukraine, cannot be allowed to stand. The now-20-year-old Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurance, signed in 1994 by the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, and Ukraine, set the path for Ukraine to give up thousands of nuclear weapons, and she remains undefended because of it.

□ 1145

The Budapest Accords welcomed the accession of Ukraine to the treaty of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons as a nonnuclear weapons state, so her inability to defend herself against such a powerful neighbor is very clear.

This week, in a joint statement, leaders from Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, and our country said:

> We join together today to condemn the Russian Federation's clear violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, in contravention of Russia's obligations under the UN Charter and its 1997 basing agreement with Ukraine.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 3 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. This diverse group of nations from throughout the world coming together further illustrates the isolation Russia is certain to face if she does not relent and fall back from its aggressive push into Crimea.

In summarizing my remarks today, let me place on the RECORD, from the last century, no place in the world suffered more than the land of Ukraine, no place had more people forcibly starved, murdered, brutally beaten, buried alive, imprisoned, arrested into forced labor, including some of my ancestors.

I know, having traveled to Ukraine, how much the people of that great country want liberty. This is a moment that history will record in our new century the 21st. Joining with nations around the world, let us give Ukraine a bit of a lift to get her over this critical period she is facing.

I also wish to place into the RECORD information about what the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe has done in Ukraine to date. I will tell the body today that journalists are not being allowed to report from Crimea. They are being blocked and beaten by the government of Russia, from the reports we are getting on the ground. How is the world community to know the full truth of what is occurring?

Russia is moving the world backwards, not forwards. This bill is an important step in helping Ukraine to transition as we join with countries from throughout the world to condemn the violation of Ukraine's sovereign borders and to help give her the courage to stand up to those who would take her liberty away.

This will be the first time in modern history that that country has a chance to become the truly borderland great nation that she is meant to be, reaching west and north and east and south.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, which is a loan guarantee to help lift that country over this most trying time and difficult crisis in its recent history.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time.

[From Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Secretary General, March 6, 2014]

OSCE TO SEND MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL TO UKRAINE

Update at 12:00, 6 March: As of now, twenty-two OSCE participating States are participating in the activity, having sent up to two representatives each. Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States. One representative from the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre is also participating.

Vienna, 5 March 2014.—Eighteen OSCE participating States decided to send 35 unarmed military personnel to Ukraine in response to its request.

The matter was discussed at a joint meeting of the Permanent Council and the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) in Vienna on 4 March 2014.

The visit is taking place under Chapter III of the Vienna Document 2011, which allows for voluntary hosting of visits to dispel concerns about unusual military activities. Ukraine has requested all OSCE participating States to send military representatives from 5 to 12 March 2014, starting in Odessa. This is the first time this mechanism has been activated.

As of now, eighteen OSCE participating States have responded positively to the request sending up to two representatives each. Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States. One representative from the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre will also be participating. The military visit participants are on their way to Ukraine now.

OSCE Secretary General Lamberto Zannier said: ''It Is my hope that this military visit will help to de-escalate tensions in Ukraine. By providing an objective assessment of the facts on the ground, the OSCE will be better placed to foster a political solution to the current crisis through dialogue.''

''Confidence-building and transparency are key elements of the OSCE approach to security, which seeks to foster openness and dialogue as the best way to resolve conflicts in our region,'' he added.

The Vienna Document 2011 is one of the main confidence-building measures developed by the OSCE. Under this document, all participating States are required to share information on their military forces, equipment and defence planning. The Document also provides for inspections and evaluation visits that can be conducted on the territory of any participating State that has armed forces.

Note to editors: Chapter III of the Vienna Document 2011 (full text see at http://www.osce.org/fsc/86597)

VOLUNTARY HOSTING OF VISITS TO DISPEL CONCERNS ABOUT MILITARY ACTIVITIES

(18) In order to help to dispel concerns about military activities in the zone of application for CSBMs, participating States are encouraged to invite other participating States to take part in visits to areas on the territory of the host State in which there may be cause for such concerns. Such invitations will be without prejudice to any action taken under paragraphs (16) to (16.3).

(18.1) States invited to participate in such visits will include those which are understood to have concerns. At the time invitations are issued, the host State will communicate to all other participating States its intention to conduct the visit, indicating the reasons for the visit, the area to be visited, the States invited and the general arrangements to be adopted.

(18.2) Arrangements for such visits, including the number of the representatives from other participating States to be invited, will be at the discretion of the host State, which will bear the in-country costs. However, the

host State should take appropriate account of the need to ensure the effectiveness of the visit, the maximum amount of openness and transparency and the safety and security of the invited representatives. It should also take account, as far as practicable, of the wishes of visiting representatives as regards the itinerary of the visit. The host State and the States which provide visiting personnel may circulate joint or individual comments on the visit to all other participating States.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—March 6, 2014]

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES: Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the ''order'') declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Ukraine.

The order does not target the country of Ukraine, but rather is aimed at persons—including persons who have asserted governmental authority in the Crimean region without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine—who undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets. The order blocks the property and interests in property and suspends entry into the United States of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following:

actions or policies that undermine democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine;

actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine; or

misappropriation of state assets of Ukraine or of an economically significant entity in Ukraine;

to have asserted governmental authority over any part or region of Ukraine without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine;

to be a leader of an entity that has, or whose members have, engaged in any activity described above or of an entity whose property and interest in property are blocked;

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE,
*March 6, 2014.*

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of my colleague if she has further speakers?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, it doesn't seem to me that we have additional speakers. We may have an additional speaker on the way.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As we wait for the additional speaker, I want to thank the chairman again. I think it is very important that we have been able to act so expeditiously in a bipartisan way to send a very strong message to Russia and to the people of Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine, as was explained so eloquently by my colleague, Ms. KAPTUR, who has been there many times, are standing up for freedom.

There are many challenges they have, the challenge of adequate housing, the challenge of adequate food, the challenge of strengthening an economy; yet the fact that we must respond as our great democracy to a situation that has been imposed by Putin is very, very troubling, when there are so many real issues to which our resources can be extended.

My grandparents came from Kiev a long time ago at the turn of the century. They escaped from the pogroms; they escaped from the lack of democracy and the impact of intolerance and brutality that existed there. When you look back upon these years and you look at the struggles that the Ukrainian people have endured, to see the unnecessary brutality that has occurred is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank you that we are working together in a bipartisan way to stand up for freedom, to stand up for democracy, to stand up for the people who are seeking a good future for their families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentlelady for cosponsoring this legislation and working in a bipartisan fashion to be sure that it is brought up in the quickest possible manner, which this is. Like you and the others who have spoken, I am proud of our committee for acting expeditiously and doing the right thing at the right time.

It is really a sad, sad, sad state of affairs that we find in Ukraine. I remember going there many years before when it was still a part of the Soviet Union under Communist rule and visiting the wonderful church where the Eastern Orthodox Church was born in Kiev and going through the labyrinth, the catacombs; and today, to realize that that peaceful, wonderful place, the home of Christianity, really, in that part of the world, is being torn apart by people of no faith is doubly troubling.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4152. This critical legislation will make Ukraine eligible for U.S. loan guarantees, helping to bolster Ukraine's struggling economy. Strong financial aid for Ukraine will send a message that the United States and the international community are backing the Ukrainian people with more than words. This step will help free Ukraine from Russia's economic coercion.

Russia's aggressive campaign to seize Ukrainian territory in the Crimean Peninsula and beyond presents a grave threat to Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. This is a crucial moment for Ukraine—any misstep from either side at this moment could lead to all-out war. It is critical that the United States and the international community act decisively to support the Ukrainian people and isolate Russia for its transgressions.

I appreciate the work that the Obama Administration has already undertaken to suspend trade talks and military cooperation with Russia—as well as to assemble an economic aid package for Ukraine. It is fitting that the United States has quickly recognized the legitimacy of Ukraine's new government, reflecting the right of the Ukrainian people to choose their own future.

However, we must recognize that tough talk alone will not persuade Russia to change its course. Russia needs to feel tangible consequences for deploying troops in Ukraine. Our partners in Europe, particularly Germany, are positioned to have a large economic impact on Russia through sanctions. It will be critical to bring them along in our efforts. Russia should also be stripped of its current G8 presidency and suspended from the G8. G8 members should boycott the 40th G8 Summit, scheduled for June 4 and 5, 2014 in Sochi.

I represent New Jersey's Ninth Congressional District, which is home to a large and active community of Ukrainian Americans. I am proud to have a productive and longstanding relationship with New Jersey's Ukrainian Americans. Since this crisis emerged, I have hosted meetings in my office and listened to the advice of those with close ties to Ukraine. The Ukrainian American community has proven to be an invaluable resource, and I am grateful for their guidance.

The people of Ukraine need support to realize a peaceful, democratic solution to this crisis. That's why it is so fitting that the United States act to support Ukraine. Once again, I urge my colleagues to support this vital measure for Ukraine in its time of need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4152.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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 materials on H.R. 2641.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 501 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. 2641.

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

□ 1155

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. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

5½ years after the financial crisis struck in 2008, America remains in a jobs recession. Millions of Americans would call it a jobs depression.

The RAPID Act responds to America's urgent need for new jobs with critical help. According to testimony received by the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee, the RAPID Act would help to stimulate the creation of 3 million jobs.

In an economy in which the labor force participation rate has reached record lows, there is little more urgent jobs legislation that Congress could pass than the RAPID Act.

The jobs the RAPID Act would create, moreover, are high-wage, highly-skilled construction jobs. This is not just sure-fire legislation to create millions of jobs; it is sure-fire legislation to create higher wages for hardworking Americans.

Why do we need legislation to create these jobs? The reason is simple. Since before the financial crisis began and up to this day, the Federal Government's outdated and overly burdensome environmental review process has kept legions of jobs and workers waiting too long for approval from Federal bureaucrats.

The United States now ranks a dismal 34th in the world in the procedures, time, and costs needed to obtain governmental approval of new construction permits.

The heart of the problem lies with delay in the completion of reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act, commonly known as NEPA. When NEPA was first implemented, neither Congress nor the executive branch contemplated that the NEPA process would bog down responsible Federal permitting.

On the contrary, when Congress debated the issue, it talked about timeframes like 90 days to complete review. In 1981, the Council on Environmental Quality, or CEQ, thought all review could be done in a year.

A recent study, however, found that the average length of time to complete just one part of the process, the preparation of an environmental impact statement, was 3.4 years and growing. Examples abound of cases in which it takes far longer.

The port of Savannah, Georgia, for example, has seen a potential dredging project mired in review for over 13 years, with no end to review in sight. Cape Wind, a significant wind energy project in Massachusetts, took 12 years to reach the end of review.

Making matters worse, many projects that finally emerge from the administrative review process only become bogged down again in lengthy litigation challenging agencies' permitting decisions.

Clearly, the system needs to be reformed. Vice President BIDEN summed it up dramatically during a visit to the Savannah port in 2013 when he said:

> What are we doing? We're arguing about whether or not to deepen this port. It's time we get moving. I'm sick of this. Folks, this isn't a partisan issue. It's an economic issue.

How do we get moving? The key is to find the right balance between economic progress and the proper level of analysis. The RAPID Act strikes this balance. It does not force agencies to approve or deny any projects. It simply ensures that the process agencies use to make permitting decisions, and the timeline for subsequent litigation, are transparent, logical, and efficient.

To do that, the RAPID Act draws upon established definitions and concepts from existing NEPA regulations. It also draws upon commonsense suggestions from across the political spectrum, including from the President's Jobs Council and the administration's Council on Environmental Quality.

Most significantly, the RAPID Act sets hard deadlines, including an 18-month maximum deadline for an environmental assessment and a 36-month maximum deadline for an environmental impact statement.

□ 1200

It cracks down on prolonged lawsuits by establishing a 180-day statute of limitations for lawsuits challenging permitting decisions and limiting claims to those presented during the permit's public notice-and-comment process, and it consolidates who manages the process by empowering lead agencies to manage environmental reviews efficiently from start to finish in order to avoid waste and duplication of effort among bureaucratic agencies.

In many respects, the bill is modeled on the permit streamlining sections of Congress' SAFETEA-LU and MAP–21 transportation legislation, which commanded bipartisan support. A study by the Federal Highway Administration found that this legislation has cut the time for completing an environmental impact statement nearly in half.

President Obama, himself, moreover, strongly supports permit streamlining consistent with the recommendations of his Jobs Council. In his 2014 State of the Union Address, the President expressed his desire ''to slash bureaucracy and to streamline the permitting process for key projects so that we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.''

Congress should transform the President's rhetoric into action and enact this legislation to streamline permitting on all federally funded and federally permitted construction projects.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this critical legislation and cut down the time it takes America's workers to see a real jobs recovery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, February 27, 2014.*

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 2641, the Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, as ordered reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on July 31, 2013. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not alter or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding and acknowledging our jurisdictional interest, and would request that you insert our exchange of letters on this matter into the committee report on H.R. 2641 and the Congressional Record during any consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
*Washington, DC, February 27, 2014.*

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2641, the ''Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013,'' which was ordered reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary on July 31, 2013.

It is my understanding that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has Rule X jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 2641. I am, therefore, most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of the bill so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include your letter and this reply letter memorializing our mutual understanding in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 2641.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
*Chairman.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2641, the so-called Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013.

Contrary to the bill's short title, H.R. 2641 would result in confusion and delay in the review and permitting process for certain construction projects. Most importantly, it would pose serious threats to public health and safety. By carving out a separate environmental review process for construction projects, which this bill doesn't even define, by the way, this bill would effectively create two different environmental review processes for the same project: one that applies to the construction phase of the project, whatever that means under the bill, and one that applies to every other phase of the project.

For instance, the bill's requirements would apply to building a nuclear reactor but not to decommissioning the reactor or transporting or storing the reactor's spent fuel after it has been decommissioned. Worse yet, this measure could jeopardize public health and safety by prioritizing project approval over meaningful analysis. It does this by restricting the opportunity for meaningful public participation, and it imposes deadlines that may be unrealistic under certain circumstances. In doing so, H.R. 2641 forecloses potentially critical input from Federal, State, and local agencies and other interested parties for construction projects that are federally funded or that require Federal approval.

This is why I have offered an amendment ensuring that the public's right to participate in the review process is not cut off by this measure, and if an agency fails to meet the unrealistic deadlines mandated by H.R. 2641, the bill would automatically green-light a project regardless of whether the agency has thoroughly reviewed the project's risks.

These failings of the bill, along with many others, explain why the President's Council on Environmental Quality and more than 20 respected environmental groups vigorously oppose this bill. It is also the reason, yesterday, the administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy, whereby the recommendation to the President, in noting that these new rules would actually cause more confusion, would be to veto the bill if passed by this House and the Senate and once it arrives at his desk.

Last but not least, H.R. 2641 fails to address the real problem with construction projects. The RAPID Act is clearly intended to apply to infrastructure projects. Yet this bill does nothing to address the actual causes of construction delays, which is the lack of funding.

Insofar as the Savannah River port dredging is concerned, the Corps of Engineers approved that project back in 2012. Of course, since 2012, in addition to shutting down the government for 16 days, we have been cutting funds for these kinds of projects. So, today, for politicians to clamor for a spotlight and then denounce the lack of funding for these very important and crucial projects for the Nation's economic well-being, it is really ridiculous that we would stand here and act like it is regulations that are holding things back. No. It is the money.

For example, there is currently a $60 billion backlog of projects authorized under the Water Resources Act. Although every single one of these projects has been successfully approved using existing review procedures under NEPA, not a single one of these projects has begun construction. Why? Because the most recent appropriations for the Corps' construction budget was only $1.2 billion. That is $60 billion in approved projects that would improve the Nation's infrastructure had they not been delayed.

Clearing this backlog would be a force multiplier in creating jobs, spurring innovation, and growing the economy. That is a jobs bill, Mr. Chairman. What is more, the Obama administration is doing everything that it can to improve the performance of Federal permitting and the review of infrastructure projects.

In March 2012, the administration issued Executive Order 13604 to modernize the Federal infrastructure permitting process and cut in half the timeline for approving infrastructure projects. This order incentivized better outcomes for communities and the environment while cutting red tape. Since implementing this order, agencies have expedited permits for over 50 major projects. In one instance, agencies shaved up to 3 years off the timeline of the Tappan Zee Bridge replacement project in New York. That is a multibillion-dollar project that is putting Americans back to work. The President then issued another memorandum in June of 2013, further directing Federal agencies to develop an integrated interagency pre-application process for significant offshore electric transmission projects requiring Federal approval.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues often claim to want to get Americans back to work, so I have to ask:

Why do we need legislation that does not create a single job—a bill that will pick winners and losers and a bill that makes the process less clear and less protective of public health and safety? Why do we need that legislation? Why must we continue to waste this Chamber's precious time on bills that do nothing?

Mr. Chairman, we should work together to address the real causes for delay in the NEPA process instead of debating this dangerous bill. In light of the bill's many serious flaws, I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to the gentleman from Georgia that the provisions on the projects that he mentioned are exactly why we need this legislation. It is because this legislation incorporates those ideas which started, by the way, in this House with the work of the Transportation Committee, in the transportation bills, and that now needs to be codified and put into law so that it can be made available not just in those projects but in every project in which the Federal Government has a regulatory role.

At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee.

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that I think we all, Republicans and Democrats, agree on is that you can't have a world-class economy with a third world infrastructure, and in many cases, that is what we have today. Putting money into highways, bridges, and other infrastructure improvements is one of the best investments that the Federal Government can make. The gentleman from Georgia said that, that it is a great investment, but when we put the money in for the projects, we need to get those projects underway.

Each infrastructure project in our country creates jobs—high-paying jobs—and they modernize our transportation system. Not only does it create jobs, but it increases fuel efficiency because it increases velocity. It saves fuel, which is good for our economy, and it makes us less dependent on foreign oil. It improves safety, which not only reduces costs but saves lives. Unfortunately, there is a major roadblock

out there in completing all of the work that we desperately need to do, and that is the excruciatingly slow process imposed by Washington on the permitting of new construction projects. Now, that is where, I think, the gentleman from Georgia and I disagree. He says there is not a problem.

Let me quote President Obama:

One of the problems we've had in the past is that sometimes it takes too long to get projects off the ground.

That is not I. That is President Obama.

There are all these permits and red tape and planning and this and that, and some of it's important to do, but we could do it faster.

That is the essence of this bill. We can do it faster. We both acknowledge it creates jobs. We both acknowledge it helps our economy, our fuel efficiency, and it saves lives. We can do that faster. That means less fuel wasted, less time wasted, jobs created. Boy, we need those jobs now. Let me tell you how difficult it is on projects.

The Northern Beltline, which is part of the loop around Birmingham, was first added to the National Highway System in 1995. Only this month, 19 years later, did we commence that project when a Federal judge finally said enough is enough—enough delays, enough court challenges, enough roadblocks—and he ordered the project to begin. During that period of time, there were four environmental studies done. Look, our tax dollars are limited. There were four environmental studies that had to be redone from start to finish because they became too old. They became outdated. That is money that is wasted. We can't afford to waste money or time or lives in making this economy better and in creating jobs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute. If I have time left, I would be glad to.

Mr. Chairman, imagine. This project in 1998 began to receive authorization and funding, but it just started this month. These were people, constituents—and not only those people living in central and north Alabama—whose commutes were longer. They were people traveling through Alabama.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARINO. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1215

Mr. BACHUS. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) for introducing this legislation. It will reduce the time it takes to review new construction projects and ensure that the permitting process is not endlessly held up in courts.

That is what the judge said in the case of the Northern Beltline. He said that this has been before the courts. Sometimes it takes people years to get their case to court. We don't need these unnecessary delays, legal expenses, and added environmental expenses.

We have done these same things in bipartisan SAFETEA-LU and MAP–21. Why are we all of a sudden saying this is a bad thing when earlier, in a bipartisan way, we approved very similar provisions?

Why in this Congress are we suddenly out here calling things dangerous that used to be bipartisan? I don't understand that. I don't think the American people understand this dysfunction.

I thank the Judiciary Committee, its members, Chairman GOODLATTE, and Mr. MARINO. This was too late for the people along the Northern Beltline, but it won't be too late the next time.

You cannot have a first-world economy with a third-world infrastructure. Putting money into highway, bridge, and other infrastructure improvements is one of the best investments that the federal government—or state governments—can make. Each infrastructure project in our Country creates jobs—high-paying jobs. And modernizing our transportation and infrastructure system not only creates jobs—high-paying jobs. It increases fuel efficiency, which is good for the environment. It improves safety, reduces costs, and saves time.

Unfortunately, there is a major roadblock out there to completing all of the work that we desperately need to get done, and that is the excruciatingly slow process imposed by Washington on the permitting of new construction projects.

President Obama has even said, "one of the problems we've had in the past is, is that sometimes it takes too long to get projects off the ground. There are all these permits and red tape and planning, and this and that, and some of it's important to do, but we could do it faster."

Today, it sometimes seems incredibly difficult to get permission in a timely manner for even a small project. And when it comes to large projects—such as the construction of the Northern Beltline in the Birmingham area that I represent—the challenges are even greater. While construction on the Northern Beltline has finally begun this month, it took too long to get there, almost two decades from first being added to the National Highway System and over ten years since funding was authorized, and that has delayed the economic benefits that the project will generate for the region.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I point out to my friend from Alabama that you cannot do construction projects without Federal funding. If there is no funding that has been appropriated, then the projects don't get done. That is what we have had here in this Congress.

Currently, we have a $60 billion backlog of projects authorized under the Water Resources Development Act. Each and every one of those projects has great importance. All of the regulatory work has been done. The projects are cleared. We just simply do not fund them here because this Congress does not want it to be said by the American people that the current administration is responsible for an economic turnaround.

Despite their best efforts and most insistent efforts, the economy continues to move along favorably, though not at the rate that we need it to. So we really need to have legislation that we are considering and debating on this floor that will create jobs and economic prosperity for Americans, as opposed to these anti-regulatory bills that come forth—it looks like about five or six every week are coming by—plus, we have to pepper in a dose of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act every once in awhile. Fifty times we have done that. Not one job created.

That is the problem that we have.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the American historical record has always been ''the worse the recession, the stronger the recovery.'' However, although the National Bureau of Economic Research states the recession ended 5 years ago, we can agree the recovery has been anything but strong.

Facts are something this administration fights with vehement opposition. Nevertheless, the simple fact is this is the slowest ''recovery'' our country has witnessed since the Truman Presidency.

After the deep recession that began in December of 2007, employment has risen sluggishly, at best, and has risen much more slowly than in the last four recoveries, for certain. According to the CBO, employment at the end of 2013 was about 6 million jobs short of where it would be if the unemployment rate had returned to its pre-recession level.

This is why I have introduced H.R. 2641, the Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, also known as the RAPID Act.

The RAPID Act creates a streamlined Federal environmental review and permitting process that establishes transparency and certainty for job creators. Furthermore, this bill would empower lead agencies to manage environmental reviews from start to finish, as well as establish time constraints on the review process and period in which a claim can be filed.

A recent study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce identified 351 State-level projects that, if approved for construction, could have created 1.9 million jobs annually during the projected 7 years of construction. While these numbers help put the issue in perspective, I don't need to see a study to know that bureaucracy is holding up projects and preventing job growth. I see it every day in my district.

For example, one of my constituents, PPL Corporation, filed an application with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a license to build and operate a state-of-the-art nuclear plant near the company's existing two-unit Susquehanna nuclear power plant. The plant would produce 1,600 megawatts of electricity, enough to power more than 1 million homes. PPL predicted this one project would create 400 construction jobs and 400 permanent jobs.

In addition, early estimates by PPL were that the project would cost $15 billion to construct. These estimates include escalation, financing costs, initial nuclear fuel, and contingencies and reserves.

Imagine for a moment, if you will, the positive impact of a $15 billion investment in my district in Pennsylvania, the 10th Congressional District.

However, Washington bureaucrats have prevented this project from creating jobs, and it has yet to break ground. Six years after the application was first filed in 2008, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission claims they are still reviewing the company's request for a combined operating license. If these individuals that are reviewing this after 6 years were working in private industry, they would have been fired in the first year. In fact, PPL says, realistically, a final decision on the project is still several years away.

This is ridiculous.

Let me be clear. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 serves worthy goals, which should be preserved. I live out in the country. I get my water from a well. I love to see the deer and the bear come through my land. I raised my children there. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that I would do anything to hurt my children, whether it is water, air, or the environment in general, they really should think again.

Federal agencies should be able to evaluate new projects to ensure that they don't pose a threat to the environment or to the public. However, over time, NEPA regulations have turned into an outdated, burdensome, and convoluted Federal permitting process that must be reined in.

The good news is that a bipartisan consensus exists on the need to reform the permitting process. In fact, the administration, the President's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness, and legislation adopted by a strong bipartisan majority in the 109th and 112th Congresses all recognize that an overly burdensome and lengthy environmental review and permitting process undermines economic growth.

The time for these reforms is now, because Americans are ready to get back to work. The RAPID Act of 2013 will remove the red tape and allow job creators to take projects off the drawing board and onto the worksite.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense reform, and I reserve the balance of my time.

MARCH 5, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned groups strongly support H.R. 2641, the ''Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development (RAPID) Act of 2013,'' which would provide a streamlined process for developers, builders, and designers to obtain environmental permits and approvals for their projects in a timely and efficient manner, allowing jobs to be created and the economy to grow.

Every year that major projects are stalled or cancelled because of a dysfunctional permitting process and a system that allows limitless challenges by opponents of development, millions of jobs are not created. For example, 351 stalled energy projects reviewed in one 2010 study (Project No Project) had a total economic value of over $1 trillion and represented 1.9 American jobs not created. Project No Project showed that in the energy sector alone, one year of delay translates into millions of jobs not created.

The Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013 would improve the environmental review and permitting process by:

Coordinating responsibilities among multiple agencies involved in environmental reviews to ensure that ''the trains run on time;''

Providing for concurrent reviews by agencies, rather than serial reviews;

Allowing state-level environmental reviews to be used where the state has done a competent job, thereby avoiding needless duplication of state work by federal reviewers;

Requiring that agencies involve themselves in the process early and comment early, avoiding eleventh-hour objections that can restart the entire review timetable;

Establishing a reasonable process for determining the scope of project alternatives, so that the environmental review does not devolve into an endless quest to evaluate infeasible alternatives;

Consolidating the process into a single Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and single Environmental Assessment (EA) for a project, except as otherwise provided by law;

Imposing reasonable fixed deadlines for completion of an EIS or EA; and

Reducing the statute of limitations to challenge a final EIS or EA from six years to 180 days.

The RAPID Act is a practical, industry-wide approach that builds on successful provisions for environmental review management found in the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21), Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), and Section 1609 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The RAPID Act also embodies the procedural improvements to ''cut red tape'' as called for by the Obama administration, including, most recently, in his January 28, 2014, State of the Union Address.

The RAPID Act addresses the problem far too many shovel-ready projects face today: lengthy project delays from endless environmental reviews and challenges result in lost opportunities to create jobs and grow the economy. Every year of delay results in millions of jobs not created. The creation of millions of jobs is worth ensuring that our governinent works faster and more efficiently.

The undersigned groups strongly support H.R. 2641. The RAPID Act would be the strong action needed to speed up the permitting process and let important projects move forward, allowing millions of workers to get back to work. We urge you to support this important bill.

Sincerely,

American Architectural Manufacturers Association, American Bakers Association, American Chemistry Council, American Coating Association, American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Forest & Paper Association, American Foundry Society, American Highway Users Alliance, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Rental Association, American Road & Transportation Builders Association.

American Supply Association, Associated Builders & Contractors, Associated Builders & Contractors—Rhode Island Chapter, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors, Associated Wire Rope Fabricators, Association of American Railroads, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Construction Industry Round Table, Edison Electric Institute, Electronic Security Association, Forging Industry Association, Foundry Association of Michigan, Independent Electrical Contractors, Industrial Energy Consumers of America, Industrial Fasteners Institute, Industrial Minerals Association—North America, Metals Service Center Institute.

Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, National Association of Electrical Distributors, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, National Federation of Independent Business, National Industrial Sand Association, National Mining Association, National Oilseed Processors Association, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Shippers Strategic Transportation Council.

National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association, Non-Ferrous Founders' Society, North American Equipment Dealers Association, Nuclear Energy Institute, Ohio Cast Metals Association, Pacific-West Fastener Association, Pennsylvania Foundry Association, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council, South Carolina Timber Producers Association, Texas Cast Metals Association, Textile Rental Services Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington Retail Association, Wisconsin Cast Metals Association, Wisconsin Grocers Association.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out in the Rules Committee last night that it was the approval process that was holding up the dredging project for the Port of Savannah.

Just yesterday, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution refuted this claim. In reality, this project—and countless others like it—are held up by a lack of funding.

To quote the article:

In the old days, a Congress that didn't agree with White House priorities simply loaded its own projects into the budget, in a bit of horse-trading.

But Republicans, particularly in the House, have placed such bargaining out of bounds—a self-imposed restriction on their own influence.

Because, under the House rules, this is an earmark.

The Savannah River Port dredging would be an earmark.

And so for us to place something in the budget which is not in the budget already—it's not allowed.

That is quoting from my colleague, Representative KINGSTON. Because it is an earmark, in other words, Congress or its representatives would be barred by our own rules from placing funding in the budget for a project.

It is unfortunate that my colleagues from Georgia on the other side of the aisle, aided and abetted by their colleagues on the other side of the aisle from across the country, can't seem to adjust their legislative actions to suit the people that they represent.

This Savannah River Port dredging is very important to Georgia's economy. It is the most important economic development project on the table, and it is ready to go, but the bond between these legislators and the big, bad Tea Party has them afraid to do what is in the best interest of their States. That is a shame.

I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the manager, my friend, Congressman JOHNSON, Mr. MARINO, our colleagues on the floor of the House, and as well on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Chair, I rise to accept the fact that there are opportunities for discussion on streamlining and effectively expediting processes in a collaborative way in the Federal Government to continue to move forward the Federal Government, as it is responsible to the American people. Unfortunately, I believe that we are not at that place today with H.R. 2641.

President Obama has been cited repeatedly. I believe that his words at that time and today are accurate. No one would want the Federal Government to stall moving projects forward.

I might ask my colleagues, however, if they would join me in fully funding infrastructure and rebuilding this country, which we have not been able to do for almost 5 years.

By reading the Statement of Administration Policy, the administration strongly rejects the legislation's premise in H.R. 2641 that public input and responsible agency decisionmaking under current law hinders job creation. The administration believes that H.R. 2641, if enacted, will lead to more confusion and delay, limit public participation in the permitting process, and ultimately hamper economic growth.

There lies, Mr. Chairman, the underpinnings of the President's veto threat.

□ 1230

Where is this bill going?

I will, at the appropriate time, place the administration's statement into the RECORD.

So what are we talking about with this legislation? One, this legislation would narrow the scope of judicial review. In addition, this legislation would narrow the review by one Federal agency, who would allegedly coordinate other Federal and State agencies.

Let me tell you what the problem with that is, Mr. Chairman; that is that each of the agencies have their own extra expertise, so you are snuffing their expertise. You are quashing their expertise. You are forcing one agency to be the giant understander of all the nuances of the other agencies which have a responsibility to their constituency and to the American people.

Then you have a set of circumstances that suggests, as my amendment will hope to correct, that you are going to deem up. If you don't get the job done, we are going to deem you up. Beam you up. We are going to just assume that everything has been done and you can go forward. It doesn't matter whether you trample on farmland in Texas or whether or not you are, in essence, leveling suburban homes in Pennsylvania or whether or not you are in the mountains of Georgia and cause havoc.

So I would make the argument that this is not an act that is answering the question. It is a solution searching for a problem. Frankly, the argument made by many of us is the principal causes of unjustified delay in implementing the NEPA review process are inadequate agency resources. And the Bush administration noted that NEPA was not a cause for delay.

I would ask my colleagues, how can we work together?

I think for a moment I will just pause and say that yesterday was an unfortunate incident in the House Oversight Committee. It did not reflect well on this institution or chairmen who lead committees.

I pause to say that because I believe it is an important statement to make on the Floor of the House, that we should never have a setting in a committee where a ranking member is silenced, or that a hand is used across one's neck to make a comment about an individual not being able to speak. All of us are equal.

I raise that here because we are talking about process and procedure. And even though one might argue that there was a regular process of this particular legislation, we could have been more collaborative, because I am empathetic and I am sympathetic that we all want to make sure that projects move quickly, that jobs are created.

But the administration has made an assessment that NEPA is not the delay; the Bush administration has done so. And what we need is to fully fund the government with adequate resources so that our agencies with the appropriate staff can move forward.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am from the region of the oil spill of 2010, and that oil spill, at that time voices that were Republican and Democrat from the gulf region were raising their voices about the process of review.

What happened with BOMA? Why wasn't there some understanding that there were some cracks in the system? Even the industry recognized that we must work on best practices, not less regulation—not bad practices, but best practices.

And what did we do? We have put in regulations that would enhance oversight of the issues of drilling.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I rise to oppose this legislation. We could do it more collaboratively, and we need to treat each other with the dignity and the respect that this particular institution deserves, both in committees and on the Floor of the House.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2641, the "Responsible and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, or as some have termed it, the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

If the RAPID Act were to become law in its present form, a permit or license for project would be "deemed" approved if the reviewing agency does not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

Mr. Chair, I share some of the frustrations expressed by many members of the House Judiciary Committee, which marked up this bill last summer, with the NEPA process.

Why are we wasting time with this bill when we could be passing H.R. 3546, a bill introduced by my colleague SANDY LEVIN, the distinguished Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee which amends the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to extend emergency unemployment compensation (EUC) payments for eligible individuals to weeks of employment ending on or before January 1, 2015.

Or we could bring up and pass H.R. 3888, "The New Chance For a New Start in Life Act," a bill I introduced which provides grants for training to those out of work—who are merely seeking to pull themselves up by their bootstraps—the American way.

But here we are on the Floor of the House of Representatives voting and speaking on the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

There is something odd about a system in which it can take half a year or more to approve the siting plan for a wind farm but fracking operations regulations can be approved and conducted a few hundred feet from somebody's home with no community oversight process in just a few months.

Something is wrong with this picture.

But I strongly believe that this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

The bill in its current form is an example of a medicine that is worse than a disease.

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, namely automatic approval of projects with the need for positive agency action.

I expect to speak on my amendment shortly but suffice it-to-say, this bill goes out of its way to ensure that some projects might be prematurely. approved.

That's because under H.R. 2641, if a federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the termination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved, deemed approved by such agency.

This creates a set of perverse incentives. First, as an agency is up against that deadline and legitimate work is yet to be completed, it is likely to disapprove the project simply because the issues have not been vetted.

Second, frequently there are times when it is the case that the complexity of issues that need to be resolved necessitates a longer review period, rather than an arbitrary limit.

So if H.R. 2641 were to become law the most likely outcome is that federal agencies

would be required 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.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

Mr. Chair, the new requirements contained in H.R. 2641 amend the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), even though the bill is drafted as an amendment to the APA.

The bill ignores the fact that NEPA has for more than 40 years provided an effective framework for all types of projects (not just construction projects) that require federal approval pursuant to a federal law, such as the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to reject this flawed and jaded legislation.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2641—RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

(Rep. Marino, R-Pennsylvania, and 10 cosponsors, Mar. 5, 2014)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 2641, which would undercut responsible decision-making and public involvement in the Federal environmental review and permitting processes. As the Administration said when this legislation was considered previously, H.R. 2641 will increase litigation, regulatory delays, and potentially force agencies to approve a project if the review and analysis cannot be completed before the proposed arbitrary deadlines. This legislation complicates the regulatory process and creates two sets of standards for Federal agencies to follow to review projects—one for ''construction projects'' and one for all other Federal actions, such as rulemakings or management plans.

The Administration strongly rejects the legislation's premise that public input and responsible agency decision-making under current law hinders job creation. The Administration believes that H.R. 2641, if enacted, will lead to more confusion and delay, limit public participation in the permitting process, and ultimately hamper economic growth. The Administration supports efforts to improve the efficiency of the environmental review processes without diminishing requirements for rigorous analyses, agency consultation, and public participation. This includes an Interagency Steering Committee that will publish a plan with 15 reforms and over 80 actions to modernize the Federal permitting and review of major infrastructure projects.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2641, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the RAPID Act. It is hard enough for working middle class wage earners, many of whom haven't seen a raise in years, to get by. With record low temperatures, polar vortexes, and damaging snowstorms, this brutal winter has created even bigger problems for America's families.

For too many, just paying the monthly heating bill has become a real challenge. A few weeks ago, my hometown paper, the Richmond Times-Dispatch, reported on record-high propane prices and the impact it has had on the 135,000 Virginia families who heat their homes with propane.

Unfortunately, cost increases are affecting families, whether they use propane, natural gas, or electricity to heat their homes. Right now, moms and dads all across America are sitting at their kitchen table looking at one of the largest home heating bills they have ever seen.

We in Congress can't do much about the cold weather, but we can enact sensible policies that expand energy supplies and reduce costs, and that is exactly what we are doing in the House this week.

If you heat your home with propane, our bills tackle the infrastructure problems that have led to record price increases. If you heat your home with natural gas, we are trying to make it easier to move the natural gas that is being developed throughout the country to your home. If you heat your home with electricity, we are halting excessive and unnecessary regulations that are expected to drive up the costs of electricity.

The bottom line? We are reducing energy costs for America's families. Middle class families in Virginia and throughout America have enough to focus on without having to worry about Washington making it more expensive for them to heat their homes.

This is an opportunity for Members of the House to stand together and to offer some relief to struggling Americans who are simply trying to pay their energy bills and provide for their families.

I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Representative MARINO, and the rest of the Judiciary Committee for their hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I would also like to thank Chairmen UPTON and WHITFIELD, Chairman SHUSTER and Congressman MCKINLEY for their work on all the legislation dealing with energy costs this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the full Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. JOHNSON, for the leadership that he has exercised here in bringing this discussion forward on a bill that is very disappointing to me.

This bill imposes hard-and-fast deadlines that will be unrealistic in certain circumstances and would undercut responsible decisionmaking and public involvement in the Federal review and permitting processes.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2641 for various reasons.

Let's begin with the very misleading short title of this bill, namely, the ''Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act.''

Rather than effectuating real reforms to the process by which federal agencies undertake environmental impact reviews as required by the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, this legislation will actually result in making this process less responsible, less professional, and less accountable.

Worse yet, this measure could jeopardize public health and safety by prioritizing project approval over meaningful analysis.

To begin with, the bill—under the guise of streamlining the approval process—forecloses potentially critical input from federal, state, and local agencies as well as from members of the public to comment on environmentally-sensitive construction projects that are federally-funded or that require federal approval.

The bill also imposes hard and fast deadlines that may be unrealistic under certain circumstances.

Moreover, if an agency fails to meet these unrealistic deadlines, the bill simply declares that a project must be deemed approved, regardless of whether the agency has thoroughly assessed risks.

As a result, this measure could allow projects to proceed that put public health and safety at risk.

For example, as the Minority's witness astutely noted at the Committee's hearing on this bill, H.R. 2641 could effectively prevent the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from exercising its licensing authority pertaining to nuclear power reactors, waste management sites, and nuclear waste disposal facilities.

And, the bill could allow such projects to be approved before the safety review is completed.

This failing of the bill, along with many others, explains why the Administration and the President's Council on Environmental Quality, along with more than 20 respected environmental groups vigorously oppose this legislation.

These organizations include the Audubon Society, League of Conservation Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, and The Wilderness Society.

In issuing its veto threat, the Administration warns that the bill ''would undercut responsible decision-making and public involvement in the Federal review and permitting processes.''

In addition, the Administration observes that the bill will ''increase litigation, regulatory delays, and potentially force agencies to approve a project if the review and analysis cannot be completed before the proposed arbitrary deadlines.''

Another concern that I have with this bill—like other measures that we have considered—is that it is a flawed solution in search of an imaginary problem.

And, that is not just my opinion. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service issued a report last year stating that the primary source of approval delays for construction projects ''are more often tied to local/state and project-specific factors, primarily local/state agency priorities, project funding levels, local opposition to a project, project complexity, or late changes in project scope.''

CRS further notes that project delays based on environmental requirements stem not from NEPA, but from ''laws other than NEPA.''

So I have to ask, why do we need a measure like the so-called RAPID Act that will undoubtedly make the process less clear and less protective of public health and safety?

My final major concern with this bill is that—rather than streamlining the environmental review process—it will sow utter confusion.

H.R. 2641 does this by creating a separate, but only partly parallel environmental review process for construction projects that will only cause confusion, delay, and litigation.

As I noted at the outset, the changes to the NEPA review process contemplated by this measure apply only to certain construction projects.

NEPA, however, applies to a broad panoply of federal actions, including fishing, hunting, and grazing permits, land management plans, Base Realignment and Closure activities, and treaties.

As a result of the bill, there could potentially be 2 different environmental review processes for the same project. For instance, the bill's requirements would apply to the construction of a nuclear reactor, but not to its decommissioning or to the transportation and storage of its spent fuel.

Rather than improving the environmental review process, this bill will complicate it and generate litigation.

But, more importantly, this bill is yet another effort by my friends on the other side of the aisle to undermine regulatory protections.

As with all the other regulatory bills, this measure is a thinly disguised effort to hobble the ability of federal agencies to do the work that Congress requires them to do.

Accordingly, I strenuously oppose this seriously flawed bill.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, a good friend and great colleague, for bringing this RAPID Act forward because I strongly support it.

I want to just reflect. Go out of these hallowed Chambers and go into the private sector, and think about going through a permitting process and think about the longer you delay, the more you have to pay. It is just that simple.

You can drag these things out and drag these things out and drag these things out. And when you ask people: What is it that I have to do? I have already done everything you required me to do. It is just a little bit more. So the answer is: How long is a piece of string? We don't know.

What we are doing by not getting this done, and we have talked about the number of jobs that are waiting. If we are talking about improving the economy—and these are not Republican jobs or Democrat jobs. These are American jobs. And what are we doing? American projects to help the American economy.

So today to even have a debate—and this is a bipartisan effort; there is no question about it. We both feel the same way. We both know what the problems are in our country right now. We have too many people unemployed. In fact, we have too many people who have given up even looking for a job. That is the unreported number that we never reflect.

But in this case we know that delaying only increases what we have to pay. And who is picking up the tab on this? It is hardworking American taxpayers. It is just not that much-maligned 1 percent that doesn't want to pay their fair share. This is every single American woman and man that is out there. It affects how they live their lives. It affects how they pay their bills. It affects the future of our economy.

So I know we have to have debates, and this is not a debate that is heated, but it is about heat in a way. This week we have talked about: let's heat American homes; let's make sure that we have a sustainable path; let's make sure that we are not putting on the backs of these folks too much.

There is an old saying where I come from. It is: Don't worry about the mule, just load the wagon.

Gentlemen, I have got to tell you, right now, the mule is about ready to unhook himself from the wagon and say: You have asked me to pull too much for far too long.

So, with Mr. MARINO and what he has brought forth today, a commonsense approach to creating jobs and getting improvements in our country, not improvements for just Republicans but improvements for every single American, isn't that why we are all here?

I know I represent 705,687 western Pennsylvanians. I don't know how they are registered; I don't know how they vote; I don't know how they worship; but I do know this: they sent me to Washington to represent their best interests and, in a larger sense, the State of Pennsylvania and the whole country. If we cannot agree on things like this, my goodness, where do we go from here?

So I would just ask my colleagues—and this is a truly a bipartisan effort. Mr. MARINO, thank you so much for what you have done. This just makes sense. And Lord, in a town where common sense is found in so few places, let's look at this and understand the uplift for the American people and for our economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, to blame the lack of job creation on the inefficiency of regulations is kind of like—it reminds me of when you are downstairs in the bathroom and something is leaking from the upstairs bathroom and then someone tells you that it is raining. It just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my good friend and ranking member on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I am a bit confused. If you are listening to the debate, you have got to be confused about what this bill is really about. Now, it is apparently about rapid siting of nuclear plants or about constructing of pipelines through your backyard without you being allowed to comment or any environmental review, and somehow this is going to lead to job creation in America.

At the beginning of the debate, they were talking about transportation and infrastructure. I happen to be on that committee also. First off, we already did some streamlining in the last highway reauthorization. There is pending streamlining in the Water Resources Development Act. But let's drill down a little. What is the real problem?

The real problem is that this side of the aisle, the Republicans, don't want to make the investments necessary to put people back to work. The highway trust fund is going broke on October 1. Not a word from that side, except the brave chairman of the Ways and Means Committee who proposed to fund it with some tax reform. But nothing else from that side. No proposal on how we are going to continue to fund transportation and infrastructure in this country.

Water Resources Development Act, we have got a bill pending with some streamlining, but guess what? There are 60 billion—''b,'' billion—dollars of backlogged authorized water resources development projects that have gone through the full NEPA process and been approved, but the annual construction budget, thanks to my friends on the other side of the aisle, is $1.2 billion a year. Let's see. I guess that figures out to a 50-year backlog, so it really isn't going to matter how much you eliminate NEPA review here, which is, essentially, what this bill is about, which cuts out the public and other small things like that. A 50-year backlog.

□ 1245

But this will solve that problem. We will be building those—well, no, we won't, really, because we don't have the money. Well, how about roads, bridges, highways, transit? There is an $80 billion backlog in transit. NEPA? No, not NEPA. No money.

Federal highways. We have 140,000 bridges on the Federal system that need replacement or substantial rehabilitation or repair. No money. It isn't a NEPA review that is stopping that. It is a lack of funding. We are not making the necessary investments.

So you are not addressing jobs here. Don't pretend you are addressing jobs, don't pretend you are addressing utility rates, and don't even pretend that this bill is going anywhere.

You know, the Republican majority repeals NEPA every other day in the Natural Resources Committee. It hasn't happened yet; and now, this is a new way to come at it, through the Judiciary Committee.

I guess they get tired. I mean, we have had a lot of bills on the floor to repeal NEPA that have been passed and have gone to the Senate, and nothing has happened. So let's try to fool them. We will cloak it in a Judiciary bill, instead of in a Resources bill, and we will pretend that it is not really about NEPA or that it is about something else.

Actually, this bill is really bizarre because it creates an entirely new

process for reviewing projects by amending the Administrative Procedures Act. It doesn't repeal NEPA.

So, wow, how are those conflicts going to work out? What are the agencies really going to do? I mean, it is gobbledygook legislation on top of making a number of false assertions about what it will accomplish.

What it is accomplishing is it has got a great name. It sounds good. RAPID, I love that name. That is good. We are really good at names around here, but we are not really good at getting things done.

There should be a bipartisan consensus, and there has been during my long tenure in Congress on building things and rebuilding things and building an infrastructure.

You know, it is embarrassing. The United States of America is investing less money in its infrastructure—which is falling apart—than many third-world countries, and I talked about how we are developing a third-world infrastructure.

I had a colleague who is very knowledgeable on the issue who has come up and said to me: You know, that is insulting. I said: Do you know how bad the state of our infrastructure is? He said: No, it is insulting to third-world countries because they are investing a larger percentage of their gross domestic product in infrastructure than the United States of America is investing.

It is plain and simple. You can dodge. You can weave. You can come up with great names. You can make unbelievable assertions on the floor. The bottom line facts, we need to invest in rebuilding America; and for every billion dollars we spend on infrastructure, it is somewhere between 15,000 and 20,000 jobs that are created, and these are private sector jobs.

Private sector jobs, they do the work when the government provides the money to the States, which goes out and competitively bids projects; and they build them, but without money, they aren't going to build them. It doesn't matter what the environmental review process is. No money, no projects.

Drop it, guys. Come on. Let's do something real around here for a change.

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

It is almost amusing to hear my colleagues from the other side say how much they want to work together, how much they want to get this country moving, how much they want to create jobs.

Since I have been here—this is my second term, fourth year—I have seen virtually no cooperation from the other side in creating jobs. They get up, and they give a good speech about names, but there is no substance to it. There is no substance to it at all.

As a matter of fact, this is a bipartisan piece of legislation. Both sides support this.

You know, my colleagues had control of the House prior to the Republicans controlling it 4 years ago. They touched none of these issues.

And I want to ask the American people—not my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—how has this Federal regulation system been going over the last 5 years?

Virtually no jobs created, agencies stopping everything they can under this administration, but yet they stand up and give a good speech about cooperation. I have rarely seen it here.

I have seen obstructionists because it is a power play. You know, when someone comes up with a good idea—and I blame both sides over the years for this—it is not what is in the best interests of the American people. It is who is in power that wants to keep it and who is not in power that wants to take it away. And you know something? The American people are completely forgotten about.

Well, one of the reasons—the main reason I came to Washington was to work for the American people, not to preserve my job, not to keep power, not to take power; but it was to do what is right. And if you would listen to what has taken place in some of the hearings over the past 3.5 years that I have been involved in, you don't hear cooperation. You don't hear it at all.

So now, I ask my colleagues on the other side: How is that Federal system going? How is that permitting system going—that regulating system going?

It is not going well at all. Just ask industry how much it has been slowed down because of regulation, and thousands and thousands of more regulations have been implemented by this administration than ever before. So let's get serious, okay? Let's be honest with the American people about what this is about.

The Federal government doesn't create jobs. Private sector creates jobs. The responsibility of the Federal Government is to remove obstacles that allow private industry to do what they do best—better than the Federal Government.

And as I said before, I have met a lot of good people here in Congress. I have met a lot of good people in the Federal system. But there is a fair number of people in the Federal system, in these agencies, that go out and say ''no,'' just for the sake of saying ''no,'' that if they had to go to work in private industry and operated under the same premise that they did in the Federal Government, they would be fired.

It is about time we start standing up for the American people and create jobs; and I hear from this administration constantly, but there are always obstacles. There are 40-some pieces of legislation sitting on HARRY REID's desk, the leader of the Senate, the Democrat who won't even bring it to the floor for a vote.

That is a disgrace. Bring it to the floor for a vote. Vote it up or down, but let the American people know what is being voted on; and it should be brought to the floor, so they know what is going on here.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, the Federal Government does not create a single job. I don't know exactly how many jobs we are talking about cutting in the Federal Government from the drawdown of the defense, but there will certainly be less federally employed Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine personnel and those who work in the Department of Defense to support their efforts to defend this Nation to keep us strong.

The Federal Government does not create a single job. Delivering our mail provides good-paying jobs, middle class.

But I must rise in opposition to this legislation, Mr. Chair, because it would just sow utter confusion. H.R. 2641 does that by creating a separate, but only partly parallel environmental review process for construction projects that will only cause confusion, delay, and litigation.

As a result of this bill, there could potentially be two different environmental review processes for the same project. Rather than improving the environmental review process, this bill will complicate it and generate litigation.

But more importantly, the bill is yet another effort by my friends on the other side of the aisle to gum up the regulatory process and, thus, undermine regulatory protections.

As with all other anti-regulatory bills that this Congress has considered over the last few weeks, this measure is simply another thinly disguised effort to hobble the ability of Federal agencies to do the work that Congress requires them to do.

Accordingly, I strenuously oppose this seriously flawed bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. I yield myself the remainder of the time, Mr. Chairman.

You know, Mr. Chairman, to bring about real and durable job recovery, there can be only one conclusion about what the House can do today, and it should vote to pass the RAPID Act.

My friend on the other side talks about the post office, and I support them. My mother worked for the post office. But you know something? The post office is self-funded, okay?

Where is the $1 trillion that this administration put into the so-called stimulus? It did nothing. It wasn't applied properly. It wasn't utilized.

This doesn't cut regulations, this legislation. It doesn't cut regulations. It cuts making a decision from 15 years down to 4.5 years. Just think in our households, how many of us would have delayed by years making decisions, were it be.

This is bipartisan legislation that would transform into immediate action

the recommendations of the President's Jobs Council, the exhortations of Vice President BIDEN, and the promises President Obama made.

The President's Jobs Council stated that our system for permitting and approving job-creating projects leads to delays and litigation and recommended in 2011 that the process be streamlined. The RAPID Act does that.

President Obama, in his 2014 State of the Union Address, promised action to slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process, so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible. The RAPID Act delivers that.

Let's come together, Republicans and Democrats, for the hardworking Americans desperate for new and high-paying jobs. The RAPID Act allows that to happen.

On average, it takes the Federal Government 10 to 15 years to approve permitting. If private industry operated in such an irresponsible manner, it would be bankrupt.

Instead of talking the talk, it is time to walk the walk and pass this legislation that will create excellent-paying jobs.

My legislation reduces permitting down to 4.5 years, and it doesn't take any authority away. It appoints a single entity, a Federal agency that has a major hand in this for oversight.

And if my colleagues are saying: well, it is not the Federal Government, it is the State and local governments.

Then that agency can light the fire under that local or State government and tell them: you must get your approvals in or, by a certain time, your opportunity to do that will be waived.

So still, in an effort to reach across the aisle and work with my colleagues and create hundreds of thousands of jobs, let's cut the red tape. Ask the people in my district about red tape—those from the VA, those from Social Security—what they have to go through with agencies—those from EPA, those from OSHA. It is a disaster.

So let's come together, Republicans and Democrats, for the hardworking Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, today, the House will pass yet another bill that weakens important environmental laws. I will vote against this legislation—H.R. 2641—which if enacted would gut the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The NEPA process requires federal agencies to go through a public assessment of the environmental impacts of certain proposed federal actions. As part of this, it mandates the consideration of alternatives to those actions. The process can identify alternatives that are often less costly with fewer impacts to the environment.

H.R. 2641 undermines this important process, by placing restrictions on alternatives that can be considered, and allowing parties with vested interests in projects to prepare environmental review documents, creating potential conflicts of interest. It could also force agencies to approve projects if review and analysis cannot be completed before arbitrary deadlines.

The claimed goal of this bill is to help projects—including infrastructure projects—to move forward more quickly. The NEPA process, however, is not the reason for project delays. The reason is a lack of investment from the federal government. At the Army Corps of Engineers, there is a $60 billion backlog of authorized water resources projects that were successfully approved under NEPA, but have not been built due to lack of funding. At the same time, our roads and bridges are in disrepair, not due to NEPA, but because the federal government is short of resources, with the Highway Trust Fund projected to need $100 billion in additional revenue over the next six years just to stay solvent.

NEPA's positive impact has been unquestionable—it has been one of the nation's most important environmental laws, ensuring careful decision making and the right of the public to participate in planning efforts that would directly impact their communities. I will be disappointed to see H.R. 2641 pass, which will only limit the public's participation, increase confusion, and undermine responsible agency reviews.

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.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–39. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2641

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

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.***

*This Act may be cited as the ''Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013'' or as the ''RAPID Act''.*

***SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FOR EFFICIENT DECISIONMAKING.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of part 1 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subchapter II the following:*

*''SUBCHAPTER IIA—INTERAGENCY COORDINATION REGARDING PERMITTING*

***''§ 560. Coordination of agency administrative operations for efficient decisionmaking***

*''(a) CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subchapter is to establish a framework and procedures to streamline, increase the efficiency of, and enhance coordination of agency administration of the regulatory review, environmental decisionmaking, and permitting process for projects undertaken, reviewed, or funded by Federal agencies. This subchapter will ensure that agencies administer the regulatory process in a manner that is efficient so that citizens are not burdened with regulatory excuses and time delays.*

*''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subchapter, the term—*

*''(1) 'agency' means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or Indian tribal government;*

*''(2) 'category of projects' means 2 or more projects related by project type, potential environmental impacts, geographic location, or another similar project feature or characteristic;*

*''(3) 'environmental assessment' means a concise public document for which a Federal agency is responsible that serves to—*

*''(A) briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or a finding of no significant impact;*

*''(B) aid an agency's compliance with NEPA when no environmental impact statement is necessary; and*

*''(C) facilitate preparation of an environmental impact statement when one is necessary;*

*''(4) 'environmental impact statement' means the detailed statement of significant environmental impacts required to be prepared under NEPA;*

*''(5) 'environmental review' means the Federal agency procedures for preparing an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, categorical exclusion, or other document under NEPA;*

*''(6) 'environmental decisionmaking process' means the Federal agency procedures for undertaking and completion of any environmental permit, decision, approval, review, or study under any Federal law other than NEPA for a project subject to an environmental review;*

*''(7) 'environmental document' means an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, and includes any supplemental document or document prepared pursuant to a court order;*

*''(8) 'finding of no significant impact' means a document by a Federal agency briefly presenting the reasons why a project, not otherwise subject to a categorical exclusion, will not have a significant effect on the human environment and for which an environmental impact statement therefore will not be prepared;*

*''(9) 'lead agency' means the Federal agency preparing or responsible for preparing the environmental document;*

*''(10) 'NEPA' means the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);*

*''(11) 'project' means major Federal actions that are construction activities undertaken with Federal funds or that are construction activities that require approval by a permit or regulatory decision issued by a Federal agency;*

*''(12) 'project sponsor' means the agency or other entity, including any private or public-private entity, that seeks approval for a project or is otherwise responsible for undertaking a project; and*

*''(13) 'record of decision' means a document prepared by a lead agency under NEPA following an environmental impact statement that states the lead agency's decision, identifies the alternatives considered by the agency in reaching its decision and states whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not adopted.*

*''(c) PREPARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—Upon the request of the lead agency, the project sponsor shall be authorized to prepare any document for purposes of an environmental review required in support of any project or approval by the lead agency if the lead agency furnishes oversight in such preparation and independently evaluates such document and the document is approved and adopted by the lead agency prior to taking any action or making any approval based on such document.*

*''(d) ADOPTION AND USE OF DOCUMENTS.—*

*''(1) DOCUMENTS PREPARED UNDER NEPA.—*

*''(A) Not more than 1 environmental impact statement and 1 environmental assessment shall be prepared under NEPA for a project (except for supplemental environmental documents prepared under NEPA or environmental documents prepared pursuant to a court order), and, except as otherwise provided by law, the lead agency shall prepare the environmental impact statement or environmental assessment. After the*

*lead agency issues a record of decision, no Federal agency responsible for making any approval for that project may rely on a document other than the environmental document prepared by the lead agency.*

*''(B) Upon the request of a project sponsor, a lead agency may adopt, use, or rely upon secondary and cumulative impact analyses included in any environmental document prepared under NEPA for projects in the same geographic area where the secondary and cumulative impact analyses provide information and data that pertains to the NEPA decision for the project under review.*

*''(2) STATE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS; SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—*

*''(A) Upon the request of a project sponsor, a lead agency may adopt a document that has been prepared for a project under State laws and procedures as the environmental impact statement or environmental assessment for the project, provided that the State laws and procedures under which the document was prepared provide environmental protection and opportunities for public involvement that are substantially equivalent to NEPA.*

*''(B) An environmental document adopted under subparagraph (A) is deemed to satisfy the lead agency's obligation under NEPA to prepare an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment.*

*''(C) In the case of a document described in subparagraph (A), during the period after preparation of the document but before its adoption by the lead agency, the lead agency shall prepare and publish a supplement to that document if the lead agency determines that—*

*''(i) a significant change has been made to the project that is relevant for purposes of environmental review of the project; or*

*''(ii) there have been significant changes in circumstances or availability of information relevant to the environmental review for the project.*

*''(D) If the agency prepares and publishes a supplemental document under subparagraph (C), the lead agency may solicit comments from agencies and the public on the supplemental document for a period of not more than 45 days beginning on the date of the publication of the supplement.*

*''(E) A lead agency shall issue its record of decision or finding of no significant impact, as appropriate, based upon the document adopted under subparagraph (A), and any supplements thereto.*

*''(3) CONTEMPORANEOUS PROJECTS.—If the lead agency determines that there is a reasonable likelihood that the project will have similar environmental impacts as a similar project in geographical proximity to the project, and that similar project was subject to environmental review or similar State procedures within the 5-year period immediately preceding the date that the lead agency makes that determination, the lead agency may adopt the environmental document that resulted from that environmental review or similar State procedure. The lead agency may adopt such an environmental document, if it is prepared under State laws and procedures only upon making a favorable determination on such environmental document pursuant to paragraph (2)(A).*

*''(e) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall be responsible for inviting and designating participating agencies in accordance with this subsection. The lead agency shall provide the invitation or notice of the designation in writing.*

*''(2) FEDERAL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—Any Federal agency that is required to adopt the environmental document of the lead agency for a project shall be designated as a participating agency and shall collaborate on the preparation of the environmental document, unless the Federal agency informs the lead agency, in writing, by a time specified by the lead agency in the designation of the Federal agency that the Federal agency—*

*''(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project;*

*''(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the project; and*

*''(C) does not intend to submit comments on the project.*

*''(3) INVITATION.—The lead agency shall identify, as early as practicable in the environmental review for a project, any agencies other than an agency described in paragraph (2) that may have an interest in the project, including, where appropriate, Governors of affected States, and heads of appropriate tribal and local (including county) governments, and shall invite such identified agencies and officials to become participating agencies in the environmental review for the project. The invitation shall set a deadline of 30 days for responses to be submitted, which may only be extended by the lead agency for good cause shown. Any agency that fails to respond prior to the deadline shall be deemed to have declined the invitation.*

*''(4) EFFECT OF DECLINING PARTICIPATING AGENCY INVITATION.—Any agency that declines a designation or invitation by the lead agency to be a participating agency shall be precluded from submitting comments on any document prepared under NEPA for that project or taking any measures to oppose, based on the environmental review, any permit, license, or approval related to that project.*

*''(5) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—Designation as a participating agency under this subsection does not imply that the participating agency—*

*''(A) supports a proposed project; or*

*''(B) has any jurisdiction over, or special expertise with respect to evaluation of, the project.*

*''(6) COOPERATING AGENCY.—A participating agency may also be designated by a lead agency as a 'cooperating agency' under the regulations contained in part 1500 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2011. Designation as a cooperating agency shall have no effect on designation as participating agency. No agency that is not a participating agency may be designated as a cooperating agency.*

*''(7) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each Federal agency shall—*

*''(A) carry out obligations of the Federal agency under other applicable law concurrently and in conjunction with the review required under NEPA; and*

*''(B) in accordance with the rules made by the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to subsection (n)(1), make and carry out such rules, policies, and procedures as may be reasonably necessary to enable the agency to ensure completion of the environmental review and environmental decisionmaking process in a timely, coordinated, and environmentally responsible manner.*

*''(8) COMMENTS.—Each participating agency shall limit its comments on a project to areas that are within the authority and expertise of such participating agency. Each participating agency shall identify in such comments the statutory authority of the participating agency pertaining to the subject matter of its comments. The lead agency shall not act upon, respond to or include in any document prepared under NEPA, any comment submitted by a participating agency that concerns matters that are outside of the authority and expertise of the commenting participating agency.*

*''(f) PROJECT INITIATION REQUEST.—*

*''(1) NOTICE.—A project sponsor shall provide the Federal agency responsible for undertaking a project with notice of the initiation of the project by providing a description of the proposed project, the general location of the proposed project, and a statement of any Federal approvals anticipated to be necessary for the proposed project, for the purpose of informing the Federal agency that the environmental review should be initiated.*

*''(2) LEAD AGENCY INITIATION.—The agency receiving a project initiation notice under paragraph (1) shall promptly identify the lead agency for the project, and the lead agency shall initiate the environmental review within a period of 45 days after receiving the notice required by paragraph (1) by inviting or designating agencies to become participating agencies, or, where the lead agency determines that no participating agencies are required for the project, by taking such other actions that are reasonable and necessary to initiate the environmental review.*

*''(g) ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS.—*

*''(1) PARTICIPATION.—As early as practicable during the environmental review, but no later than during scoping for a project requiring the preparation of an environmental impact statement, the lead agency shall provide an opportunity for involvement by cooperating agencies in determining the range of alternatives to be considered for a project.*

*''(2) RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES.—Following participation under paragraph (1), the lead agency shall determine the range of alternatives for consideration in any document which the lead agency is responsible for preparing for the project, subject to the following limitations:*

*''(A) NO EVALUATION OF CERTAIN ALTERNATIVES.—No Federal agency shall evaluate any alternative that was identified but not carried forward for detailed evaluation in an environmental document or evaluated and not selected in any environmental document prepared under NEPA for the same project.*

*''(B) ONLY FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED.—Where a project is being constructed, managed, funded, or undertaken by a project sponsor that is not a Federal agency, Federal agencies shall only be required to evaluate alternatives that the project sponsor could feasibly undertake, consistent with the purpose of and the need for the project, including alternatives that can be undertaken by the project sponsor and that are technically and economically feasible.*

*''(3) METHODOLOGIES.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall determine, in collaboration with cooperating agencies at appropriate times during the environmental review, the methodologies to be used and the level of detail required in the analysis of each alternative for a project. The lead agency shall include in the environmental document a description of the methodologies used and how the methodologies were selected.*

*''(B) NO EVALUATION OF INAPPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVES.—When a lead agency determines that an alternative does not meet the purpose and need for a project, that alternative is not required to be evaluated in detail in an environmental document.*

*''(4) PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.—At the discretion of the lead agency, the preferred alternative for a project, after being identified, may be developed to a higher level of detail than other alternatives in order to facilitate the development of mitigation measures or concurrent compliance with other applicable laws if the lead agency determines that the development of such higher level of detail will not prevent the lead agency from making an impartial decision as to whether to accept another alternative which is being considered in the environmental review.*

*''(5) EMPLOYMENT ANALYSIS.—The evaluation of each alternative in an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment shall identify the potential effects of the alternative on employment, including potential short-term and long-term employment increases and reductions and shifts in employment.*

*''(h) COORDINATION AND SCHEDULING.—*

*''(1) COORDINATION PLAN.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall establish and implement a plan for coordinating public and agency participation in and comment on the environmental review for a project or category of projects to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review.*

*''(B) SCHEDULE.—*

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall establish as part of the coordination plan for a project, after consultation with each participating agency and, where applicable, the project sponsor, a schedule for completion of the environmental review. The schedule shall include deadlines, consistent with subsection (i), for decisions under any other Federal laws (including the issuance or denial of a permit or license) relating to the project that is covered by the schedule.

''(ii) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In establishing the schedule, the lead agency shall consider factors such as—

''(I) the responsibilities of participating agencies under applicable laws;

''(II) resources available to the participating agencies;

''(III) overall size and complexity of the project;

''(IV) overall schedule for and cost of the project;

''(V) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that could be affected by the project; and

''(VI) the extent to which similar projects in geographic proximity were recently subject to environmental review or similar State procedures.

''(iii) COMPLIANCE WITH THE SCHEDULE.—

''(I) All participating agencies shall comply with the time periods established in the schedule or with any modified time periods, where the lead agency modifies the schedule pursuant to subparagraph (D).

''(II) The lead agency shall disregard and shall not respond to or include in any document prepared under NEPA, any comment or information submitted or any finding made by a participating agency that is outside of the time period established in the schedule or modification pursuant to subparagraph (D) for that agency's comment, submission or finding.

''(III) If a participating agency fails to object in writing to a lead agency decision, finding or request for concurrence within the time period established under law or by the lead agency, the agency shall be deemed to have concurred in the decision, finding or request.

''(C) CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER TIME PERIODS.—A schedule under subparagraph (B) shall be consistent with any other relevant time periods established under Federal law.

''(D) MODIFICATION.—The lead agency may—

''(i) lengthen a schedule established under subparagraph (B) for good cause; and

''(ii) shorten a schedule only with the concurrence of the cooperating agencies.

''(E) DISSEMINATION.—A copy of a schedule under subparagraph (B), and of any modifications to the schedule, shall be—

''(i) provided within 15 days of completion or modification of such schedule to all participating agencies and to the project sponsor; and

''(ii) made available to the public.

''(F) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF LEAD AGENCY.—With respect to the environmental review for any project, the lead agency shall have authority and responsibility to take such actions as are necessary and proper, within the authority of the lead agency, to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review for the project.

''(i) DEADLINES.—The following deadlines shall apply to any project subject to review under NEPA and any decision under any Federal law relating to such project (including the issuance or denial of a permit or license or any required finding):

''(1) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DEADLINES.—The lead agency shall complete the environmental review within the following deadlines:

''(A) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PROJECTS.—For projects requiring preparation of an environmental impact statement—

''(i) the lead agency shall issue an environmental impact statement within 2 years after the earlier of the date the lead agency receives the project initiation request or a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement is published in the Federal Register; and

''(ii) in circumstances where the lead agency has prepared an environmental assessment and determined that an environmental impact statement will be required, the lead agency shall issue the environmental impact statement within 2 years after the date of publication of the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in the Federal Register.

''(B) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROJECTS.—For projects requiring preparation of an environmental assessment, the lead agency shall issue a finding of no significant impact or publish a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in the Federal Register within 1 year after the earlier of the date the lead agency receives the project initiation request, makes a decision to prepare an environmental assessment, or sends out participating agency invitations.

''(2) EXTENSIONS.—

''(A) REQUIREMENTS.—The environmental review deadlines may be extended only if—

''(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency, the project sponsor, and all participating agencies; or

''(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The environmental review shall not be extended by more than 1 year for a project requiring preparation of an environmental impact statement or by more than 180 days for a project requiring preparation of an environmental assessment.

''(3) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS.—

''(A) COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—For comments by agencies and the public on a draft environmental impact statement, the lead agency shall establish a comment period of not more than 60 days after publication in the Federal Register of notice of the date of public availability of such document, unless—

''(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency, the project sponsor, and all participating agencies; or

''(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

''(B) OTHER COMMENTS.—For all other comment periods for agency or public comments in the environmental review process, the lead agency shall establish a comment period of no more than 30 days from availability of the materials on which comment is requested, unless—

''(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency, the project sponsor, and all participating agencies; or

''(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

''(4) DEADLINES FOR DECISIONS UNDER OTHER LAWS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which a decision under any other Federal law relating to the undertaking of a project being reviewed under NEPA (including the issuance or denial of a permit or license) is required to be made, the following deadlines shall apply:

''(A) DECISIONS PRIOR TO RECORD OF DECISION OR FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—If a Federal agency is required to approve, or otherwise to act upon, a permit, license, or other similar application for approval related to a project prior to the record of decision or finding of no significant impact, such Federal agency shall approve or otherwise act not later than the end of a 90-day period beginning—

''(i) after all other relevant agency review related to the project is complete; and

''(ii) after the lead agency publishes a notice of the availability of the final environmental impact statement or issuance of other final environmental documents, or no later than such other date that is otherwise required by law, whichever event occurs first.

''(B) OTHER DECISIONS.—With regard to any approval or other action related to a project by a Federal agency that is not subject to subparagraph (A), each Federal agency shall approve or otherwise act not later than the end of a period of 180 days beginning—

''(i) after all other relevant agency review related to the project is complete; and

''(ii) after the lead agency issues the record of decision or finding of no significant impact, unless a different deadline is established by agreement of the Federal agency, lead agency, and the project sponsor, where applicable, or the deadline is extended by the Federal agency for good cause, provided that such extension shall not extend beyond a period that is 1 year after the lead agency issues the record of decision or finding of no significant impact.

''(C) FAILURE TO ACT.—In the event that any Federal agency fails to approve, or otherwise to act upon, a permit, license, or other similar application for approval related to a project within the applicable deadline described in subparagraph (A) or (B), the permit, license, or other similar application shall be deemed approved by such agency and the agency shall take action in accordance with such approval within 30 days of the applicable deadline described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(D) FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—Any approval under subparagraph (C) is deemed to be final agency action, and may not be reversed by any agency. In any action under chapter 7 seeking review of such a final agency action, the court may not set aside such agency action by reason of that agency action having occurred under this paragraph.

''(j) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

''(1) COOPERATION.—The lead agency and the participating agencies shall work cooperatively in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review or could result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

''(2) LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—The lead agency shall make information available to the participating agencies as early as practicable in the environmental review regarding the environmental, historic, and socioeconomic resources located within the project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration. Such information may be based on existing data sources, including geographic information systems mapping.

''(3) PARTICIPATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—Based on information received from the lead agency, participating agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environmental, historic, or socioeconomic impacts. In this paragraph, issues of concern include any issues that could substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the project.

''(4) ISSUE RESOLUTION.—

''(A) MEETING OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—At any time upon request of a project sponsor, the lead agency shall promptly convene a meeting with the relevant participating agencies and the project sponsor, to resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review or could result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

''(B) NOTICE THAT RESOLUTION CANNOT BE ACHIEVED.—If a resolution cannot be achieved within 30 days following such a meeting and a determination by the lead agency that all information necessary to resolve the issue has been obtained, the lead agency shall notify the heads of all participating agencies, the project sponsor, and the Council on Environmental Quality for further proceedings in accordance with section 204 of NEPA, and shall publish such notification in the Federal Register.

''(k) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of each Federal agency shall report annually to Congress—

''(1) the projects for which the agency initiated preparation of an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment;

*''(2) the projects for which the agency issued a record of decision or finding of no significant impact and the length of time it took the agency to complete the environmental review for each such project;*

*''(3) the filing of any lawsuits against the agency seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by the agency for an action subject to NEPA, including the date the complaint was filed, the court in which the complaint was filed, and a summary of the claims for which judicial review was sought; and*

*''(4) the resolution of any lawsuits against the agency that sought judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by the agency for an action subject to NEPA.*

*''(l) LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by a Federal agency for an action subject to NEPA shall be barred unless—*

*''(A) in the case of a claim pertaining to a project for which an environmental review was conducted and an opportunity for comment was provided, the claim is filed by a party that submitted a comment during the environmental review on the issue on which the party seeks judicial review, and such comment was sufficiently detailed to put the lead agency on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks judicial review; and*

*''(B) filed within 180 days after publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing that the permit, license, or approval is final pursuant to the law under which the agency action is taken, unless a shorter time is specified in the Federal law pursuant to which judicial review is allowed.*

*''(2) NEW INFORMATION.—The preparation of a supplemental environmental impact statement, when required, is deemed a separate final agency action and the deadline for filing a claim for judicial review of such action shall be 180 days after the date of publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing the record of decision for such action. Any claim challenging agency action on the basis of information in a supplemental environmental impact statement shall be limited to challenges on the basis of that information.*

*''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to create a right to judicial review or place any limit on filing a claim that a person has violated the terms of a permit, license, or approval.*

*''(m) CATEGORIES OF PROJECTS.—The authorities granted under this subchapter may be exercised for an individual project or a category of projects.*

*''(n) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirements of this subchapter shall apply only to environmental reviews and environmental decision-making processes initiated after the date of enactment of this subchapter.*

*''(o) APPLICABILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (p), this subchapter applies, according to the provisions thereof, to all projects for which a Federal agency is required to undertake an environmental review or make a decision under an environmental law for a project for which a Federal agency is undertaking an environmental review.*

*''(p) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede, amend, or modify sections 134, 135, 139, 325, 326, and 327 of title 23, sections 5303 and 5304 of title 49, or subtitle C of title I of division A of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act and the amendments made by such subtitle (Public Law 112–141).''.*

*(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the items relating to subchapter II the following:*

*''SUBCHAPTER IIA—INTERAGENCY COORDINATION REGARDING PERMITTING*

*''560. Coordination of agency administrative operations for efficient decisionmaking.''.*

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Council on Environmental Quality shall amend the regulations contained in part 1500 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to implement the provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title, and shall by rule designate States with laws and procedures that satisfy the criteria under section 560(d)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Not later than 120 days after the date that the Council on Environmental Quality amends the regulations contained in part 1500 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to implement the provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title, each Federal agency with regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall amend such regulations to implement the provisions of this subchapter.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 113–374. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 25, strike lines 1 through 19.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1300

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the provision deeming approved any project in which the agency does not meet deadlines contained in the bill. As we have listened to the discussion, as I indicated in my earlier time on the floor, there is much that we can agree to on the issue of making more effective our Federal Government, making it work for the people. We all agree to that. In fact, I had suggested that we provide full funding for infrastructure rebuild.

But this bill ignores the value of oversight. The bill also ignores the fact that NEPA has, for more than 40 years, provided an effective framework for all types of projects—not just construction projects—that require Federal approval pursuant to a Federal law such as the Clean Air Act.

I want to read into the RECORD a comment that I made earlier, why this is a misdirected legislation. The CEQ, general counsel for 25 years during the Reagan, George H. W. Bush, Clinton, and George W. Bush administrations, who was intimately involved in the implementation of NEPA through the executive branch, observed most delays in the environmental review processes are caused by factors other than NEPA or justified by the nature of the project.

But yet this bill would indicate that if by the time that this bill designates the oversight has not been finished—that could be an oversight for a nuclear-fired plant; it could be an oversight dealing with some of the energy resources that we have that require that kind of oversight; it could be the oversight of building a major construction project through a heavily populated neighborhood; or it could be oversight on many aspects of America's business—then this bill says it is simply deemed up—deemed up, Mr. Chairman.

So how can one believe that problems will be solved by just ignoring—ignoring—the process?

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, and that is that automatic approval, that deeming up, that beaming up. And so I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment which relieves us of that burden of fearfully passing legislation that would, in fact, deem up.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, with all due respect to my colleague with whom we have worked closely on several matters on several committees, Mr. Chairman, the American people desperately need new jobs. Just this week, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that America's labor force participation rate is at a 35-year low. Over 92 million Americans who could work are outside of the workforce. That is more than the population of all but 14 of the world's 228 countries—and more than every country in the Western Hemisphere but Brazil and Mexico.

We face this historically low rate not because Americans don't want to work, but because so many Americans have despaired of any hope of finding a new full-time job and have abandoned the workforce. The RAPID Act offers strong help to reverse this tragedy, restore hope, and produce millions of new jobs.

We must pass the bill, not weaken it, to provide these new, high-wage jobs. But the gentlelady's amendment would weaken the bill in one of the worst possible ways. It would remove the clear consequence in the bill for agencies

that refuse to follow the bill's deadlines. That consequence is to deem permits approved if agencies refuse to approve or deny them within those deadlines.

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides 4½ years for agencies to complete their environmental reviews for new permit applications and reasonable additional time for agencies to wrap up final permit approvals or denials after that. 4½ years is more time than it took the United States to fight and win World War II.

If agencies can't wrap up their environmental reviews in that much time and then meet the bill's remaining deadlines, there is something terribly wrong with the agencies. The prospect of facing a default approval at the end of the substantial time the bill grants is an eminently responsible, reasonable way to assure that agencies will conduct full reviews and wrap their work up in time to make up-or-down decisions on their own.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and, reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me restate again what is in this legislation.

If a Federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the determination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved—deemed approved—by such agency.

Mr. Chairman, do the American people want something deemed approved that might be a dangerous and unsuitable project in their community?

And as it relates to the creation of jobs, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, but I will tell you that it is said by the Federal Highway Administration, the majority of the approved projects required limited documentation or analysis under NEPA. Further, when environmental requirements have caused project delays, requirements established under laws other than NEPA have generally been the fault. NEPA has not stopped the creation of jobs.

But what I can tell my good friend is that, if we could pass the unemployment insurance extension, we can give opportunity to Americans to keep looking for jobs; and if we pass an infrastructure bill, we would have jobs.

So my point is that my amendment is very simple. It is just to eliminate that provision that might dangerously put Americans in jeopardy by, in essence, allowing projects to be approved while there is a studious, conscientious review of that project that is to generate jobs but to provide for the safety, the security, the tranquility, and the peace of the American people. I can't imagine that we would want to throw into legislation on streamlining an absolute hatchet that says your neck is cut off if, in fact, you are not finished with your work; the heck with it, we are going on to produce this project.

I know that the American people believe in the spirit of my good friend from Pennsylvania's intentions. We can work together. We can put legislation forward that can be constructive. But a shortened time of 4 years is nothing to celebrate if, in essence, the time is needed for review.

I have cited some of the challenges that we face: oil spills; construction projects that have seen large numbers of deaths because of the way it was done; collapse of buildings, as we have seen in the tragedy of the building that was collapsed in Pennsylvania; and other terrible disasters that have occurred that require the rebuild of certain facilities in the United States.

I cannot imagine—again, I might say that the general counsel that was general counsel for the CEQ to all of the last four Presidents has indicated NEPA is not a problem.

I ask that my amendment, the Jackson Lee amendment, be supported and make this legislation a step better and a step in a direction to get it where it should be. I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, for this opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 2641, the "Responsible and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013."

If the RAPID Act were to become law in its present form, a permit or license for project would be "deemed" approved if the reviewing agency does not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

My amendment strikes the provision deeming approved any project for which agency does not meet deadlines contained in the bill.

Mr. Chair, I share some of the frustrations expressed by many members of this committee with the NEPA process.

There is something odd about a system in which it can take half a year or more to approve the siting plan for a wind farm but fracking operations regulations can be approved and conducted a few hundred feet from somebody's home with no community oversight process in just a few months.

Something is wrong with this picture.

But I strongly believe that this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

Mr. Chair, why are we wasting time with this bill when we could be passing H.R. 3546, a bill introduced by my colleague Sandy Levin, the distinguished Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee, which amends the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to extend emergency unemployment compensation (EUC) payments for eligible individuals to weeks of employment ending on or before January 1, 2015.

Or we could bring up and pass H.R. 3888, "The New Chance For a New Start in Life Act," a bill I introduced which provides grants for training to those out of work—who are merely seeking to pull themselves up by their bootstraps—the American way.

But here we are on the Floor of the House of Representatives voting and speaking on the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

The bill in its current form is an example of a medicine that is worse than a disease.

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, namely automatic approval of projects with the need for positive agency action.

Under H.R. 2641, if a federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the termination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved, deemed approved by such agency.

This creates a set of perverse incentives. First, as an agency is up against that deadline and legitimate work is yet to be completed, it is likely to disapprove the project simply because the issues have not been vetted.

Second, frequently there are times when it is the case that the complexity of issues that need to be resolved necessitates a longer review period, rather than an arbitrary limit.

So if H.R. 2641 were to become law the most likely outcome is that federal agencies would be required 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.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

The Jackson Lee Amendment sets up a trigger after a period of time for a process, which is not automatic approval, but is rather a convening of the stakeholders around figuring out what is standing in the way of the NEPA decision.

Mr. Chair, the new requirements contained in H.R. 2641 amend the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), even though the bill is drafted as an amendment to the APA.

The bill ignores the fact that NEPA has for more than 40 years provided an effective framework for all types of projects (not just construction projects) that require federal approval pursuant to a federal law, such as the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2641 and keep Americans working.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I am just going to close on this thought here. My colleague on the other side says that 4½ years is just simply not enough time to go through the permitting and licensing project. Just think about this: ask the people in the private sector when you see buildings going up, before they are going up when there is a statement on the land where the building is going to go up as to this project is going to take place in so much time, ask those people, get information to see how long it takes the private sector to do the same thing that the Federal Government is supposed to be doing. At most, a couple of years—not 10 years, not 12 years, not 15 years. Private industry can have this done in a couple of years with all the research, with all the permitting, with all the licensing, and with all the hearings.

I think one of my colleagues said this blocks out the public from hearing or making any statements. That is simply

not true. That is absolutely not true. The public still has the time and can do that.

So with that, I oppose my good friend's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

Mr. MCKINLEY. 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 27, insert after line 17 the following, and redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly:

''(k) LIMITATION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON .—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any environmental review or environmental decision-making process, a lead agency may not use the social cost of carbon.

''(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'social cost of carbon' means the social cost of carbon as described in the technical support document entitled 'Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013, revised in November 2013, or any successor thereto or substantially related document, or any other estimate of the monetized damages associated with an incremental increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit agencies under this legislation from using the social cost of carbon that this administration implemented under executive order. Late on a Friday afternoon in June of 2013, this increase in the cost estimate for the social cost of carbon showed up in an obscure rule regarding microwave ovens. In typical fashion with this administration, there was no public debate, no stakeholder comment, and no vote in Congress for this estimate which increased the cost over 50 percent. But they didn't consider the social cost of mental anguish and health care for those that lose their job as a result.

Then again, this is the same administration who issued a de facto ban on new coal-fired powerhouses and refused to hold listening sessions in the areas most affected by fossil fuels. Coal production is down throughout Appalachia, and down by nearly half over the last 5 years under this administration.

Too many people in Washington just don't get it. When you shut down the fossil fuel industry in a community—in particular, a coal mine—you shut down an entire community. Railroad workers, machinists, timber and coal industries, pharmacists, and schoolteachers all are effected by these kinds of policies. Entire communities, the social fabric of our Nation, are on edge while this administration's ideologically driven policies are threatening hundreds of thousands of jobs all across America.

This is the same President who, in 2008, said he would bankrupt the coal industry. This has become personal to me, Mr. Chairman, and many people throughout the coalfields of America. The rest of the world is investing in coal, building new plants, and increasing their consumption of coal—but not here in America.

This President is gambling with our economy and risking America's future. For a President who likes to talk about fairness, Mr. Chairman, blaming our fossil fuels as a health risk isn't fair.

But then again, is it fair for the EPA to require standards that can't be achieved? Is it fair to blame man for climate change when naturally occurring $CO_2$ emissions represent 96 percent naturally, while U.S. coal emissions contributed only two-tenths? Let me say that again. Two-tenths of 1 percent of the emissions occur from coal-fired powerhouses.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would prohibit an agency from considering the social cost of carbon—social cost of carbon—in an agency's environmental review of a proposed construction project.

This amendment ignores the fundamental reality that climate change is real and we need to do something about it. The social cost of carbon, or SCC, is an estimate of the social and economic benefits of reducing carbon dioxide emissions that began under the Bush administration and has been upheld by the courts. For example, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ordered the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to include SCC in its light-truck fuel economy standards in 2007.

Thomas Sterner, an economist with the Environmental Defense Fund, cited the Obama administration's SCC estimates as ''a welcome step forward, reflecting the latest versions of the underlying models.'' Billy Pizer, a Duke University economist, notes that the ''key thing is we are recognizing the answer is not zero. We know there are negative consequences. And we are trying to put an accurate dollar value on it.''

Even William Bumpers, an attorney with Baker Botts, who typically represents manufacturers in pollution cases, acknowledged that the ''only real cost of carbon that I know is wrong is zero.''

□ 1315

Perhaps most importantly for purposes of this amendment is that there is overwhelming consensus that every ton of carbon dioxide emitted into the atmosphere has very real costs to human health, ecosystems, and the economy.

The SCC estimates involve extensive analysis of the best available peer-reviewed literature and climate economic assessment models. They include a broad range of costs associated with anticipated climate impacts on society, such as the property damage from increased flood risks, or the additional energy costs associated with climate oscillations.

Since 2009 alone, there have been a series of major climatic events that demonstrate the costly effects of climate change. How many so-called ''hundred-year storms'' have to hit a major city like New York before climate skeptics will wake up?

The 2011 Texas drought alone cost farmers and ranchers over $5 billion. How many farmer's crops must wither on the vine before we face up to the real costs inaction?

I ask my colleagues to oppose this very detrimental amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think we all can admit that $CO_2$ emissions have increased. In the last numbers of years, 200 years, $CO_2$ emissions have increased from 320 parts per million to 400 parts per million. During this same period of time, however, population has expanded by eight times. Life expectancy across the world has doubled. Human cancers and viral diseases have decreased. Do opponents of our fossil fuels truly believe our society will be developed on anything other than cheap, abundant, and reliable sources of energy such as coal and natural gas?

Fossil fuels have lifted billions of people out of poverty. $CO_2$ is essential to human life. In The New York Times, Bill Gates was quoted as saying:

If you could pick just one thing to reduce poverty, by far you would pick energy.

According to statistics from the EIA, in 2010, 80 percent of the world's GDP is attributed to fossil fuels. This represents $60 trillion.

However, the opponents of this amendment and fossil fuels in general turn a blind eye to the suffering of over 1.3 billion people across the world who have no access to electricity for heating, cooking, and water supplies. That is a social travesty.

To quote one climate scientist we spoke with:

Just so radical environmentalists can feel better about themselves, they prevent families and children living in poverty from having access to the most dependable and affordable energy resources.

That, Mr. Chairman, is immoral.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his staunch support of this amendment and his hard work on the underlying legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to accept this amendment and the legislation. Poverty is not just the number one threat to the environment and health in our society, but throughout the world in general.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

It is bad enough that agencies already take too much time to conclude construction permit reviews. It is even worse for them to draw out the process on the basis of junk science. And that is precisely what the Obama Administration's pronouncements on the "Social Cost of Carbon" appear to be.

To be specific, multiple commenters on the Administration's latest "findings" argue that "carbon's social cost is an unknown quantity; that [social-cost-of-carbon] analysts can get just about any result they desire by fiddling with non-validated climate parameters, made-up damage functions, and below-market discount rates; and that [social-cost-of-carbon] analysis is computer-aided sophistry, its political function being to make renewable energy look like a bargain at any price and fossil energy look unaffordable no matter how cheap."

Junk science and sophistry have no place standing between hardworking Americans and new, high-paying jobs. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 9, insert after "subchapter." the following: "In the case of a project for which an environmental review or environmental decisionmaking process was initiated prior to the date of enactment of this subchapter, the provisions of subsection (i) shall apply, except that, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in determining a deadline under such subsection, any applicable period of time shall be calculated as beginning from the date of enactment of this subchapter.".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Mr. MARINO for putting forth this bill, the RAPID Act. This bill is a giant step toward implementing an environmental review process that works. I offer an amendment today not to alter the process, but to ensure that projects that are currently languishing in current environmental review have an opportunity to access the tools provided in this bill.

Infrastructure projects are vital to my home State of Florida. From port infrastructure to airports to seaports, road projects, even the Everglades restoration projects, my State's economy is supported by wise in investment in infrastructure.

Two projects in my State have suffered greatly under the current environmental review process. Orlando International Airport has had plans to develop a piece of property for airport services for more than a decade. The expansion would create skilled, high-paying jobs, and would be a boost to central Florida's economy. The plans have been under environmental review since 2008. A simple environmental assessment should not take more than 6 years.

Another project in our State, Port Everglades, involves deepening an existing channel by a few feet. The deepening of the channel at Port Everglades will allow more exports to flow out of our State on Post Panamax ships. This project is vital to our State as a whole, but also important to central Florida due to the large amounts of citrus that ships out of our State through Port Everglades. The more citrus we can ship, the more jobs we create. However, the channel deepening has been under environmental review for more than 17 years. For nearly two decades, Port Everglades has been caught in an endless cycle of review. The Florida delegation is committed, both Republicans and Democrats, to getting this project complete.

My amendment today is offered with these projects in mind. This amendment simply applies the same timelines that the RAPID Act establishes for new projects to projects that are currently under review.

Does it mean that they would be automatically, if it is already 4½ years into the project? No, it just means that timeline would not go beyond another 4½ years.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make the so-called RAPID Act, which, by the way, I would rename, as our caucus has done, the Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act.

This RAPID Act will apply retroactively to construction projects that are currently under review. As a result, all of the bill's problematic provisions that we have cited, including its arbitrary deadlines for environmental review and restrictions on public comment, would apply to pending construction projects that require Federal approval or Federal permitting.

This amendment, like the RAPID Act, ignores the fact that NEPA is not the problem. According to the Congressional Research Service, which is nonpartisan, project approval delays based on environmental requirements are not caused by NEPA. Rather, CRS reports that these delays are caused by State and local factors like project funding levels, local opposition to a project, a project's complexity, or late changes in the project scope.

This amendment would do nothing to address the underlying problem, and that underlying problem is the lack of funding. So we need to address, Mr. Chairman, the root causes of the delays in the process, not threaten public health and safety by automatically approving projects when agencies fail to meet arbitrary deadlines.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure everyone understands what this does. It would limit to 4½ more years. So we have a project 17 years in. Now we are saying, all right, can you give us an answer in 4½ more years? Over two decades, and we can't get an answer? I don't know; maybe we won't. But if the answer is "no," say it. That is all they have to do. This doesn't automatically approve anything. What it says is, Give us an answer. Isn't 21 years long enough?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate that I utter this saying: Show me the money. When the money is there, projects can start being funded and work can begin. Workers can start working and getting paychecks. In that way, we will reinvigorate this economy. We have got to have—instead of anti-regulatory bills, we need job-creation bills.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, just to highlight some construction that has taken place in the past before we had all this regulation: San Francisco Bay Bridge construction started July 9, 1933, and the bridge opened up on November 12, 1936. Chesapeake Bay Bridge construction started in January of 1949 and the

bridge opened up July 30, 1952. Empire State Building construction started January 22, 1930, and the building opened up May 1, 1931. The Chrysler Building construction began in 1926 and was completed in 1930. One of my favorites: the new Yankee Stadium groundbreaking was in August of 2006; opening day was April of 2009.

There are thousands of comedians out of business. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would get serious about following the premise that the American people want—less red tape—instead of trying to be funny, we would be in good shape.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman, and I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

The RAPID Act includes important reforms to assure that agencies wrap up their environmental reviews for construction permits within a generous four-and-one-half years. The current language of the bill applies these reforms to all "environmental reviews" and all "environmental decisionmaking processes" begun after the bill's enactment.

The amendment takes the next step and applies the bill to environmental reviews and environmental decisionmaking processes begun before enactment. But it also generously provides that the time remaining for agencies to conclude a review or decisionmaking process will be calculated as if the review or process had begun on the date of enactment—just as with a new permit application. Other deadlines in the bill will likewise be calculated as if the relevant timeframe began on the date of enactment, not before enactment.

The amendment thus represents a very reasonable balance between assuring that pending permit applications will at last be wrapped up and providing agencies with adequate time to wrap them up.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his support, and I urge Members to vote for this amendment. It is a good amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

Mr. NADLER. 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 30, line 23, insert after "112-141)." the following:

"(q) EXCEPTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of a project described in paragraph (2), or an environmental document pertaining to such a project.

"(2) PROJECT DESCRIBED.—A project described in this paragraph is any project that pertains to a nuclear facility in an area designated as an earthquake fault zone.".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment exempts from the bill any construction project for a nuclear facility planned in an area designated as an earthquake fault zone.

The RAPID Act would prevent meaningful input on complicated construction projects that have the potential to have disastrous impact on individuals living near them.

The meltdown of the nuclear reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi power plant in Japan in the aftermath of a devastating earthquake and tsunami highlights the dangers of regulatory failure when it comes to ensuring the safe operation of nuclear reactors. In particular, the Fukushima disaster illustrates the failure in planning a construction project in an area susceptible to earthquakes and tsunamis.

March 11, 2014, next week, marks the 3-year anniversary of the Fukushima meltdown. A recent reporter visiting the site described it like this:

The site of Fukushima nuclear disaster in Japan remains a post-apocalyptic landscape of abandoned towns, frozen in time.

□ 1330

Now, consider the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant, which is only 24 miles from New York City and, according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, could be at risk of reactor core damage from an earthquake. An estimated 17 million people live within a 50-mile radius of the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant.

By imposing strict deadlines and limiting opportunities for agencies and the public to participate in the approval process, this bill could prevent the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from being able to protect the tens of millions who live in the greater New York Metropolitan area and millions of Americans who live near nuclear power plants from a catastrophe akin to what happened at Fukushima in Japan.

I want to point out that we have already had nuclear accidents right here in the United States. Just last month, night shift workers inhaled plutonium that was leaked from a nuclear waste burial site in Carlsbad, New Mexico.

Radioactive materials reached the surface and were inhaled by several workers. Those workers face the possibility of subatomic particles bombarding their internal organs for the rest of their lives.

Now, imagine the immense risk to human health that would result from a large-scale leak caused by an earthquake. It would be catastrophic. We cannot afford to water down nuclear regulations or restrict the ability of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from doing its job of protecting human health.

My amendment would ensure that the inclusive and prudential construction approval process that currently exists under the National Environmental Policy Act will continue to apply to any construction projects for a nuclear facility planned in an area designated as an earthquake fault zone.

The procedures in this bill that would short-circuit the NEPA procedures are just too dangerous when you are considering an application to construct a nuclear facility in an earthquake fault zone.

I urge everyone to support the amendment because, when it comes to constructing a nuclear facility in an earthquake fault zone, we really cannot be too careful.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is unnecessary and could needlessly block important energy construction projects from breaking ground.

The March 2011 "Project No Project" study identified 351 energy projects, including nuclear projects, that, if approved, could generate $1.1 trillion for the economy and create 1.9 million jobs annually.

I appreciate that my colleague is concerned about the safety of nuclear power, including in earthquake fault zones. The RAPID Act does not require agencies to approve or deny any particular project or permit application.

It simply ensures that the environmental review and permitting process is conducted by agencies in an efficient and transparent manner. It is consistent with the administration's own guidance, the President's Jobs Council's recommendations, prior, bipartisan legislation, and the all-of-the-above energy strategy that America needs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that, no, the RAPID Act does not guarantee any nuclear power plant or anything else, but it does short-circuit the proper review.

It, for instance, says that if certain procedures are not completed within a certain period of time, the application is deemed approved. It means that the applicant can slow-walk information and get an approval automatically because the review is not complete within a period of time.

It is just too dangerous. The present procedures that we have have, in fact, allowed us to build the nuclear power plants, and other facilities have been built.

We should not play Russian roulette with the lives of millions of Americans

by short-circuiting the environmental review of nuclear power plants, especially in earthquake fault zones.

Yes, we need energy. Yes, we should have energy from all sorts of power sources, but we should do it safely and not risk Fukushimas galore.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 32, after line 2, insert the following:

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall have the effect of changing or limiting any law or regulation that requires or provides for public comment or public participation in an agency decision making process.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order and urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to protect the right of the public to comment on Federal projects under the NEPA review process.

The purpose of my amendment is simple. It protects the right of the public to comment. This amendment would ensure that H.R. 2641, the so-called RAPID Act of 2013, does not restrict the right of any member of the public to comment on construction projects that may have an environmental impact.

Like the administration and more than 20 well-respected environmental groups, I oppose the RAPID Act. This bill threatens public health and safety by putting a thumb on the scales in favor of private sector businesses in the project approval process.

It is yet another antiregulatory measure whose sole purpose is to grease the wheels of the approval process for projects that are environmentally sensitive.

Aside from creating duplicative and costly regulatory requirements that pertain to only certain types of projects, the RAPID Act would also limit the right of the public to comment on these projects.

The bill does that in two ways: First, by reducing opportunities for public input; and, second, by fast-tracking the approval process through arbitrary deadlines.

The NEPA approval process has protected the environment for more than 20 years, Mr. Chairman, and it is designed to be smart from the start.

Through an open, flexible, and timely process, NEPA empowers the public to weigh in on decisions. That means that the local farmer who owns land that would be affected by a Federal construction project has equal footing as the company that would stand to benefit from that project. My amendment is vital to ensuring that the RAPID Act doesn't shut the public out of this process.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join me in ensuring that the RAPID Act does not foreclose public participation.

Accordingly, I urge that this committee make my amendment in order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The RAPID Act will create jobs by ensuring that the Federal environmental review and permitting process works like it should. The RAPID Act is drafted to make agencies operate efficiently and transparently; it does not prevent citizens from participating in this process.

In fact, the bill makes sure that agencies provide the public with reasonable public comment periods. It authorizes up to 60 days of public comment on Environmental Impact Statements, up to 30 days of comment on environmental assessments and other documents, and grants the lead agency authority to negotiate extensions or provide them on its own for good cause.

This is more than fair. By comparison, the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, regulations only require agencies to allow 45 days for public comment on draft Environmental Impact Statements and 30 days for public comments on final Environmental Impact Statements.

The RAPID Act also reasonably requires that a person comment on an environmental document before challenging it in court, and bring any suit within 6 months, as opposed to 6 years. Opponents should not be able to delay a project indefinitely by playing hide-the-ball with agencies or by resting on their rights.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, 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. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution at the desk previously noticed under rule IX.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on March 5, 2014, during a hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Chairman Darrell E. Issa gave a statement and then posed ten questions to former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner, who stated that she was invoking her Fifth Amendment right not to testify;

Whereas the Committee's Ranking Member, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, clearly sought recognition to take his turn for questions under Committee and House Rules;

Whereas, Chairman Issa then quickly adjourned the hearing and refused to allow him to make any statement or ask any questions;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings protested immediately, stating: ''Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a Committee like this. You just cannot do this. This is, we are better than that as a country, we are better than that as a Committee.''

Whereas, Chairman Issa then returned and allowed Ranking Member Cummings to begin his statement, but when it became clear that Chairman Issa did not want to hear what Ranking Member Cummings was saying, turned off Ranking Member Cummings' microphone, ordered Republican staff to ''close it down,'' and repeatedly signaled to end the hearing with his hand across his neck;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings objected again, stating: ''You cannot have a one-sided investigation. There is absolutely something wrong with that'';

Whereas Chairman Issa made a statement of his own and posed questions during the hearing, but refused to allow other members of the Committee, and in particular the Ranking Member who had sought recognition, to make statements under the five-minute rule in violation of House Rule XI;

Whereas Chairman Issa instructed the microphones to be turned off and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement in violation of Rule XVI because he did not want to permit Ranking Member Cummings to speak;

Whereas Chairman Issa's abusive behavior on March 5 is part of a continuing pattern in which he has routinely excluded members of the Committee from investigative meetings, and has routinely provided information to the press before sharing it with Committee members;

Whereas Chairman Issa has violated Clause 1 of Rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct which states that ''A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House'': Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives strongly condemns the offensive and disrespectful manner in which Chairman Darrell E. Issa conducted the hearing of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on March 5, 2014, during which he turned off the microphones of the Ranking Member while he was speaking and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—''ayes'' 211, ''noes'' 186, answered ''present'' 10, ''not voting'' 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—211

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
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
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
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)

NAYS—186

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
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—10

Brooks (IN)
Capuano
Clarke (NY)
Conaway
Dent
Deutch
Gowdy
Issa
Meehan
Sánchez, Linda T.

NOT VOTING—23

Bachus
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Rooney
Schneider
Schwartz
Smith (NE)
Vargas

□1408

Messrs. CARNEY and SCHRADER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. NUNES, MULVANEY, PEARCE, DUNCAN of South Carolina, HARRIS, MEADOWS, GINGREY of Georgia, MILLER of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. MCKINLEY, CRAMER, BRADY of Texas, WALDEN, MCALLISTER, DUFFY, and AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mmes. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, CLARKE of New York, Messrs. CAPUANO and DEUTCH changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''present.''

Messrs. CONAWAY, GOWDY, DENT, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

So the motion to table 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. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 107, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

## RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 501 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. 2641.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1410

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. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting CHAIR) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in part C of House Report 113–374, offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), 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 C of House Report 113–374 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 228, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

AYES—180

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
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
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
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
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
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
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
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
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
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—22

Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1415

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 188, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

AYES—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
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
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
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)

NOES—188

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
Marchant
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1420

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 187, noes 220, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—187

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—220

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
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
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
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—23

Barber
Barton
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Schwartz
Stockman

□ 1424

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) 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 192, noes 217, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

AYES—192

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
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
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—217

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo
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
Schrader
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—21

Barton
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Hurt
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1429

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, 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. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 501, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment 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 amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was 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

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

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

Ms. DELBENE. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DelBene moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2641 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 30, line 23, insert after ''112-141).'' the following:

''(q) PROTECTING LOCAL COMMUNITIES, PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS AND TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of a project described in paragraph (2) , or an environmental document pertaining to such a project.

''(2) PROJECT DESCRIBED.—A project described in this paragraph is any project that—

''(A) affects the safe drinking water supply or air quality of local communities that are located near the project;

''(B) involves condemnation or infringing the private property rights of American citizens; or

''(C) affects the health, safety, or sovereignty of Native American tribes.

''(r) MAKING IT IN AMERICA AND PROVIDING JOBS FOR UNEMPLOYED WORKERS.—Any environmental document approved pursuant to this act shall assess whether a construction project—

''(1) will utilize equipment and materials manufactured in the United States; and

''(2) will result in the hiring of unemployed workers, including veterans, who are actively seeking work and for whom unemployment taxes were paid during prior employment.''.

Mr. MARINO (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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. DELBENE. 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.

Infrastructure improvements and construction projects are crucial not only for safety, but also for a robust and strong economy. Unfortunately, many of our roads and bridges are in a state of disrepair. This isn't the result of environmental review processes, but, unfortunately, a shortsighted failure to invest in our crumbling infrastructure.

We need to invest in safety improvements for our bridges and renovations along major highways, so that we don't experience tragedies like the Skagit Valley I–5 bridge collapse in my district last year.

For Washington State, moving forward on construction and infrastructure projects that efficiently move people and goods will improve connections to Washington's ports, support trade, help connect people to their jobs, and spur economic growth.

I understand that these projects are a valuable driver of job growth and can put people back to work; and I agree with supporters of this legislation, that Congress must do everything possible to remove barriers to our economic recovery and to job creation.

But we simply don't have data to suggest that regulatory red tape and overregulation through the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, are hampering construction projects or impeding job growth.

In fact, a 2012 Congressional Research Service report called into question the idea that NEPA compliance is a source of delay in Federal highway projects and found that delays in permitting for construction projects are more often tied to, among other things, a lack of project funding, whether from State, local, or Federal sources.

This is a real problem and one that Congress can help solve by making targeted investments in our Nation's infrastructure, whether by passing a final Water Resources Development Act reauthorization bill or by reforming the highway trust fund to provide more adequate funding for roads and bridge construction.

Instead, the RAPID Act, in its current form, is based on the flawed premise that our current laws—not only NEPA, but laws like the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act—impede economic growth. In fact, these laws serve important purposes, such as protecting private property owners, local communities, and tribal governments that may be impacted by Federal actions.

While this bill has a worthy goal—to prevent delays in the approval of proposed construction projects—this cannot come at the expense of our public health and safety, our environment, or the rights of private property owners.

My amendment would ensure that this bill does not override the current regulatory protections governing certain construction projects.

Just weeks after a hazardous chemical spill harmed the water supply for residents of West Virginia, we cannot afford to undermine regulatory protections that have been in place for decades as a result of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts.

So my amendment excludes construction projects affecting our drinking water or air quality from the weaker regulatory procedures established by this legislation. This amendment will help ensure that Americans continue to have access to clean air and water.

My amendment also makes clear that, when a Federal construction project would condemn or infringe on the private property rights of any American, it could not sidestep the review process, as provided under this legislation.

Additionally, gutting the NEPA requirements under current law for construction projects could pose unique challenges for Indian country, which is why my amendment would continue the current NEPA process for construction projects that would impact health, safety, or tribal sovereignty of Native American tribes.

The RAPID Act, as currently drafted, fails to ensure meaningful tribal consultation on these types of projects.

Finally, my amendment ensures that we are prioritizing our investments effectively. There are too many Americans who continue to look for work, and my amendment would require that every construction project assess whether we will help long-term unemployed Americans, including veterans, get back to work.

This amendment is an opportunity for us to reduce unemployment and assist our veterans struggling to find civilian job opportunities.

The approval process should consider whether the project will utilize equipment and materials manufactured in the United States and whether it will result in the hiring of unemployed workers who are actively seeking work. We should always do our best to support American jobs and American products when spending taxpayer dollars.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. MARINO. ''Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered,'' words of Representative DANIEL WEBSTER, right up there.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit isn't about improving legislation. It is about imposing roadblocks, erecting hurdles, pointing to excuses to keep us from doing what we were sent here to do, which is to set the wheels of progress turning to lift the American people out of crisis and economic calamity, to lift the American people into prosperity and high-paying jobs.

People have hungered for months and years for good, new high-paying jobs. Americans want to know that Washington hears them, Washington cares about them, and Washington knows how to get the red tape out of the way so they can get back to work.

The families that depend every day on their breadwinners, finding some way to make ends meet, want to know that we can deliver on the job we were sent here to do.

For 3 years, the President's Jobs Council recommended that we streamline the Federal permitting process. Vice President BIDEN's urgent words have been echoing:

> It's time we get moving. Folks, this isn't a partisan issue. It's an economic issue.

Less than 2 months ago, President Obama stood in the House and promised action to slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, this legislation does this. The RAPID Act is exactly what our private and public sector leaders have called for. It is what millions of American workers yearning for new work and hoping for higher wages need.

But what do we have before us now with this motion to recommit? It is the exact mirror image of everything that is wrong with the Federal permitting process and keeps jobs from the American people.

We have a trumped up argument, a procedural device, a tried and true tactic of delay—an excuse for Members of Congress to duck a vote and not make a needed decision that will bring millions of good, high-paying jobs to the American people.

It is time that the bureaucrats in D.C. and it is time that we, elected officials, clearly understand that we work for the American people and that the American people are the government of the United States.

It is time for we, the Members of the House and the Senate, to take the handcuffs off private industry, the job creators, and remove the boot of delay and procrastination from the throat of prosperity. Vote against this motion, and vote for the RAPID Act.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 2641, if ordered, and suspension of the rules with regard to H.R. 4152.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 217, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

AYES—190

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
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—217

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
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
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
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—23

Barton
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
McKeon
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Roskam
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1447

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 229, noes 179, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

AYES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Daines
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
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
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
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
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
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)

NOES—179

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
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
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
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

Barton
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1454

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVISION OF COSTS OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4152) to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 23, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—385

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NAYS—23

Amash
Bentivolio
Broun (GA)
Campbell
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Gohmert
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Kingston
Massie
McAllister
Mulvaney
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Sanford
Stockman
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Amodei
Barton
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Poe (TX)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1501

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker on rollcall vote No. 114 on March 6, 2014, for H.R. 4152, to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine, I was recorded as voting "no" when I wanted to be recorded as voting "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unable to vote in Washington, DC and missed the following votes:

1) Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2641 and H.R. 2824. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

2) H. Res. 501—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2641 and H.R. 2824. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

3) Smith (TX)/Schweikert Amendment to H.R. 3826—Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment.

4) Capps/McNerney Amendment to H.R. 3826—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

5) Schakowsky/Lowenthal Amendment to H.R. 3826—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

6) Waxman Amendment to H.R. 3826—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

7) Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3826. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion to recommit.

8) Final Passage of H.R. 3826—Electricity Security and Affordability Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

9) Motion to Table the Fudge Privileged Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion to table.

10) Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

11) McKinley Amendment to H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment.

12) Nadler Amendment to H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

13) Johnson (GA) Amendment to H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

14) Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion to recommit.

15) Final Passage of H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

16) H.R. 4152—To Provide for the Cost of Loan Guarantees for Ukraine—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Today, in a strong bipartisan vote, the House passed a bill to provide the administration with the authority to extend loan guarantees to the government in Ukraine, and I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his support, along with Chairman HAL ROGERS and Ranking Member NITA LOWEY. I urge the Senate to act promptly on this bill and send it to the President for his signature.

Building upon this support, I expect the House to consider a resolution under suspension next week to express our support for the people of Ukraine and their territorial integrity.

In addition, the House will consider a number of bills to address the executive overreach of the Obama administration. Mr. Speaker, these bills are designed to restore the balance of power created by our Founders and require that this President faithfully execute our Nation's laws. The House will consider the following bills to reestablish the rule of law:

H.R. 3973, the Faithful Execution of Law Act, authored by Representative RON DESANTIS, to require Federal officials to report to Congress when the administration fails to faithfully enforce current law;

H.R. 4138, the ENFORCE Act, sponsored by Representative TREY GOWDY, to establish procedures under which the House, or the Senate, may authorize a lawsuit against the executive branch for failure to faithfully execute laws; and

H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act, authored by Representative SCOTT TIPTON, to ensure privately held water rights.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as you know, the patch for the Medicare sustainable growth rate expires at the end of the month. For this reason, I expect the House to consider H.R. 4015, the SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014, sponsored by Representative MICHAEL BURGESS, next week. This completely paid-for bill will replace the flawed SGR formula.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given to us.

Let me say that on Ukraine, I think the House acted properly. It acted in a timely fashion to express the views of this House with respect to the Russian violation of international law and the agreements that they have with Ukraine, and I am pleased we were able to join together to pass that through the House. Hopefully the Senate will pass it quickly.

I just make the observation that the Senate I know believes that the reform of IMF will be important to work with that extension. We will see what happens on that. I thank the gentleman and his side of the aisle for acting promptly. We were pleased to join in that action.

Let me ask the gentleman, the gentleman mentioned as we know that by March 31 the authorization for the sustainable growth rate payment will expire and the payment to physicians for Medicare services will be substantially reduced under present law. There is, I think, a strong feeling by many of us that this needs to be fixed. It needs to be fixed permanently, and it needs to be paid for.

It is my understanding that the bill H.R. 4015, a bipartisan agreement on the SGR payment policy, as the gentleman knows, does not have a pay-for in it. Is it my understanding that that will be amended before it is brought to the floor, or will there be an amendment on the floor to add the pay-for?

I yield to the gentleman

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We all are concerned about the SGR fix. We have seen this movie more than four, five, six times. Physicians were in town this week explaining to us exactly the impact of not getting this done on time, so that their billing systems and their cash flows are not interrupted. We have a keen interest in small businesses, which are most physician offices, so there is a keen interest to do that. That will be amended on the floor to include the pay-for that will offset the SGR.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Let me clarify, Mr. Speaker, this will be under a rule and there will be an amendment made in order to add the pay-for; is that correct?

Mr. CONAWAY. No, the pay-for will be added through the Rules Committee.

Mr. HOYER. So before it comes to the floor, it will be paid for.

I ask the gentleman, it is my understanding that the pay-for, I don't know if I am accurate on this, but my understanding is that the pay-for is the repeal of the individual mandate. If so, can the gentleman tell me whether he has any indication that the Senate would be in agreement on that, and I say that because obviously there hasn't been agreement in the past, and if we use that as a pay-for, it seems to me it puts at risk meeting the March 31 deadline.

Mr. CONAWAY. The specifics of the pay-for have not yet been finalized. There are lots of things under consideration. We, too, want this done in advance of the March 31 date so, like I said earlier, physician offices can continue their billing as is without the interruption that a failure to extend or fix the doc fix would cause. We are keen on making that work, and the specifics of what the pay-for will be are currently under discussion.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I would say I am hopeful in light of the fact that the bill itself is a bipartisan, or at least the two committees have agreed on it, and I think there is general agreement on the fix for the SGR, but the pay-fors have been contentious. I would hope that, as the bill has been a product of agreement, that the pay-for, which is essential, would also be a product of that. I would hope we would see a bill come to the floor that does have agreement of both sides of the aisle so we can, as the gentleman points out and we fully agree, ensure that the SGR is fixed and put on a sustainable path for our Medicare and for the provider community prior to March 31. I would hope that could happen.

Next, I don't know whether the gentleman has watched colloquies in the past, but the majority leader and I have had an ongoing discussion about immigration reform. Both of us believe

the immigration system is broken. Both of us believe it needs to be fixed. Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any likelihood of an immigration bill coming to the floor anytime soon? Again, we have a relatively short period of time left to go, and we believe this legislation is one of the most important pieces that are pending on the agenda, and I would be, as I told the majority leader, very inclined to try to work with the majority on behalf of the minority, and I know the minority would like to get an immigration reform bill that we can both agree on passed as soon as possible.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is nothing scheduled for next week, and I would tell the minority whip, beyond that I am not aware of any further scheduling other than I know it is not next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I hope if it is not next week, it will be soon. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2014

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 10, 2014, and that the order of the House of January 7, 2014, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that date.

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

There was no objection.

## MILITARY SERVICE IS NOT ENTITLEMENT TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, recently recorded in political dialogue was a statement about one of my colleagues somehow feeling that his military service ''entitled him to a seat in Congress.''

Mr. Speaker, no one in the military feels that their service entitles them to anything. I am deeply disappointed in the implication that because I served my country, I feel entitled to serve in this esteemed body—or, for that matter, to anything. My colleague didn't pledge an oath of service to God and country because he felt he would get something in return.

Mr. Speaker, this type of statement not only is regrettable, reprehensible, and offensive, but it diminishes the sanctity of military service and those who tirelessly and selflessly dedicate themselves to it.

□ 1515

## VETERANS UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate for veterans is more than 10 percent. 900,000 veterans receive food stamps each month. Nearly $104 million in food stamps were redeemed at military commissaries in fiscal year 2013, yet the majority has repeatedly failed to bring the extension of unemployment insurance to a vote.

Since it expired last year, more than 2 million individuals, including 200,000 veterans, have been cut off from this vital lifeline.

I know firsthand how important this program is for hardworking veterans. After I completed flight school and returned home to Illinois, I relied on unemployment insurance to help me transition back to civilian life.

The unemployment rate for veterans recently separated from the military is now sitting at 10 percent. 246,000 veterans who served since 9/11 are now out of work.

For those coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan, this transition has been especially challenging. They have enough to worry about without suffering from cuts to unemployment insurance.

Taking an up-or-down vote on extending unemployment insurance is the right thing to do, Mr. Speaker. We need to renew this for those searching for jobs and those who are getting back on their feet.

Our veterans and unemployed have not given up on finding work, and we cannot give up on them.

## MAKE COMMON SENSE CHANGES TO END HUNGER

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans, led by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, criticize our Nation's antipoverty programs. Some want to drastically change them, and others want to eliminate them altogether. Over the past 6 months, we have seen $19 billion in cuts to SNAP alone, our Nation's premier antihunger program.

Participation in SNAP reached an all-time high a few years ago because of the Great Recession, the worst economic period since the Great Depression. That is because people were either unemployed or underpaid.

If you want to reduce SNAP participation, it is simple: put more people back to work and better paying jobs. Yesterday, the Center for American Progress released a report showing how easy one step is. They found that increasing the minimum wage to $10.10 would move about 3.5 million people off of SNAP, simply because they wouldn't need it.

We shouldn't arbitrarily cut antipoverty programs like SNAP. We must make commonsense changes like increasing the minimum wage if we are truly going to end hunger in this country.

## WELCOME HOME STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS LAVERY

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Nicholas Lavery from Medway, Massachusetts.

Nick graduated from UMass with a degree in criminal justice and enrolled in the Special Forces in 2007. After graduating as a distinguished honor graduate from the Special Forces Qualification Course, he became a Green Beret.

There is an excerpt from a letter that I wanted to share with you that Nick left his loved ones when he first deployed.

> If I should fall, do not let your heart fill with sadness. Know that I passed doing what I love to do, what I believe in, what brings me happiness, that is protecting those who cannot fend for themselves, protecting the United States of America, and all those who I love so dearly. Look back on me with kindness and happiness, be happy knowing that I could not have chosen a better way to go.
>
> With love filling my body for my friends and family, I tried to always be there for you all. Whether the shirt off my back or somebody's teeth, if you needed it, I would get it for you. Happiness was brought to me through the eyes of my loved ones. Seeing you all happy brought me such joy.
>
> I live for you. I never wanted money, accommodations, or even any sort of recognition. None was necessary. I hope I served you all well. I gave it my all. No need for thank you. The pleasure was all mine.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, Nick Lavery will be coming home, loved, alive, and a hero.

Since enlisting in 2007, Nick has been awarded three Purple Hearts. In the spring of 2013, Nick and his team were involved in a green-on-blue attack, which is a strike against coalition members by people dressed in their own uniform. Nick sustained injuries to his right leg during that attack and subsequently had it amputated below his knee.

He will receive a Silver Star with Valor and a Bronze Star with Valor at Fort Bragg on March 27.

After over a year in Walter Reed, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the town of Medway is proud to say to Nick: welcome home.

## PLANT VOGTLE

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Department of Energy's recent loan guarantee for Plant Vogtle in Burke County, Georgia. Plant Vogtle is the first nuclear power plant built in the United

States in almost 3 decades, and I am proud to represent the district where our Nation's nuclear renaissance has begun.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have supported the expanded use of nuclear power as part of a comprehensive energy policy. Plant Vogtle will not only provide safe, reliable energy for Georgians, but it will also create the kind of good-paying jobs that we need.

The expansion of Plant Vogtle will create 5,000 jobs at the height of construction and 800 permanent jobs after construction is complete.

The Federal Government's guarantee is expected to save Georgia electric customers nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in interest expense—a direct dollar-for-dollar savings for Georgia customers, Georgia workers, and Georgia businesses.

This is exactly the sort of investment the Federal Government should be making. At virtually no risk to the Federal taxpayer, we save money for Georgia taxpayers as they pay for the infrastructure that will create good-paying jobs that support the lifestyles of virtually everyone else in the Georgia economy.

I commend all of the stakeholders for coming to this agreement, and I look forward to all of the good things that it will lead to.

## HONORING REV. DR. LAFAYETTE FERNANDEZ CHANEY, SR.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, with great sympathy and sadness, I rise to pay tribute to the late Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., the extraordinary leader who touched the lives of many through his education and religious endeavors.

Under his leadership, Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston experienced tremendous growth, both spiritually and financially. The beloved Rev. Dr. Chaney was requested to join our Lord on Friday, February 28, 2014; and he was 96 years old.

He gained his bachelor of arts and his bachelor of divinity from Paul Quinn, got a master of arts degree from Texas Southern University, studied for his doctorate at Baylor, and received his doctorate from Texas Southern University.

He was a teacher. He taught mathematics and science at Moore High School. He taught it in Waco at the Oakwood Elementary School. He taught at Waltrip Senior High School. He loved children.

He was someone who was a builder. He had professional memberships in a lot of educational associations. He was pastor at a number of churches, but his greatest gift and his greatest cherished memory was the pastorship for 50 years at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church.

Even when the church was without a home and he had to hold the congregation together to help build the beautiful church that we have, he was there to support and grow that church.

He, as well, was someone who enjoyed leadership in a variety of organizations and was courageous enough to appoint the first female minister at the Damascus Missionary Baptist Church, Evangelist LaSandra Easter.

I enjoyed, Mr. Speaker, my time with Pastor Chaney and visiting him at his last church commemoration—his anniversary and the church anniversary. It was my pleasure to be with him to share in the glory of the celebration of his wonderful life. He has run a great race. He has finished the course. He has gone on to receive his great reward.

I ask this body to have a moment of silence in his honor.

Thank you, Reverend Chaney, for being a great Houstonian and a great Texan and, yes, a great American.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Rev. Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., the extraordinary leader who touched the lives of many through his educational and eccliastical endeavors. Under his leadership, Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston experienced tremendous growth, both spiritually and financially. The beloved Rev. Dr. Chaney was requested to join our Lord on Friday, February 28, 2014 as he departed this life at 9:30am. He was 96 years old.

Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., was born March 27, 1917 in Waco, Texas to proud and loving parents, Adell and Tom W. Chaney. He was educated in the public schools of Waco and Le Vega Independent School District, graduating from Moore High School in Waco, Texas.

Rev. Dr. Chaney received both his Bachelors of Arts and Bachelors of Divinity Degrees from Paul Quinn College. He received his Master of Arts Degree from Texas Southern University and studied in the doctorate program at Baylor University from 1968 to 1975. In August 1982, he received his Doctorate Degree in Higher Education from Texas Southern University.

Rev. Dr. Chaney taught mathematics and science at Moore High School in Waco, Texas for twelve years and was principal of Oakwood Elementary School in Waco, Texas for eleven years. From 1972 to 1986, he taught mathematics and psychology at Waltrip Senior High School in Houston. During the same period, he was an adjunct professor of mathematics and psychology for Houston Community College.

Reverend Dr. Chaney's professional memberships and honors include: past president of Waco Classroom Teachers Association, Waco Administrators Association and the Central Texas District Teachers Association. In 1965, he was nominated for "Who's Who" amongst professional men in Texas. He was a member of the American Association of University Professors, Phi Delta Kappa and Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternities.

He was pastor of the following churches: Little Tehuacana Baptist Church in rural Waco, Texas; Sweethome Baptist Church in Mexia, Texas; First Baptist Church in Thornton, Texas; Second Baptist Church in Itasca, Texas, Shiloh Baptist Church in Madisonville, Texas and served as Senior Pastor for 50 plus years at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston, Texas.

He served as Senior Advisor of the Youth Convention of the General Baptist Convention of Texas, Teacher of the Youth Department of the National Baptist Convention of America, Director of the Ushers and Nurses of the Independent General Association of Texas, member of the Evangelical Board of the General Baptist Convention of Texas, and President of Union Bible College in Houston.

His crowning glory was completing his life as Senior Pastor of Damascus Missionary Baptist Church. During this time, he successfully held the congregation together during the homeless years from May 25, 2003 through September 2, 2007, while the church's new home at its current location was being constructed.

Rev. Dr. Chaney also made history by appointing the first female minister at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church, Evangelist LaSandra Easter.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Dr. Chaney lived a consequential life and made a difference. He has run the great race; he has finished the course. He has gone on to receive his great reward: a place in the Lord's loving arms.

I ask that a moment of silence be observed in memory of the Rev. Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr.

## PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION THANK YOU

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Barack Obama for signing the Presidential proclamation recognizing March 2014 as Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.

I would also like to give a special thanks to the 146 Members of Congress who signed onto the letter I authored and sent to the President requesting the issuance of this proclamation.

Finally, but more importantly, thank you to the colorectal cancer community who have given their time, sweat, and tears to raise awareness about prevention and early detection. Our efforts have not gone unnoticed.

This month, the highest office in the land, the President of the United States, brought national attention to our fight.

What better way to pay tribute by remembering those who have lost their battles to colon cancer, such as my late father, the honorable Congressman Donald Payne, Sr., who I followed into Congress, who lost his battle with cancer 2 years ago today.

This proclamation honors his memory and it honors those who are fighting the battle against colon cancer today.

## MONEY AND POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of money

and politics. I address it knowing that many of my constituents and many Americans across the country are in a pretty bad mood about Washington, about politics as usual, about Congress.

They are angry because they feel like their voice can't be heard. They are frustrated because they feel like somebody else writes the rules, somebody else makes the policy, and their opinions on issues don't matter.

A big part of the reason for that frustration and that anger is they look out and they see these super-PACs and other Big Money campaign donors and PACs and special interests pouring money into Washington, pouring money into our political system.

They feel like those are the folks that call the shots here in Washington, that when it comes time for us to make public policy, too often the institution of Congress leans in the direction of the Big Money and the special interests and away from the priorities and the needs and the concerns and the demands of everyday citizens.

People are pretty smart. Americans are pretty smart. If they are feeling this way, there is probably a good reason for it. When you do the research, when you track the numbers, when you look at the amount of money that is pouring in here, it is no wonder that Americans have become cynical and angry and fed up and disillusioned. It is no wonder that the favorability rating—the approval rating of this institution is as low as it is.

Let's look at some of those numbers. In the 2012 election cycle, Big Energy—the big energy industry poured $140 million into Congressional campaigns. That is in one election cycle. They spent another $380 million on lobbying expenditures here in the city of Washington, here on Capitol Hill.

Wall Street, they were at the top of the list. Again, in one election cycle, in the 2012 election cycle, the financial industry contributed $660 million to Congressional campaigns and spent another $490 million—almost a half a billion dollars—on lobbying up here on Capitol Hill.

Sometimes, we ask ourselves—and I know my constituents ask me, and I know Americans raise this from time to time—how is it the case that an industry like the oil and gas industry in 2011 posted profits—the top five oil and gas companies posted profits of $132 billion?

How is it that an industry like that continues to get taxpayer subsidies every year to the tune of $5 billion? How are they able to preserve that loophole when they are making all those profits and they don't need that taxpayer subsidy? How does that come to pass?

Well, I just read you the numbers. If you are pouring $140 million into campaigns and you are spending another $380 million on lobbying, you can keep those loopholes in place.

Why can't we close some of these loopholes that Wall Street and the financial industry enjoys? The same answer applies. Look at how much influence is coming from the money that pours in from those industries.

When Americans feel in their gut that somehow their voice isn't being heard and it is the interests of Big Money that rules the roost around here, there is a factual basis for that, and it is something that we need to address.

□ 1530

Whatever the priority is that Americans care about—whether it is jobs and the budget, whether it is health care and education, whether it is protecting our environment, whether it is reining in the influence of Wall Street and making sure that important regulations are in place—whatever the priority is that Americans want to see, the fact of the matter is that Big Money gets in the way of those priorities. It pours into campaigns; it pours into lobbying shops; and it stops often coming out of the gate these priorities that everyday Americans put at the top of their lists. It is no wonder that so many Americans are fed up. In fact, when you talk to them, when you get them to start talking about how they really feel, the fact of the matter is that many are downright disgusted by the influence that Big Money has on our politics and on our government.

We have got figure out what to do about this. If we want to reclaim some of the trust of the American people, if we want Americans to have confidence that their government is actually working for them, we have got to address this problem. The first step to any recovery is to recognize the problem, and the fact of the matter is that the institution of Congress is too dependent upon Big Money and special interests. As a result, when it comes time to make public policy, it leans away from the public's interest and in the direction of the special interests.

So what can we do?

A month ago, joined by 128 original cosponsors, I introduced the Government by the People Act. This is a first step. This will not cure all of the ills that bedevil Congress and Washington, and it is not waving a magic wand, but it is an important first step in Americans' being able to say: We want to take our government back from the special interests and Big Money. We want our government to work for us.

The Government by the People Act is premised on the idea that we have to put ordinary Americans—everyday citizens—at the center of the funding of campaigns and take that away from the PACs and the special interests and the Big Money campaign donors. The fact that we had so many cosponsors on this bill at the point of introduction, I think, shows that Members of this institution are hearing from their constituents and understand the anger and frustration that is out there and recognize that they need to do something about it. Let me tell you about the Government by the People Act because it is really designed to make sure that the voices of everyday citizens are as powerful as the voices of the Big Money campaign donors.

The first thing it does is to provide a $25 tax credit, what we are calling the My Voice Tax Credit—a $25 refundable tax credit—to any American who makes a contribution to a congressional campaign in both of the 2 years of the election cycle.

Now, why did we do that?

If you look at the numbers right now, you will see that a very small percentage of Americans actually participates in the funding of campaigns. The funding is dominated by a small group that tends to be of the more wealthy citizens in society, and ordinary Americans out there are not getting into the role of helping to power campaigns on the funding side. We want to encourage them to do that. We want to say to those citizens who want to support a good candidate who is turning to them and listening to their concerns: If you are willing to put $15 or $20 or $25 behind that candidate who stands for the right thing, we will help you do that. We will provide this tax credit to make it a little bit easier for you to step up and be a part of the solution.

So the My Voice Tax Credit does exactly that. It gives a voice back to everyday citizens who feel right now like their voices can't be heard, like they are not empowered to participate in the system, to participate in the solution. That is why we created the My Voice Tax Credit, and that is the first important element of the Government by the People Act.

The second is that we want to make sure that the voice of the everyday citizen can be loud enough to compete with the big money out there, so we created something called the Freedom From Influence Matching Fund. This would provide matching dollars that would come in behind those grassroots donations and boost them up—amplify the voice of the grassroots—so that now those everyday citizens can get the attention of candidates or of Members of Congress who might otherwise be inclined to go spend their time on K Street or on raising money from Big Money campaign donors. Now they have an incentive to go do a house party back in their districts and raise small donations, knowing that those matching funds will come in behind it, and they will be able to raise sufficient dollars to run competitive campaigns.

So we combine those two elements to try to change the way campaigns are funded—the My Voice Tax Credit to promote those small donations, those grassroots donations, and the Freedom From Influence Matching Funds to come in behind it and amplify it so the voices of everyday people can actually be heard, can actually compete with the megaphone that Big Money has and special interests have. That is what the Government by the People Act is designed to do—to empower everyday

citizens to really have a voice again in their own democracy.

The third piece is just as critical. Over the last two election cycles, Americans have seen the spending by super-PACs and by outside groups go through the roof, and they have been turned off by it. They know that there are good candidates who run for office who make a strong case on issues that matter to the public but that they get into those last 60 days—the home stretch of a campaign—and suddenly a super-PAC comes in and pours money into negative advertising, and before you know it that candidate's voice is wiped off the playing field. So we said that, in that home stretch—in those 60 days—we wanted to make sure, of a candidate who chooses to participate in this system, who chooses to reach out to everyday citizens and lift their voices up, that that candidate's own voice would be able to stay in the mix, because that candidate's voice represents the voices of thousands of small donors and other supporters who have stepped up behind him. So, in the last 60 days, candidates who choose to participate in this system would get the benefit of some additional dollars to help them stay in the game, to help keep their voices in the mix, up to Election Day.

There is evidence, Mr. Speaker, to show that, of candidates who work hard to reach out and build relationships with their constituents, if they can get enough dollars in that final stage to stay in the game—to keep their voices there, to keep representing the interests of everyday citizens—then even if a super-PAC or some outside group comes in and throws a lot of money at them, they can still prevail. That is the way it ought to be. Candidates who are doing the right thing—Members of Congress who are trying to serve their constituents and lift up the voices of their constituents—ought to be able to survive the process where some outside group is coming in and trying to wipe them off the face of the map.

So those are the three pieces of the Government by the People Act—the My Voice Tax Credit to encourage and help everyday citizens participate on the funding side of campaigns, a Freedom From Influence Matching Fund that will come in behind that and provide matching dollars to amplify the voices of the grassroots and everyday citizens, and then some extra dollars in that final stretch for participating candidates who suddenly face an attack from a super-PAC or from some other outside group so that their voices and the voices of the people they represent, who have invested in them, can still be heard.

I have talked about why this is so important in terms of changing the perception that Americans have of Washington and Congress, the notion that if everyday citizens feel that Members of Congress can continue to represent them because they are the ones who powered their campaigns instead of the special interests and Big Money being the ones to underwrite their campaigns that that can begin to restore some confidence. It won't change it overnight—it won't cure all the ills of this place—but it will begin to restore some confidence on the part of everyday citizens that their voices can actually be heard here, that when the campaign is over and governing begins, this institution will continue to listen to them because they are the ones who helped to lift that candidate up on his shoulders.

I want to come at it from another angle for a moment. If you have a system like this that allows a good, strong candidate who knows how to reach out and network in his district to be competitive, you will see a different kind of person coming to Washington. Right now, more than half of the people who serve in Congress are millionaires. That is not surprising because, to run for office, you need a lot of money, and you need to know a lot of people who have a lot of money—that is the reality—but if you have a system where small donors and matching funds can lift up a candidate and power his campaign, you will get people running for Congress and being competitive who in the past would never have had a chance.

I was recently in Maine or in New Hampshire, and I sat on a panel with a legislator from Maine. In Maine, they have a system that helps candidates who reach out to the grassroots be able to assemble the funds to be competitive. This legislator said, but for that system, she would not be a member of the Maine State Legislature because she wouldn't have been able to raise the dollars she needed to run for office and represent the people in her district, but because a system like that existed, she is now in the Maine State Legislature.

I believe that we would see people competing for Congress and succeeding and being elected who right now have no way to access this place, and those are the kinds of people who represent the broad American constituency. Another way to begin restoring people's faith in this institution is if they look here and they say: Do you know what? There is somebody who is a community activist in my district. There is somebody who volunteered at my church who decided to get into politics, who decided to put his name in the ring. Because there is a system for funding campaigns now that combines small donations with matching funds, that person was able to run and compete and be elected. I think that that will lift up many Americans and make them believe that their voices actually make a difference here, that their voices can be heard.

I want to put this in another context as well. There are many things that we can do to try to address the influence of Big Money in our politics. We need more disclosure and transparency in terms of where these independent expenditures are coming from. I support the DISCLOSE Act, which is sponsored by my colleague, Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, because Americans deserve to know where this big money comes from and who is spending it so they can make a judgment about whether that is fair and whether the people to whom that money is going ought to be representing them here in Washington. We need that transparency and we need that disclosure. That is an important reform.

It is important also, I believe, to try to address the decisions of this Supreme Court, in particular the Citizens United decision, which basically took the lid off of outside campaign spending and expenditures by these super-PACs and other independent groups, and has resulted in this flood of negative campaign commercials and advertising to come in in the final weeks and months of the campaign cycle.

□ 1545

So we need to address that.

There are proposals that have been introduced in this body for a constitutional amendment that would rein in the spending of these outside groups. I think we need to address that, too. Those are important measures that we need to undertake. I also think it is critically important that there be something that is part of the reform agenda that has to do with empowering everyday citizens.

If you think about it, disclosure and putting limits on the spending of these outside groups and super PACs is about reining in the conduct and the behavior of the bad actors out there—the people who have kind of gone too far, but we also have to do something to empower and lift up the good actors—everyday citizens who just want to see their government do the right thing and who have commonsense solutions and want the people they elect to Congress to reflect that commonsense perspective.

That is why we need the Government by the People Act. It would create a system that would empower everyday citizens. It would allow them to feel that their voice is being heard and that they are not just standing back as observers watching the titans, the Big Money players, the super PACs sort of duking it out in the ring like two professional wrestlers, but that they can participate.

Everyday citizens could step in the ring and say, You know what? My voice is just as important as the voice of that big donor, and I demand to be heard. That is what that everyday citizen is saying. They want their voice to be heard, but we have got to give them a system that will allow for that.

We called this bill the Government by the People Act because when I, and others, listen to Americans across the country, we hear them saying, We are tired of a government that appears to be of, by, and for the special interests

and the Big Money. Put very simply, we want our government back. We want it back.

The Government by the People Act is an attempt to begin to change business as usual and to create a system that will give government back to the people that it is supposed to represent. That is our only path back to relevancy, in the eyes of the general public. That is our only path back to restoring a trust and confidence that we need as an institution in order to get things done, and let me tell you something: when it comes to relevancy and trust and confidence, we are hanging on by a thread right now.

When you look at the polls and the surveys in terms of what people think about Washington, and they feel that the priorities of this place have become Big Money and special interests, in the minds of most Americans, our relevancy is hanging by a thread.

We need to do something. The Government by the People Act is a reform that can begin to reclaim government and democracy and the political system back for everyday citizens out there that are so frustrated with what is going on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic. I am optimistic by nature. I think we can get this reform. When we introduced the bill, we had 128 cosponsors at the point of introduction. We have 140 as of today.

I think Members of this body themselves are at a point where they want to see something different. A lot of Members of Congress are exhausted by the current system. They wish they could raise money a different way. They wish they could run their campaigns and fund their campaigns by turning to the people they represent instead of having to chase the PAC money and the Big Money and the special interests all the time.

There is something wrong with an equation where people go into the voting booth, they pull the lever for you and send you to Washington to represent them, and the day you get to Washington, you have to start representing the Big Money and the special interests because that is the only way you can raise money to fund your campaign.

Let's think about it in those terms. What happens to the franchise when somebody gets here and they have to turn their back on the people who elected them because they have got to go raise the money from someplace else?

What if the place you went to power your campaigns was back to your constituents—everyday citizens—because you had a system that would match their small donations and be able to lift a candidate up and power them forward? That would change the way things operate around here.

I invite people listening to this to go back through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the statements of Members of the House and the Senate who announce their retirement and—sometimes within 24 hours—go to the floor of the Senate or the House and talk about the problem of money and politics and how corrosive it has become. Liberated finally from the current system by the fact that they have decided to move on, they are able to stand back and in a clear-eyed and candid way talk about this problem of influence that comes from Big Money and special interests and what it is doing to this place.

I want to read you a quote because I think this really goes right to the heart of the matter. People are fed up with the gridlock and dysfunction here. We can connect a lot of that to this issue of money and politics.

Let me read you a quote from 1982:

> When political action committees give money, they expect something in return other than good government. It is making it much more difficult to legislate. We may reach a point where if everybody is buying something with PAC money, we can't get anything done.

Do you know who said that in 1982? Robert Dole, the minority leader at that time and a Republican Member of the U.S. Senate. That was in 1982.

The influence of Big Money on our politics and on our governing has metastasized since then, but even then, on the front edge of this trend, Bob Dole could see what it would do to the institution, and he was lamenting it.

So a public that is upset about gridlock and dysfunction of this place needs a solution that will address the influence Big Money has here. Because that will help, I think, change the whole way in which we operate. Other Members have made similar comments, as I mentioned a moment ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am optimistic. I think we have a good piece of legislation. I think it goes to the heart and tries to address a lot of the cynicism that so many Americans have out there that their voice can't be heard.

I want to mention that we have at this stage over 40 national organizations who have gotten behind this legislation. This is a new development. We have had reform bills in the past—good ones—but they didn't have that kind of broad support from grassroots organizations across the country—civil rights groups like the NAACP; environmental groups like the Sierra Club and Green Peace; labor groups who have been out there trying to address the issues of working families, like CWA and others.

Why are they coming to this? Because they figured out what the American people have figured out. The good things they want to see when it comes to the environment or to creating jobs or to making sure people are treated fairly in this society, all those good things are being thwarted by the influence that Big Money has over the way this institution operates.

So they are coming to this fight now, saying, If we care about the environment, if we care about jobs, if we care about economic justice, we have to adopt reforming the way campaigns are funded as part of our own efforts.

Already, within the first 3 or 4 weeks since we introduced the bill, over 400,000 citizen cosponsors from across the country have signed petitions supporting the Government by the People Act because they understand that this reform is meaningful and will make a difference.

So I am optimistic that we can get this done. We are not going to get it done tomorrow. We are not going to get it done next week. But with the opportunity to channel in a constructive way some of this anger and cynicism and frustration that the American people are feeling right now that their voice is not heard, if we have a vehicle to channel that and organize it into a strong momentum, then when the opportunity presents itself to actually achieve this reform, I think we can do it.

I think that if we don't do it, Americans will finally turn away completely from this place and say, You can't help us any more.

That is what is at stake here: the relevancy of this institution and the relevancy of this, the people's House, to the people, and until we address the problem of the influence of Big Money over our system, we are not going to be able to reclaim the confidence and the trust of the American people.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I close, I wanted to tell the story of a person in my district. A couple of years ago, he came to one of my house parties. He is a longtime supporter of mine. He came up to me after the House party was over and said, Look, I would like to contribute $25 to your campaign.

He said, I can't do more than that. I can't afford more than that, but I would like to do it. I would be proud to do it. I just don't know if it will make a difference. Will it matter?

He was, I think, saying what many Americans are saying, which is, Do our voices count? Can we really compete with the Big Money out there? Is anybody listening to us?

That is what he was saying to me.

If we can pass legislation like the Government by the People Act and create a new way of funding our campaign that puts everyday citizens in the middle of the equation, make them the ones to sort of solve this problem for us, and empower them, then I will be able to say to constituents like that person who came up to me and was feeling marginalized by the current system, Not only are you relevant, not only is your voice important, your voice is the most important part of the way we power campaigns in this country.

That is the message we need to send. That is the outreach we need to do.

So we can move with this legislation from a system of politics, a democracy that is too often of, by, and for the Big

Money campaign donors and the special interests, to a government that truly is of, by, and for the people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE SITUATION IN UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–95)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the ''order'') declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Ukraine.

The order does not target the country of Ukraine, but rather is aimed at persons—including persons who have asserted governmental authority in the Crimean region without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine—who undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets. The order blocks the property and interests in property and suspends entry into the United States of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

- to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following:
  - actions or policies that undermine democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine;
  - actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine; or
  - misappropriation of state assets of Ukraine or of an economically significant entity in Ukraine;
- to have asserted governmental authority over any part or region of Ukraine without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine;
- to be a leader of an entity that has, or whose members have, engaged in any activity described above or of an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order;
- to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described above or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or
- to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 2014.*

□ 1600

## MARCH 6 FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is March 6, and I want to talk about March 6 in a historical perspective, history that is very important that Americans know about.

Yesterday, on the House floor, I talked about the things that are going on in the Ukraine and compared Mr. Putin's aggressive actions toward Europe, similar to the actions of Adolf Hitler and the Nazis.

Before I do that today, I would like to yield some time to two of our Members who have discussions on other issues. First, I would like to yield as much time as he wishes to consume on a different issue to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

### STUTTERING FOUNDATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss something very close to me. I want to talk about stuttering. I have been a lifelong stutterer, and when I was young I experienced some very difficult times, but that is a story really for another day.

More than 70 million people stutter. One in every 100 people in the world stutter. In the U.S., more than 3 million Americans stutter. You probably have a friend, a neighbor, a classmate, a coworker, or a family member who stutters. Most people do.

About 5 percent of all children go through a stuttering phase that lasts 6 months or more. Some will recover by late childhood, but one out of every 100 children will be left with long-term stuttering.

I would like to take this time to tell you a little bit more about stuttering, what it is and how family members and friends can help.

Stuttering is a disorder where the flow of speech is broken by repetition, prolongations, or abnormal stoppages of sounds and syllables. For some people, unusual facial and body movements may happen when they try to speak.

Stuttering is most likely caused by four factors:

One, Genetics;

Two, child development. For example, children with other speech and language problems or developmental delays are more likely to stutter;

Three, the makeup of the brain. An ongoing research study by Dr. Anne Smith with the Purdue University Stuttering Project shows that people who stutter seem to process speech and language differently than those who don't;

And four, lastly, family dynamics have an impact. High expectations and fast-paced lifestyles can also contribute to stuttering.

People who stutter are no different from those who do not stutter. In fact, studies by Dr. Ehud Yairi at the University of Illinois show that people who stutter are as intelligent and as well-adjusted as those who don't.

Contrary to what many people believe, stuttering can be treated. I want to let anyone know out there who stutters or who has a child who stutters, much can be done.

Speech-language pathologists, therapists trained to help deal with speech issues like stuttering often work in schools, clinics, at universities, and in private practice to help treat stuttering.

The most important thing, and many experts agree: early intervention is key. The earlier we can identify stuttering in our children and get them the help they need, the better chances we have at helping them to speak more fluently.

If you stutter, or if a child or loved one stutters, or if you even think they might be stuttering, get help immediately.

One of the best ways to help is by visiting the Stuttering Foundation. The foundation was started by Malcolm Fraser more than 70 years ago. His book, called ''Self-Therapy for the Stutterer,'' was originally published in 1978, and still is one of the best books on stuttering available.

You can visit the foundation's Web site at www.stutteringhelp.org. They have lots of well-trusted, expert information available for free, including Malcolm Fraser's book, as well as countless brochures and videos and other materials for parents and teachers.

Unfortunately, there is no instant miracle cure for stuttering, no surgery, no pills, no intensive weekend retreats. Stuttering takes time and effort and commitment to work through.

Some people outgrow it. Some people respond well to years of therapy and learn to speak fluently, with almost no trace of difficulty. For many others, stuttering becomes a lifelong struggle, as it has for me.

For those of us who stutter, and for the millions of parents with children who stutter, we all know stuttering becomes more challenging for teenagers. Kids can be tough on classmates who stutter and, for some, the teasing and the mocking can be too much.

We must help people who stutter understand that there are many people who know firsthand how difficult it is for someone who stutters, and that help is available.

We need to be patient, kind, understanding, and attentive. We need to know and show that we care.

If you stutter, let me just tell you something: Don't give up. So much can be done.

I thank the gentleman for giving me the time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, I believe history is something that we should remember and talk about.

Today, is March 6. It probably doesn't mean much to a lot of folks in the United States, but to those of us from the State of Texas, March 6 is an important day.

I want to put it in context. There are 3 important, very important days for those of us from Texas, March 2, March 6, and April 21, and I will get to the significance in just a moment.

Many, many years ago, parts of Texas, Mexico, Central America, and even South America, were controlled by the European country of Spain. It controlled all of that area.

The people of Mexico decided that they wanted to have their own independent country. It sounds familiar, does it not?

They rebelled against the Spanish, and they formed the Republic of Mexico. They established a Constitution. It was called the Constitution of 1824.

As sometimes happens with new democracies, the President takes over. His name was Santa Anna. Santa Anna, when he took power legally, constitutionally, under a democratic regime, did what some dictators, unfortunately, still do. He abolished the government. He abolished the Constitution of 1824. He created a centralist, authoritarian government.

But several areas, states, if you will, in Mexico dissented, objected, vocally objected, even rebelled. Those areas of Mexico were Coahuila y Tejas, the state of Coahuila and Texas; Durango; Jalisco; Nuevo Leon; Queretaro; San Luis Potosi; Tamaulipas; Yucatan; Zacatecas; and a couple of others.

Most of those areas, those states did nothing more than just object, dissent, and quickly Santa Anna moved in to quell any disruption or disturbances.

But there were three of those areas that actually formed their own republics, if you will. There was the Republic of the Rio Grande, the Republic of the Yucatan, and the Republic of Texas.

Santa Anna quickly, of course, moved to stop these new countries, if you will, areas, that were seeking independence from this totalitarian dictator named Santa Anna. As history has shown, they all failed—except the Republic of Texas.

That is what I would like to talk about this evening, Mr. Speaker. What happened in Texas was that the people objected, people of all races, both Tejanos—and Tejano is a uniquely Texan name; a Tejano is someone of Mexican or Spanish descent that is, or was, born in what is now Texas—and the Anglos as well dissented, objected to Santa Anna's imperialistic dictatorship.

It started over a cannon. In October of 1835, the Mexican government sent some military over to the little town of Gonzalez, Texas, and demanded that the colonists, the people there, give up their cannon, their arms, and they objected. They refused to do it, and so there was a skirmish between the Mexican regulars and the colonists who lived in Gonzalez.

Shots were fired on both sides. I don't know that anybody was really hurt too bad. A couple of folks were wounded. More importantly, the Mexican military left, and they did not get the cannon, and thus started the Texas War of Independence.

You may have heard of the flag, the Come and Take It flag. The Texians, as they called themselves, painted a cannon on a white background and wrote underneath it, ''Come and Take It,'' being defiant.

In any event, that started the battle. That started the Texas War of Independence against a dictator, a person who had abolished, remember, the Constitution of the Republic of Mexico.

Santa Anna then decided he would put down this rebellion, all of these rebellions that I talked about, and he successfully did so in other parts of Mexico, in those areas that I had mentioned. Then he moves across the Rio Grande River with three different armies coming into Texas to put down this so-called rebellion against his dictatorship.

So the first battles of Texas independence were successful, in 1835, October of 1835, and that brought us into 1836.

Success was not the norm in 1836. On March 2, 1836, 54 Texans, including Lorenzo De Zavala, Thomas Rusk, Antonio Navarro, and that famous person, Sam Houston, gathered not too far from San Antonio in a place called Washington-on-the-Brazos, declared their independence from Mexico, wrote a constitution, declaration of independence, rather, very similar to the American Declaration of Independence. It was signed by all of them on March 2, 1836.

Turned out March 2 also happens to be the birthday of Sam Houston. Imagine that. That is the first important date.

Meanwhile, assembled down the road from Texas, declaring independence at Washington-on-the-Brazos, were a group of volunteers. They were all together in this old, beat-up Spanish church that was 150 years old at the time. It was a town called Bear. We know it now as San Antonio.

The place that they assembled themselves to fight off the invasion of the dictator was the Alamo.

This is an artist sketch of the way the Alamo looked at the time that the 187 volunteers defended the place.

□ 1615

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, the flag that is flying over the Alamo was not what a lot of people think, the Lone Star flag, which was the flag of the Republic of Texas, the flag of Texas now. It is the flag of 1824. It is very similar to the Mexican flag.

But what the defenders had done was remove the Mexican eagle and put the number 1824. Why did they do that? Because when they went into the Alamo, what they were wanting—what they were trying to do was reestablish a constitutional government in Mexico, and they wanted the constitution of 1824. That is why that flag flew over the Alamo.

The people who entered the Alamo did so on February 23, 1826. They did so before March 2, before the declaration of independence, because they knew that the invaders were coming under the direction of the president, the dictator, and the general, Santa Anna.

It is interesting, these people who were in the Alamo, they were all volunteers, Mr. Speaker. They came from almost every State in the United States and 13 foreign countries, including Mexico; and I will just mention some of the States that they came from.

They came from Alabama, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, several from Massachusetts. They came from the State of Mississippi, Missouri, as far away as New Hampshire, New Jersey, several folks from New York, North Carolina, Ohio.

A great number came from Pennsylvania and, of course, South Carolina, even one from Rhode Island; and many, many came from the State of Tennessee. There were also native Texans in the Alamo, if you would refer to them as that; and they were the nine—at least nine Tejanos that fell in the Alamo. There may have been more. We don't know. There was also one from Vermont and several from Virginia.

They were also from foreign countries, Denmark, several from England, Ireland, Germany, Scotland, Wales, France, and some other countries as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will now place into the RECORD a list of the defenders who fell at the Alamo and the States or countries that they were from.

THE DEFENDERS OF THE ALAMO

1) Buchanan, James, Alabama; 2) Fishbaugh, William, Alabama; 3) Fuqua, Galba, Alabama; 4) White, Isaac, Alabama; 5) Baker, Isaac G., Arkansas; 6) Thompson, Jesse G., Arkansas; 7) Warnell, Henry, Arkansas; 8) Jennings, Gordon C., Connecticut; 9) Grimes, Albert (Alfred) Calvin, Georgia; 10) Melton, Eliel, Georgia; 11) Shied, Manson,

Georgia; 12) Wells, William, Georgia; 13) Wills, William, Georgia; 14) Lindley, Jonathan L., Illinois; 15) Bailey, Peter James III, Kentucky; 16) Bowie, James, Kentucky; 17) Cloud, Daniel William, Kentucky; 18) Darst, Jacob C., Kentucky; 19) Davis John, Kentucky; 20) Fauntleroy, William H., Kentucky.

21) Gaston, John E., Kentucky; 22) Harris, John, Kentucky; 23) Jackson, William Daniel, Kentucky; 24) Jameson, Green B., Kentucky; 25) Kellogg, John Benjamin, Kentucky; 26) Kent, Andrew, Kentucky; 27) Rutherford, Joseph, Kentucky; 28) Thomas, B. Archer M., Kentucky; 29) Washington, Joseph G., Kentucky; 30) Despallier, Charles, Louisiana; 31) Kerr, Joseph, Louisiana; 32) Ryan, Isaac, Louisiana; 33) Garrand, James W., Louisiana; 34) Smith, Charles S., Maryland; 35) Flanders, John, Mass.; 36) Howell, William D., Mass.; 37) Linn, William, Mass.; 38) Pollard, Amos. Mass.

39) Clark, M.B., Mississippi; 40) Millsaps, Isaac, Mississippi; 41) Moore, Willis A., Mississippi; 42) Pagan, George, Mississippi; 43) Parker, Christopher Adams, Mississippi; 44) Baker, William Charles M., Missouri; 45) Butler, George D., Missouri; 46) Clark, Charles Henry, Missouri; 47) Cottle, George Washington, Missouri; 48) Day, Jerry C., Missouri; 49) Tumlinson, George W., Missouri; 50) Cochran, Robert E., New Hampshire; 51) Stockton, Richard Lucius, New Jersey; 52) Cunningham, Robert W., New York; 53) Dewall, Lewis, New York; 54) Evans, Samuel B., New York; 55) Forsyth, John Hubbard, New York; 56) Jones, John, New York; 57) Tylee, James, New York.

58) Autry, Micajah, North Carolina; 59) Floyd, Dolphin Ward, North Carolina; 60) Parks, William, North Carolina; 61) Scurlock, Mial, North Carolina; 62) Smith, Joshua G., North Carolina; 63) Thomson, John W., North Carolina; 64) Wright, Claiborne, North Carolina; 65) Harrison, William B., Ohio; 66) Holland, Tapely, Ohio; 67) Musselman, Robert, Ohio; 68) Rose, James M., Ohio; 69) Ballentine, John J., Pennsylvania; 70) Brown, James Murry, Pennsylvania; 71) Cain (Cane), John, Pennsylvania; 72) Crossman, Robert, Pennsylvania; 73) Cummings, David P., Pennsylvania; 74) Hannum, James, Pennsylvania; 75) Holloway, Samuel, Pennsylvania; 76) Johnson, William, Pennsylvania; 77) Kimble (Kimbell), George C., Pennsylvania; 78) McDowell, William, Pennsylvania; 79) Reynolds, John Purdy, Pennsylvania; 80) Thurston, John M., Pennsylvania; 81) Williamson, Hiram James, Pennsylvania; 82) Wilson, John, Pennsylvania.

83) Martin, Albert, Rhode Island; 84) Bonham, James Butler, South Carolina; 85) Crawford, Lemuel, South Carolina; 86) Neggan, George, South Carolina; 87) Nelson, Edward, South Carolina; 88) Nelson, George, South Carolina; 89) Simmons, Cleveland Kinloch, South Carolina; 90) Travis, William Barret, South Carolina; 91) Bayliss, Joseph, Tennessee; 92) Blair, John, Tennessee; 93) Blair, Samuel C., Tennessee; 94) Bowman, Jesse B., Tennessee; 95) Campbell, James (Robert), Tennessee; 96) Crockett, David, Tennessee; 97) Daymon, Squire, Tennessee; 98) Dearduff, William, Tennessee; 99) Dickinson, Almeron, Tennessee; 100) Dillard, John Henry, Tennessee; 101) Ewing, James L., Tennessee; 102) Garrett, James Girard, Tennessee.

103) Harrison, Andrew Jackson, Tennessee; 104) Haskell, Charles, M., Tennessee; 105) Hays, John M., Tennessee; 106) Marshall, William, Tennessee; 107) McCoy, Jesse, Tennessee; 108) McKinney, Robert, Tennessee; 109) Miller, Thomas R., Tennessee; 110) Mills, William, Tennessee; 111) Nelson, Andrew M., Tennessee; 112) Robertson, James Waters, Tennessee; 113) Smith, Andrew H., Tennessee; 114) Summerlin, A. Spain, Tennessee; 115) Summers, William E., Tennessee; 116) Taylor, Edward, Tennessee; 117) Taylor, George, Tennessee; 118) Taylor, James, Tennessee; 119) Taylor, William, Tennessee; 120) Walker, Asa, Tennessee; 121) Walker, Jacob, Tennessee.

122) Abamillo, Juan, Texas; 123) Badillo, Juan Antonio, Texas; 124) Espalier, Carlos, Texas; 125) Esparza, Gregorio (Jose Maria), Texas; 126) Fuentes, Antonio, Texas; 127) Jimenez, Damacio, Texas; 128) King, William Phillip, Texas; 129) Lewis, William Irvine, Texas; 130) Lightfoot, William J., Texas; 131) Losoya, Jose Toribio, Texas; 132) Nava, Andres, Texas; 133) Perry, Richardson, Texas; 134) Andross, Miles Deforest, Vermont; 135) Allen, Robert, Virginia; 136) Baugh, John J., Virginia; 137) Carey, William R., Virginia; 138) Garnett, William, Virginia; 139) Goodrich, John Camp, Virginia; 140) Herndon, Patrick Henry, Virginia; 141) Kenny, James, Virginia; 142) Main, George Washington, Virginia; 143) Malone, William T., Virginia; 144) Mitchasson, Edward F., Virginia; 145) Moore, Robert B., Virginia; 146) Northcross, James, Virginia.

147) Zanco, Charles, Denmark; 148) Blazeby, William, England; 149) Bourne, Daniel, England; 150) Brown, George, England; 151) Dennison, Stephen (or Ireland), England; 152) Dimpkins, James R., England; 153) Gwynne, James C., England; 154) Hersee William Daniel, England; 155) Nowlan, James, England; 156) Sewell, Marcus L., England; 157) Starr, Richard, England; 158) Stewart, James E., England; 159) Waters, Thomas, England; 160) Wolfe, Anthony (Avram), England; 161) Wolfe, son age 12, England; 162) Wolfe, son age 11, England.

163) Burns, Samuel E., Ireland; 164) Duvalt, Andrew, Ireland; 165) Evans, Robert, Ireland; 166) Hawkins, Joseph M., Ireland; 167) Jackson, Thomas, Ireland; 168) McGee, James, Ireland; 169) Rusk, Jackson J., Ireland; 170) Rusk, Jackson J., Ireland; 171) Ward, William B., Ireland; 172) Courtman, Henry, Germany; 173) Thomas, Henry, Germany; 174) Ballentine, Richard W., Scotland; 175) McGregor, John, Scotland; Robinson, Isaac, Scotland; 177) Wilson, David L., Scotland; 178) Johnson, Lewis, Wales; 179) Brown, Robert, France.

180) Day, Freeman H.K.; 181) Garvin, John E.; 182) George, James; 183) McCafferty, Edward; 184) Mitchell, William T.; 185) Mitchell, Napoleon B.; 186) Roberts, Thomas H.; 187) Smith, William H.; 188) Sutherland, William Depriest; 189) White, Robert; 190) John (last name unknown).

As I mentioned, they were all volunteers. They did not look like an army. They were everything from lawyers, doctors, shopkeepers, frontiersmen, adventurers, people who had served in other armies. They were all, though, freedom fighters who volunteered to go into the Alamo on February 23.

Commanding the Alamo was my favorite person in all of history, William Barret Travis. William Barret Travis was a lawyer. That is one reason I like him. I am a lawyer. But he was a 27-year-old individual, first born in South Carolina, raised in Alabama, and found his way to Texas; and he was a revolutionary. He wanted independence for the State of Texas—or the Republic of Texas.

He took command of the Alamo, and he sent out ''scouts''—would be the term—asking that people who lived in the area come to the Alamo and help defend the Alamo, fight against this imperialistic dictator, and get Texas independence.

He sent his best friend, who also came from South Carolina, Jim Bonham, out as a scout, along with others—Juan Seguin was one—trying to get folks to come to help out at the Alamo.

Unfortunately, only one small town responded in the affirmative, and that was Gonzales, Texas, where it all began. There were 32 volunteers from Gonzalez, all men—young men—primarily the entire population of Gonzales, Texas, marched from Gonzalez to the Alamo. They were the only reinforcements that were there.

Now, if you would, Mr. Speaker, think about frontier life, the harsh frontier where the male population—basically the entire male population of a small town leaves. They headed to the Alamo where they figured that they were not going to be able to return.

The ones that were left were those strong-willed frontier women and their children, who later had to forge their own history, absent their spouses—remarkable women, remarkable men who went to the Alamo.

It is said, in history, that when these 32 defenders showed up at the Alamo, Travis looked down and said to his friend: They came here to die.

Now, William Barret Travis, in his plea for help to go and fight for liberty, independence—as I told you, most of the folks did not go. They were there already, the ones that were going to fight. He sent out many dispatches, and he sent a letter asking the people to go to the Alamo.

I have a copy of that letter, and I have another copy on my wall in my office. I have had that since the days I was a prosecutor and a judge in Texas, and many other Members from Texas have what I think is the most passionate plea for liberty written by anybody anywhere in the world.

So you see the surroundings, 186 men surrounded by thousands of other enemies, military. Here is what he said in that letter, Mr. Speaker. It is dated February 24, 1836, at the Alamo.

> To all the people of Texas, fellow citizens, and compatriots, I am besieged with 1,000 or more of the enemy under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continuous bombardment and cannon fire for over 24 hours, but I have not lost a man.
>
> The enemy has demanded surrender at its discretion. Otherwise, the fort will be put to the sword. I have answered that demand with a cannon shot, and the flag still waves proudly over the wall. I shall never surrender. I shall never retreat. I call upon you in the name of liberty, patriotism, and everything dear to our character to come to my aid with all dispatch.
>
> If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself for as long as possible and die like a soldier that never forgets what is due his honor and that of his country.
>
> Victory or death, William Barret Travis, commander of the Alamo.

We all know what happened later. He and his fellow freedom fighters were killed. Some historians say that before

it was impossible to leave the Alamo, William Barret Travis brought the whole group—garrison, 186 volunteers, drew a line in the sand and said: if you are with me, cross the line.

Everybody crossed. They had the opportunity to leave, but they did not.

After 13 days of glory, if you will, at the Alamo, Travis and his men sacrificed their lives on the altar of freedom. March 6, 1836, that is why I mention March 6, because today is March 6. It is an anniversary of those people who gave up their lives willingly to fight for freedom, similar to the history of the United States.

You know, America took 7 years to gain independence from the British. They lost a lot of lives, men and women, during that. It seems as though freedom always has a cost. Good things always do. Important things always do.

You see, some people in history have down in their soul, Mr. Speaker, that living free is more important than anything, including their own lives; and if they can't live as free people, they will fight and give up their lives in exchange for that belief. Those are remarkable people who have done that throughout history all over the world.

But today, we remember those 186 defenders of the Alamo, people like William Barret Travis, Davy Crockett from Tennessee, Jim Bowie from Louisiana, the 11 Tejanos that I have mentioned, because they were willing to do that.

Travis said, in the last letter that he sent from the Alamo, that victory will be worse for Santa Anna than defeat because of the losses. It turns out that was true. He was able to delay Santa Anna's march into Texas while a Texas Army was being built, surrounded by their commander, General Sam Houston, which I will get to in a minute.

Jim Bonham is another person of interest, I think. He was the scout, along with Juan Seguin, who went out to send the word: come to the Alamo for help.

As legend says, when he got to Washington-on-the-Brazos, where the Texas Republic was being formed, on March 2, 1836, drafting the declaration of independence, he asked for those men there to come to their Alamo.

They refused to do it. They said forming a government was more important than going to the Alamo. Bottom line, they didn't go.

So he gets on his horse, and he starts to ride back to the Alamo. The men there at Washington-on-the-Brazos tried to stop him: What are you doing? You will be killed.

And he said: My friends have the right to know that no one is coming.

I don't know if that happened or not. Some historians say it did. It just shows you the type of people that they were at the Alamo.

So after 13 days, Santa Anna did what he said he was going to do. He flew the red flag, blew the bugles. It was said that they would not offer any quarter to anyone unless they surrendered at a certain time.

They did not surrender. None of the men in the Alamo were given any quarter. They were all killed. Santa Anna then continued his march through Texas.

Remember, if you will, Mr. Speaker, he had already established his domain militarily over other peoples in Mexico that had the desire to object to his dictatorship and suppressed them militarily.

Now, he had moved that experienced army into Texas, one at the Alamo, and was moving towards Sam Houston, who was moving his army toward the eastern part of Texas, toward the United States. That time in history is called the ''Runaway Scrape.''

The colonists, everybody between San Antonio and the American/Texas border, was moving east. They were leaving their property. It was being burned. They left in what is called the Runaway Scrape, not only the volunteer army, but the families as well.

So Sam Houston kept moving toward the east. He did not pitch a battle right away. He formed the army, as I said, all volunteers. Juan Seguin and his band of scouts, cavalry, if you will, had ended up joining Sam Houston.

And then, in April 1836, on the plains of San Jacinto—most Americans don't even know where that is—but it is down there near Houston, Texas. You probably have heard of that place.

In the marsh, in the swamp, these same type of individuals who were at the Alamo were in Sam Houston's army. It was a little larger, almost 600, and these were individuals of all races.

They were people from the United States, foreign countries, from Mexico, Tejanos; and they finally decided, on April 20, that they were going to stop where they were on the plains of San Jacinto in the marsh and pitch a battle.

□ 1630

Now, the plan was to have the battle held April 22. What had happened was Santa Anna had already caught up with them. He had pitched his tents, he had his thousand or so soldiers. He had two other armies still in Texas moving in to reinforce him, and everyone expected this battle to take place on April 22.

But history and war determines when battles are to take place. Sam Houston talked to his commanders. They decided it was time on April 21 to do battle. Now, history has always shown that battles take place at dawn. They still do. Well, these Texans they didn't get around to it until the afternoon on April 21. And they decided that they would just attack the Mexican Army, Santa Anna, who was not prepared for an attack. And sure enough, in the middle of the afternoon, this outnumbered Texas Army attacked Santa Anna's army.

The battle lasted 18 minutes. Something that I thought was quite unique and clever, once again, as I have mentioned, his Tejanos, of course, were fighting for Texas' independence. They were pushing for Texas' independence against the dictator Santa Anna. But they weren't wearing uniforms, not like the Mexican Army. They wore whatever they had. They looked pretty rough and pretty tough.

So Sam Houston, to make sure that the Tejanos weren't mistaken for Santa Anna's army, he had all of them put a playing card in their hatband. In those days, playing cards weren't little like we have today; they were big. So they would stick a playing card in their hatbands so they could be recognized.

His cavalry protected the flanks. The Texas Army marched in one long column. They didn't have enough for two columns. They marched down and in 18 minutes defeated Santa Anna's army, caught them by surprise, and captured almost all of them. In fact, they captured more than were in Sam Houston's army. Casualties on the part of the Texans were minor. Sam Houston was wounded in the leg. And the rest, they say, was Texas history. It was American.

Texas quickly declared and set up its own government and claimed a lot of Texas. Things have changed. When Texas became a country in 1836, here is a map of what they claimed was Texas. I won't make any editorial comments about whether we think that still should be Texas or not, Mr. Speaker, but, anyway, you see what is now modern-day Texas over here. But Texas claimed part of New Mexico, part of Arizona, all of Oklahoma, Colorado, and up to Wyoming. And you may ask: Well, how did you lose that land? Well, when Texas became part of the Union, Texas sold that to the Federal Government to pay off its debts for the war.

So, anyway, that is the way Texas used to look. It doesn't look like that anymore. We have no plans to retake this territory, Mr. Speaker. I just thought I would mention it. Anyway, that was the Republic of Texas. And Texas was an independent country for 9 years. Some say we should have stayed an independent country. I don't know about that.

Texas wanted to join the Union. Finally, after several votes, Texas got into the Union. After one Louisiana Senator switched his vote, Texas joined the Union and became part of the United States. Because of the fact that Texas was a republic, Texas can divide into five States. I don't see that happening, not like California, who is thinking about it. I don't think that is going to happen in Texas. Texas flies the Texas flag even with the American flag because Texas was a republic.

I think Texans still have that independent spirit that our ancestors had. Things are different in Texas. It is a whole different country, and the reason is because our history is different. The reason, Mr. Speaker, is because the people of Texas of all races, backgrounds, and religions still have that

independent spirit about freedom, remembering our ancestors who gave their lives and gave their property so that we could have freedom and independence, and Texas could be an independent country even for 9 years.

That is why historically I think that we appreciate those people who want independence. We appreciate people who want liberty. Right now, it is those folks in Ukraine trying to keep out some dictator—I call him a dictator—President Putin of Russia.

So, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today and honor today, March 6, because it is one of those three important days: March 2, Texas' independence; March 6, 1836, the Alamo failed, we remember those people; and then April 21, 1836, is when Texas actually got independent and started its quest into being an independent entity.

In closing, I would like to read the lyrics of a song that Marty Robbins wrote a long time ago. Mr. Speaker, you are old enough to maybe even have heard of this song, but Marty Robbins wrote it in honor of the people at the Alamo. It goes like this. It says:

In the southern part of Texas in the town of San Antone,
There's a fortress all in ruin and the weeds have overgrown.
You may look in vain for crosses and you'll never see a one,
But sometime between the setting and the rising of the sun,
You can hear a ghostly bugle as men go marching by;
You can hear them as they answer to that roll call in the sky:
Colonel Travis, Davy Crockett, and 180 more;
Captain Dickinson, Jim Bowie, stand present and accounted for.
Back in 1836, Sam Houston said to Travis: ''Get some volunteers and go fortify the Alamo.''
Well, the men came from Texas and from old Tennessee and a lot of other places.
They joined up with Travis just to fight for the right to be free.
Indian scouts with squirrel guns, men with muzzle loaders,
Stood together heel and toe to defend the Alamo.
''You may never see your loved ones,'' Travis told them that day.
''Those who want to can leave now, those who fight to the death, let 'em stay.''
So in the sand he drew a line with his army sabre,
Out of 185, not a soldier crossed the line.
With his banners a-dancin' in the dawn's golden light,
Santa Anna came prancin' on a horse that was black as the night.
He sent an officer to tell Travis to surrender.
Travis answered with a shell and a rousin' yell.
Santa Anna turned scarlet: play Deguello, he roared.
''I will show them no quarter, every one will be put to our sword.''
185 holding back 5,000.
Five days, 6 days, 8 days, 10; Travis kept holding again and again.
Then Travis sent for replacements for his wounded and lame,
But the troops that were comin', never came, never came, never came.
So twice Santa Anna charged and then blew recall.
But on that fatal third time, Santa Anna breached the wall and he killed them one and all.
Now the bugles are silent and there is rust on each sword,
And the small band of soldiers lie asleep in the arms of the Lord.
In the southern part of Texas, near the town of San Antone,
Like a statue on his pinto rides a cowboy all alone.
He sees the cattle grazin' where a century before,
Santa Anna's guns were blazin' and the cannons used to roar.
His eyes turn a little misty, and his heart begins to glow,
And he takes his hat off slowly to those men of the Alamo,
To the 13 days of glory at the siege of Alamo.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

I yield back.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 10, 2014, at 2 p.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4907. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Enhancement of Contractor Employee Whistleblower Protections (DFARS Case 2013-D010) (RIN: 0750-AH97) received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4908. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Acquisitions in Support of Operations in Afghanistan (DFARS Case 2013-D009) (RIN: 0750-AH98) received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4909. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Disclosure to Litigation Support Contractors (DFARS Case 2012-D029) (RIN: 0750-AH54) received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4910. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4911. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to TAAG Angola Airlines of Luanda, Angola; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4912. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the FY 2012 report on activities to preserve and promote minority ownership of insured financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4913. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alkyl Alcohol Alkoxylate Phosphate and Sulfate Derivatives; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0862; FRL-9906-24] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4914. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Affecting Visibility State Implementations Plan Revisions; Withdrawal of Federal Implementation Plan for American Electric Power/Public Service Company of Oklahoma [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0227; FRL-9906-81-OAR] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4915. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Affecting Visibility; State Implementation Plan Revisions; Revised BART Determination for American Electric Power/Public Service Company of Oklahoma Northeastern Power Station Units 3 and 4 [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0227; FRL-9906-93-Region 6] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4916. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Nonattainment New Source Review; Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0927; FRL-9906-67-Region 3] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4917. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — GS-omega/kappa-Hxtx-Hv1a; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0389; FRL-9904-92] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4918. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — N-(n-octyl)-2-pyrrolidone; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0093; FRL-9906-17] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4919. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0775 and EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0008; FRL-9905-87] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4920. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls for 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4921. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report including matters relating to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4922. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Agency Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2014-2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4923. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a Congressional Notification: Integrated Mission Management Committee and the National Intelligence Management Council; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

4924. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a Congressional Notification: Appointment of National Intelligence Managers for Europe/Eurasia and Africa; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 311. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms (Rept. 113–375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## 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. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BARTON, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HALL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 6. A bill to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 4156. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow advertisements and solicitations for passenger air transportation to state the base airfare of the transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 4157. A bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, 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. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BYRNE, and Ms. JENKINS):

H.R. 4158. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Monitoring the Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, the Judiciary, Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HOYER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 4159. A bill to provide for investment in innovation through research and development and STEM education, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4160. A bill to prohibit further action on the proposed rule regarding changes to Medicare prescription drug benefit programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 4161. A bill to encourage and further research on the engagement of underrepresented youth in the STEM fields; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 4162. A bill to establish a Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program in the Department of Energy to provide financial assistance to promote energy efficiency and onsite renewable technologies in manufacturing and industrial facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 4163. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HURT (for himself and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 4164. A bill to exempt smaller public companies from requirements relating to the use of Extensible Business Reporting Language for periodic reporting to the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 4165. A bill to protect crime victims' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4166. A bill to transfer recreational management authority for Lake Berryessa in the State of California from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4167. A bill to amend section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, known as the Volcker Rule, to exclude certain debt securities of collateralized loan obligations from the prohibition against acquiring or retaining an ownership interest in a hedge fund or private equity fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4168. A bill to provide payment for patient navigator services under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 4169. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 4170. A bill to provide for a Youth Mental Health Research Network; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURGESS, Mr.

YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 4171. A bill to establish a commission to examine the processes used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to provide unemployment rates and to make recommendations to Congress for any changes in methodology or improvements to such processes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4172. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to clarify when certain academic assessments shall be administered; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 4173. A bill to establish the Brownfield Redevelopment and Economic Development Innovative Financing program to promote urban renewal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 4174. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to modernize and improve Alaska bypass freight mail transportation; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4175. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Victory for Veterans stamp, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 4176. A bill to establish a position of Science Laureate of the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Medicare beneficiaries participating in a Medicare Advantage MSA to contribute their own money to their MSA; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 4178. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for reforms to the EB-5 immigrant investor program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish requirements relating to marijuana impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit rollovers from health savings accounts to Medicare Advantage MSAs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4181. A bill to appropriate funds for carrying out certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to emergency care and trauma services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4182. A bill to provide that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways shall be administered in accordance with the general management plan for that unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 4183. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to empower the States to set the maximum annual percentage rates applicable to consumer credit transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. COOK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the manner in which an advance payment of initial educational assistance paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is charged against the entitlement of a veteran to such assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution encouraging reunions of divided Korean American families; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H. Res. 504. A resolution raising a question of privileges of the House.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 505. A resolution strongly recommending that the United States renegotiate the return of the Iraqi Jewish Archive to Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H. Res. 506. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Václav Havel by directing the House of Representatives Fine Arts Board to provide for the display of a bust of Václav Havel in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 507. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in support of a women's economic bill of rights; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 508. A resolution expressing support for designating October 6, 2014, through October 12, 2014, as "Naturopathic Medicine Week" to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H. Res. 509. A resolution expressing support for designation of August 23 as "Black Ribbon Day" to recognize the victims of Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

173. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to supporting Senate Bill 1926 to delay implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012; to the Committee on Financial Services.

174. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of South Carolina, relative to a Congressional Resolution consenting to the Health Care Compact; 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. GARDNER:

H.R. 6.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 4156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States).

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to "regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . .".

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"; and

(c) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states that "No Money shall be drawn from

the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time''; and

(d) Article II, Section 2, Clause 2, which states that the President, ''by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States. . .''

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4160.

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 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 4161.

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 provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4163.

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 within the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 4164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 1, which reads: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which reads: The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the fonvoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.'' Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, ''to promote the general welfare.''

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 4170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4173.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7, section 8, of article I to establish Post Offices and Post Roads, in combination with clause 18, section 8, article I 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 Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Sec. 8 of the United States Constitution—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the constitution states that: ''The Congress shall have the 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. TIERNEY:

H.R. 4183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 4184.

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.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 118: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 148: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 411: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 460: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 515: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 522: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 533: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 647: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 688: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 689: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 778: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 795: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 808: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 822: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BASS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 863: Mr. WALZ, Ms. CHU, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr.

HANNA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 956: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1084: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1201: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1249: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1252: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1263: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1310: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1331: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1354: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1386: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1427: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1475: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1507: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1528: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1551: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 1563: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1591: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1692: Mr. NADLER and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1701: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1726: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1751: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1832: Mr. NEAL and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1915: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1953: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1998: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2005: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2021: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2235: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2291: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2315: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2364: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2377: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 2452: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2453: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2456: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2510: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2529: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2560: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2582: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2591: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2646: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2654: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COOK, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2707: Mr. JONES and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2772: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2825: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2847: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2901: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2921: Mr. HANNA, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2932: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2935: Ms. BASS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2939: Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2996: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 3022: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 3043: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 3086: Mr. HIMES and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3116: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3118: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3155: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3211: Mr. HURT and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3240: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3305: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 3318: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3384: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3397: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3431: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3464: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3474: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3482: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 3494: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 3505: Mr. Takano and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3508: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 3530: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 3600: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 3620: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3663: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3673: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3698: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3717: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 3725: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3732: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3740: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3749: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3829: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3873: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3929: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 3930: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3958: Mr. JONES, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3978: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3982: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 4015: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. REED, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 4026: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4031: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 4040: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 4041: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 4045: Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIND, Mr. OLSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 4060: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BARR, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 4068: Mr. TERRY and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 4070: Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 4092: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4106: Mr. COFFMAN and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 4128: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4137: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 4138: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 4139: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 4140: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4152: Ms. GRANGER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. J. Res. 68: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res, 16: Mr. ENYART, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. BYRNE.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Ms. DELBENE.

H. Res. 36: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 231: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Res. 418: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 442: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HARPER.

H. Res. 476: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H. Res. 494: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 498: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 499: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

## DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 7 by Mr. BISHOP on the bill (H.R. 1010): Bobby L. Rush.