



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2011

No. 63

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 10, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM GRAVES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM HIGHER GAS PRICES

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 1 year after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, Americans are paying record gas prices. In northern Virginia, gas that used to cost \$3 per gallon now costs more than \$4 per gallon.

This gas price hike is a result of instability in the Middle East and possible oil speculation and is a reminder of our dangerous dependence on foreign oil.

Sadly, our Republican colleagues are not advancing legislation to help our hard-pressed consumers. Their plan would line the pockets of Big Oil, which saw its profits skyrocket 30 percent in line with rising gas prices.

Fortunately, there are positive steps we can take to promote energy independence in America and to protect consumers: improve vehicle efficiency, boost production of domestic renewable energy, and convert oil industry tax breaks into gas price relief for our consumers.

America owns 1.5 percent of the world's oil but consumes 22.5 percent; so we can't drill our way to energy independence. The only way to end our dependence on foreign oil and reduce gas prices is by improving automobile efficiency and developing new sources of clean, domestic energy. Energy independence is going to depend on reducing our oil consumption and shifting to domestic forms of energy like wind, solar, biofuels, and gas. Energy independence will save consumers money and protect us from the instability of the Middle East.

At the end of 2010, Congress extended tax credits for biofuels and the production of wind and solar energy. These tax credits increased wind energy production by nearly 43 percent in just 2 years. So extending them is an important step to increasing the supply of domestic energy.

Under the authority of the Clean Air Act, President Obama and automakers recently announced an agreement to improve the efficiency of automobiles by 30 percent by 2016. This agreement will save consumers \$3,000 for each car purchased 5 years from now. Here is another way of looking at it: If you could save 30 percent at the pump, better vehicle efficiency would more than offset the recent spike in gas prices.

Unfortunately, oil companies and their allies here in Congress are trying to roll back much of this progress. Re-

publican Speaker BOEHNER forced through legislation which would repeal much of the Clean Air Act, hurting American consumers and undermining our national security.

Last week, the leadership in the House passed legislation to short-circuit safety rules for oil production off America's coasts, increasing the likelihood of another Deepwater Horizon catastrophe. Their legislation would also allow oil exploration that would impede naval operations off the Chesapeake Bay in Virginia. This week, they want to attempt to pass a bill allowing for more oil drilling even if it interferes with military bases or endangers coastal economies.

I do not support reckless efforts to allow unregulated oil drilling which endangers coastal economies and national security. Last week, I introduced amendments to these oil drilling bills. One would strike the anti-safety language and add a provision to repeal \$37 billion in oil company tax loopholes. The amendment would remit this money to American drivers. Averaged among licensed drivers, my amendment would give \$185 to every licensed driver in America, reducing the equivalent price of gasoline by 27 cents a gallon. The other amendment was written to protect national security. It simply requires that the Commander in Chief, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, certify that before we drill for oil off the coast of Virginia that it does not hamper national security and naval operations. I was shocked that all but a handful of Republicans voted to kill this commonsense amendment.

Since the leadership has blocked efforts to include real gas price relief in their oil drilling bills, I am introducing standalone legislation to assist consumers. The bill, entitled the Gas Price Relief Act, would terminate tax loopholes for oil companies while rebating the savings to our hard-pressed commuters throughout America.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3117

There are many positive steps, Mr. Speaker, we can take to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, steps that will include clean energy, renewable energy, and efficiency in our vehicles. That's the path we need to take if we are going to reduce our reliance on foreign oil and achieve genuine energy independence.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Georgia) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Jane Wood, Jerusalem-Mt. Pleasant United Methodist Church, Rockville, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, God of our past, present, and future, we look to You today as we begin this session of the United States House of Representatives.

We thank You this afternoon for those who are assembled here. They have been given a great privilege and an awesome responsibility.

Bestow upon them the wisdom, discernment, and knowledge they need. Be very near to each of them, and may this day be a day of accomplishment.

By Your grace, enable these Representatives to continue on the "path to a more perfect Union."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair an-

nounces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the whole number of the House is 432.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 9, 2011 at 10:05 a.m.:

That the Senate has added additional conferee H.R. 658.

Appointments:

United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PUTTING THE GULF BACK TO WORK ACT

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I have said many times on this floor and in meetings with constituents, this country does not have an energy strategy, and the only thing worse than not having an energy strategy is having bad energy policy. Yet the answer lies right here in our own backyard. We have the resources, but this administration continues to block access.

Today we're voting on H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act. It is crucial to restoring our own capabilities to produce energy by moving forward with permit applications in a sensible amount of time.

It's deplorable that businesses, like Leed Petroleum in Lafayette, Louisiana, with 22 employees, cannot get back to work and have no options unless we hold these regulators' feet to the fire and force them to do their jobs. These independent producers and service companies, the backbone of American energy production, deserve answers and real solutions.

With oil and gas prices skyrocketing, there is no excuse for any delays to offshore energy production. The people of this country are tired of uncertainty. They are tired of dependence on foreign oil, and they're tired of record gas prices.

The bottom line is we must begin the path toward a solid energy policy to get Americans back to work. There's no excuse for delay.

HONORING ISRAEL ON HER 63RD BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and to celebrate the State of Israel on her 63rd birthday.

Sixty-three years ago, Israel was founded against all odds, through enormous courage and after a difficult struggle. Now she is the beacon of freedom and hope throughout the region.

As the only true democratic society in the Middle East, Israel has built a technologically advanced and thriving economy. Israel's a world leader in biotechnology research and is home to some of the world's great entrepreneurial success stories. Her people enjoy freedom of expression in all forms, and she boasts one of the strongest records on human rights.

The United States, as the first country to recognize Israel's independence, forged an unbreakable bond with Israel through our shared values and goals, and the partnership and cooperation between our two countries has never been stronger. The United States is committed to ensuring Israel's ability to defend herself and will continue to provide the most advanced assistance in security and the most robust economic aid.

In 63 years, Israel has persevered against all odds, against foreign armies, terrorism, and those who deny her right to exist.

Today we reaffirm the bond between the United States and Israel, that it will not be broken. And today the United States stands firmly with our great ally Israel in true friendship and celebration.

WHOSE SIDE IS PAKISTAN ON?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after years of funneling money to Pakistan, we still don't know whose side they are on in this war on terror.

We have given Pakistan \$12 billion in foreign aid since 2002. We have reimbursed them \$9 billion for their military operations in the war on terror. It's time we freeze the foreign aid to Pakistan until we get some answers about their knowledge of bin Laden's whereabouts.

We cannot continue to give Pakistan money in the hopes they will be our friend and ally. We did not trust them enough to give them advance notice of the bin Laden operation. We even had detailed plans to fight the Pakistanis if they interfered with the capture of bin Laden.

Bin Laden was able to live in a mansion right under the nose of the Pakistan military academy for years, but government officials say they didn't know where bin Laden was. That statement defies the evidence, and that "dog just won't hunt."

And that's just the way it is.

**BOEING BEING BULLIED BY
UNIONS AND THE NATIONAL
LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board has filed a complaint against the Boeing Corporation to stop thousands of jobs at the currently built 1.2 million square foot production facility in South Carolina. This is the second line for 787 jetliners which are so popular due to 20 percent less fuel use than any other airplane of its size.

Manufacturing employees locate in South Carolina due to the welcoming climate provided by the right-to-work laws, with trained workers educated at world-class technical colleges. Boeing has a right to contract to work where it's in the best interest of its shareholders and workers.

I appreciate Governor Nikki Haley leading the defense of our workers against the Obama administration's attack. I am grateful Attorney General Alan Wilson is recruiting fellow attorneys general across America to protect jobs. South Carolina is fortunate to have America's youngest Governor and America's youngest attorney general energetically standing up for freedom of American workers.

Welcome to Washington Adjutant General Bob Livingston, former 218th commander in Afghanistan, with Legislative Liaison Matt Nichols.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

MASSACHUSETTS FUTURE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we only need to look at Massachusetts to see a preview of what is in store if we fail to repeal ObamaCare.

Just a few years ago, it was predicted that the Massachusetts health reform would reduce emergency room care by getting patients in to see primary care physicians. But a new survey shows that only half of primary care physicians are able to accept new patients right now. It now takes 48 days to see an internist for a routine checkup. Premiums in Massachusetts remain among the highest in the Nation. Low reimbursements in the Commonwealth Care health plan mean that only about half of doctors accept the State-managed insurance.

Far from solving Massachusetts' health care crisis, the health reform law has created problems of its own. The Massachusetts Medical Society finds that the environment for physicians continues to deteriorate, despite

billions in government spending—just a sample of what awaits the Nation under ObamaCare.

□ 1410

**TAXES, PENALTIES, AND FEES IN
PPACA**

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, the Patient Protection Affordable Care Act, billed as a health care bill, is actually a tax bill. It is riddled with fees and penalties that will drive up the cost of health care by imposing taxes on families and businesses.

Included in the law was a tax increase on nonmedical expenditures from a health savings account. There has always been a 10 percent penalty, but now it jumps to 20 percent.

In addition, beginning next year, employers who have 50 full-time employees for the previous calendar year must offer health coverage that meets the minimum essential benefit coverage requirement of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and that coverage requirement is likely to cost \$52 billion over the next 10 years, hardly the way to foster job creation in an economy that desperately needs jobs.

The individual mandate starts out as a tax; then it is a penalty. Oh, now it's back to a tax again. The administration creatively changed its position when it realized that the mandate was indeed a tax, even though it violated the President's own pledge during the campaign not to raise taxes on middle class Americans to pass his signature health care legislation.

The taxes in the health care law will affect everyone inevitably and cannot help but drive up the cost of health care in this country.

**STOP THE PAIN AT THE GAS
PUMP**

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, with Americans feeling pain at the gas pump, I am so glad that the House remains focused on lowering the cost of energy and creating an environment for positive job growth.

American energy production has been handcuffed by a moratorium that the President has placed on new oil, natural gas, and coal production right here in the United States. Mr. Speaker, there is simply no reason that a country with the largest fossil fuel reserves in the world should be suffering through another energy crisis, a crisis that has already cost America thousands of jobs, forced manufacturers to relocate overseas, and made a gallon of gas unaffordable.

The folks that get hurt the most are our seniors on fixed incomes, small

businesses, and the poor. This administration apparently thinks the best way to help these folks is to raise their energy taxes and then lend Brazil billions of dollars to drill for oil, while our workers and our factories stand idle.

What we need is a dose of common sense when it comes to our domestic energy policy. We have to use our own oil, natural gas, and coal to create jobs and stop the pain at the pump.

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with concern over oil prices and the effect these high prices have on the American consumer.

In my district in northeast Indiana, fuel prices are around \$4.10 a gallon. Just this morning, WANE TV reported gas prices in northeast Indiana will be at \$4.29 by the end of today. At \$4.29 a gallon, many of my constituents will not get out of the gas station for under \$80.

The Third Congressional District of Indiana is rural and geographically expansive, causing many constituents to fill up their gas tanks two to three times a week simply from commuting to and from work. For many, this cost makes their total monthly expenditure for gas at or above their rent or mortgage payment.

When President Obama took office, we saw gas prices at a national average of \$1.84. Now we are told gas prices could be as high as \$5 by Memorial Day. We cannot continue the status quo and expect Hoosiers to pay at the pump.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, and H.R. 1231, Reversing the President's Offshore Moratorium Act, sponsored by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. These bills, along with H.R. 1230, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, that the House passed last week, will help us move away from our dependence on foreign oil by opening restrictions placed on the Outer Continental Shelf, allowing us to tap into our domestic resources. Doing this will provide jobs to more Americans and lower our gas prices.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio) at 4 p.m.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1229.

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

There was no objection.

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1229.

□ 1601

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. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, with Mr. 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, families and businesses across the country are struggling with skyrocketing gasoline prices that in many places have already passed \$4 per gallon. Everyday activities, such as commuting to work or taking the kids to soccer practice, have strained family budgets, forcing Americans to make tough choices and sacrifices. Unfortunately, rising gasoline prices are not the only energy crisis currently hurting our country. For over a year, communities along the Gulf of Mexico have suffered through a real and then de facto moratorium on offshore drilling imposed by the Obama administration. The administration's intentional slow-walking of drilling permits has cost 12,000 jobs according to their own estimates. According to economist Dr. Joseph Mason, this could cost over 36,000 jobs nationwide if businesses and their employees are not allowed to return to work soon. Over the past month, the Natural Resources Committee has heard from numerous small businesses in Louisiana that have had to lay off hundreds of people, eliminate benefits and diminish their savings just to try to stay afloat.

The bill being considered by the House today will help address all of these concerns. It will put the people and businesses along the gulf back to work by requiring the administration to act on new drilling permits in a timely manner. For Americans across the country who are suffering from rising gasoline prices, this bill acts now to expand American production to help lower costs. H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act, sets a firm time line for the Secretary of the Interior to act on permits. Let me be very clear. Action does not necessarily mean approval. Action simply means that the Secretary must make a decision either to approve or to deny a permit. The bill gives the Secretary 30 days to act, along with two 15-day extensions. This 30-day time frame is consistent with the time line for approving exploration plans, which are far more complicated. A deadline is necessary in order to stop the endless bureaucratic delays and inaction that are currently taking place and to provide companies with some certainty.

There are over 50 permitted projects in the Gulf of Mexico that were under way when the Obama administration imposed the moratorium in May 2010. Nearly a year later, over 40 of those same 50 projects have yet to resume work. This bill would give the Secretary 30 days to restart these projects that have already been approved.

I want to stress that H.R. 1229 will have an immediate impact on jobs and energy production. Each drilling platform supports 800 to 1,400 jobs. Each permit that is issued translates into several hundred people returning to work. In addition, there are production wells just waiting for permits to resume work, meaning that more American energy could come online within months of a permit being issued. Perhaps most importantly, H.R. 1229 also makes significant safety improvements. U.S. offshore drilling helps create American energy and American jobs, but it must be done in a safe and responsible manner.

The bill reforms current law by requiring a drilling company to obtain a permit to drill from the Secretary. Currently, such a permit is not required by law, only by regulation. The bill further reforms the law by requiring the Secretary to conduct a safety review. The bill ensures that all proposed drilling operations must, quote, meet all critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention, and oil spill response and containment requirements.

Finally, this bill establishes an expedited judicial review process for resolving lawsuits relating to gulf permits. This reform ensures that ending the de facto moratorium imposed by the Obama administration isn't replaced by paralyzing and frivolous lawsuits that could take years to resolve.

What we will see today during the course of this debate are two very different approaches to America's energy

future. Republicans are pursuing an all-of-the-above energy approach to American energy production to create jobs, generate revenue, lower gasoline prices, and strengthen our national security. The Obama administration and congressional Democrats, on the other hand, want to make energy more expensive. Their agenda is to raise taxes to make energy production more difficult and costly. We saw proof of this last Congress when they did everything they could to push through the job-destroying Waxman-Markey national energy tax. Now they are trying to increase taxes on American energy producers.

While Americans are looking for solutions to lower gasoline prices, the Democrats' proposals would increase prices even higher. How in the world higher prices and taxes on energy would help Americans at the gas pump is beyond me.

It's time for Congress to take steps to end the economic pain in the gulf by allowing people to return to work. It's time to ease the pain of high gasoline prices by expanding American energy production. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to create jobs, to lower prices, including the price of gas at the pump, and to strengthen our national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1229. Need I remind the Members of this body that 1 year and 19 days ago, the Deepwater Horizon oil rig exploded, killing 11 workers and creating economic and environmental havoc. For 87 days following the explosion, more than 4 million barrels of oil spewed from the blown-out Macondo well, coating nearly 1,000 miles of gulf coastline and temporarily closing over 88 square miles of some of the Nation's most productive fishing grounds. Yet this Congress has not enacted a single legislative reform to improve the safety of offshore drilling. Instead, the majority now brings forward in the name of spurious claims a bill to encourage more domestic offshore drilling without applying the lessons learned from the gulf blowout. With the spurious claim that more domestic offshore drilling will lower gas prices, they claim that we have to grease the skids, we have to open the doors, we have to give further breaks to the oil companies.

□ 1610

Now, sadly, it seems their motto is "Ignore the spill. Drill, baby, drill."

Frankly, the majority's trio of offshore drilling bills were written as though the Deepwater Horizon disaster had never occurred. That's why I refer to them as the "amnesia acts." Collectively, they will make offshore drilling less safe while opening up vast new swaths of our coastlines without adding any new safety requirements or environmental safeguards on the oil and gas industry.

So today we are taking up the second “amnesia act.” H.R. 1229 would impose artificial and arbitrary deadlines on the Department of the Interior to approve permits to drill. Specifically, this legislation would require the Department to act on a permit to drill within 30 days. After 60 days, whether or not—whether or not, let me emphasize that—the safety and environmental review has been completed by the Interior Department, the drilling application would be deemed approved.

Need I remind my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that offshore drilling in U.S. waters was determined by the spill commission, the bipartisan, independent spill commission, to be four times more deadly than in other parts of the world prior to the Deepwater Horizon tragedy. It was four times more deadly to drill in the gulf by the same companies than to drill, for example, in the North Sea, hardly a comfortable environment. Now, under this bill, we could actually have less careful oversight and review of offshore drilling than we had before the Deepwater Horizon disaster.

This bill is a dangerous solution in search of a really nonexistent problem. Since the implementation of new safety and environmental standards in June of last year, the Department has added staff, improved its review, and has issued 52 shallow water drilling permits. Only six more permits currently are pending. Since the oil industry demonstrated the capability to contain a deepwater blowout in mid-February, we think, the Department has issued permits for 13 new deepwater wells. There are only 12 permits in the queue for approval; yet the majority is claiming we’ve got to grease the skids, that we’ve got to remove any impediments for the oil companies, that we have to “drill, baby, drill.”

Ironically, the enactment of H.R. 1229 could halt this progress. This bill could hamper new permits being issued or stop new permits altogether because the Department might be forced to deny permits if the safety and environmental reviews are not completed in the arbitrary 60 days.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, this legislation would issue a blanket extension of existing leases. In contrast to this across-the-board approach, the Department is working on a case-by-case basis to extend existing leases affected by the temporary suspension of new drilling, where such action is warranted, not on a blanket basis but on the basis of the actual facts, of the actual evidence. H.R. 1229 would give a free ride to companies even if their leases are many years from expiring.

With regard to the comment that has been made already in this debate, that this is about prices at the gasoline pump, need I remind my colleagues—now, this was under the George Bush administration—that in 2008, the Energy Information Administration said, if all drilling over the entire east coast Continental Shelf were opened up, the

effect on oil prices would be “insignificant.”

H.R. 1229 also contains language designed to close the doors of the courthouse to citizens who believe that the Federal Government is not complying with the law. Imagine that. Citizens who are trying to be diligent citizens would not be able to make sure that the law is being applied. Citizens from Florida or Alabama would be forced to bring any lawsuits regarding energy projects in the Gulf of Mexico to Louisiana or Texas courts. In addition, H.R. 1229 contains language that would prevent attorneys’ fees from being awarded in successful cases—a deterrent if I’ve ever heard of one. These provisions are aimed at environmental plaintiffs, but will almost certainly impair the legal rights of many other potential plaintiffs, including other oil and gas companies.

In the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster, the principles guiding offshore drilling should be smart and safe. If H.R. 1229 is enacted, the guiding principles will be fast and loose. This is the wrong response to the largest oil spill in U.S. waters. We should not rush to allow drilling permits to be deemed approved without the appropriate safety and environmental checks. We should not provide blanket extensions to existing leases. We should not close the doors of the courthouse to American citizens. We should not pass this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a new member of the Natural Resources Committee, a member who is jumping in and making an immediate impact on the need for increasing our energy production, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today we are taking up the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, which will accomplish two very important goals: create jobs and help lower energy costs. It will end the Obama administration’s de facto drilling moratorium in the gulf in a way that is safe, transparent, and responsible.

A study from Louisiana State University predicted that keeping this moratorium in place for 18 months could cause the loss of more than 36,000 jobs nationwide. We simply can’t afford the Obama administration’s job-killing policies. Rather than putting Americans back to work, they’re seriously impacting America’s energy production. The “March 2011 Short-Term Energy Outlook” from the Energy Information Administration noted that production from the Gulf of Mexico is expected to fall by 240,000 barrels per day this year.

If we’re going to become energy secure, we need to increase our energy production, not limit it; and we need to commit ourselves to developing our own resources. The Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act will help do that.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a Member who is doing an excellent job of pointing out the need for bringing jobs and production back online in Louisiana and in the gulf, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak on this important issue, H.R. 1229.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, it is one of a trifecta of bills that we’re passing out of the House, once and for all and after 40 years, to begin actually putting together a cogent energy policy for this country. Now, before I talk about it, I do want to make a couple of comments.

Our President has been saying over and over again that our energy production, our oil production is at the highest level it has ever been. ED MARKEY, the ranking member of the committee said the same thing. Mr. Salazar of Interior, Mr. Bromwich just the other day, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ said the same thing.

Why are you saying this?

Very clearly, right now we are producing oil at a level of 6 million barrels a day, down from a high in 1972 of 9 million barrels a day; and off the gulf coast, where you claim that production is its highest ever, we were down from 1.7 million barrels a day last year to 1.59 million today, and it will be going down by another 225,000 barrels of oil per day by next year.

For heaven’s sake, there’s a reason we have a structural increase in the cost of our energy. It is, very simply, that we’re constraining the output of oil. So let’s get on it. Let’s finally start producing oil in this country, and let’s become energy independent once and for all.

Louisiana is being hurt in two ways. Number one, of course, is the increasing price of gasoline; but it’s also jobs. As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) just mentioned, Dr. Joseph Mason from Louisiana State University, from my home State, said that we’re looking at a loss of 36,137 jobs over an 18-month period out of the gulf coast alone. In February, Seahawk Drilling, which owned and operated 20 rigs on the gulf coast, filed chapter 11 due to the Obama administration’s de facto moratorium.

□ 1620

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

We have lost 12 rigs so far to such countries as Nigeria, Egypt, the Congo, and Brazil, and guess who we just gave \$2 billion to drill oil? Brazil, of all places. So we gave them the rig, we gave them the money so they can drill oil to sell back to us and to put tax money into their coffers. For heaven’s sake, this is crazy.

So in conclusion, I'd like to say today, let's get our Louisiana and Texas and other people back to work. Let's invest in our energy across this country, and let's get the gas prices down.

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman used the term "trifecta." It's a curious selection of words because, indeed, you could see the oil companies right now lining up at the ticket window to cash in their trifecta winnings if this goes forward.

The oil companies are currently sitting on 60 million acres of public land onshore and offshore in which they are not producing. The oil industry is sitting on more than 11.5 billion barrels of oil, nearly as much as they could ever get from drilling up and down the east coast and the west coast. This is where they should be directing their attention, but instead, where are they directing their attention as they bring in profits that for this year looked to be something like \$100 billion? They are using those profits not to provide more resources for the American people but to buy back stock. Exxon, which had about a \$10 billion profit in the first quarter of this year, just the first three months, used most of its money, more than half of it, to buy back stock.

So it is curious that my colleague used the phrase "trifecta" because, indeed, this is a bonanza, a big winning ticket for the Big Oil companies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to yield 1 minute to a new member of the committee who represents a district right on the gulf coast and is passionate about what is happening and not happening down there and what should be happening, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle should listen to this story. It's a true life story very well. It talks about the face of Big Oil, and I'm going to tell you what it is.

There's a little community in my district named Coteau Holmes which has been around since the Cajuns were kicked out of Acadian and settled down into Louisiana. It's a fishing village. There's a gentleman down there who graduated high school in 1968 and began to work in the oil and gas industry, and for 30 years, he worked in the oil and gas industry. He raised two children in that oil and gas industry, never asked the government for anything other than to ply his trade.

The experience he gained in the Gulf of Mexico led him to work on the first Deepwater projects in the Gulf of Mexico. He worked for Shell Oil and Gas—Big Oil—and guess what. When he retired, he was making in excess of \$1,750 a day. He put two kids through college.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. LANDRY. If this is not the American Dream that my colleagues

on the other side of the aisle claim to tout so much, what is? This is a gentleman who doesn't have a college education. Who actually his children were the first generation in his entire family ancestry to ever make it to college, and he could not have paid for them to go to college if not for the opportunity to drill in the Gulf of Mexico.

My colleagues should understand that down there we create jobs. We create good-paying jobs, not minimum-wage jobs, the type of jobs that provide for the American family and allow the American Dream to be a reality.

Mr. HOLT. We are indeed concerned about jobs. For the example that my friend from Louisiana gives about someone whose livelihood is at stake, I could produce dozens of others, maybe a shrimp fisherman. You know, my friends maybe remember the "Forrest Gump" movie. They've seen those pictures. In fact, my friend from Louisiana probably has been out on one of those shrimp boats. Well, they were sitting idle. They were sitting idle for weeks and weeks.

The breeding grounds, the fisheries, were and still are in jeopardy. People all over the country are not buying the fish that drank of this black gold. In fact, 88,000 square miles, as I said earlier, of fisheries were polluted by this tremendous spill, and need I remind my colleagues that the coastal communities of the Gulf of Mexico, the heart of offshore drilling, that the jobs that are dependent on tourism and fishing exceed all the natural resource extraction and mining jobs by a factor of five, five times as many jobs dependent on tourism and fisheries.

Yes, we should learn the lesson, rather than hurrying through these permits. We should learn the lessons of last year's oil spill and protect those jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona, who's a new member of the committee and understands these issues well, Mr. GOSAR.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the people in my district are hurting. Rising gas prices are cutting deep into family budgets. Food prices are skyrocketing. Communities that are home to destination locations like the Grand Canyon are bracing themselves for fewer summer visitors because families simply cannot afford to travel.

Main Street America can no longer afford inaction from the President and his administration, and that is why I stand here today in support of H.R. 1229. The bill not only will put thousands of Americans back to work, it would increase our production of oil here at home and lower the cost of gas.

It is time we put our country back to work and use our resources here at home instead of abroad, and it is time the government makes a serious com-

mitment towards energy independence and an all-of-the-above approach that America wants.

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Santa Barbara, California (Mrs. CAPPS), who has experienced firsthand the economic cost of oil spills.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from New Jersey for recognizing me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1229. A year ago BP's Deepwater Horizon rig exploded in the Gulf of Mexico, leaving 11 people dead and over 1,000 miles of shoreline oiled. It also left the local economy in shambles. The once lucrative fishing and tourism businesses were devastated by this spill. Many gulf residents are still struggling, and yet the oil industry would have us believe it suffered greatly during the temporary moratorium on new drilling. The fact is the gulf produced 1.6 million barrels of oil per day last year, an all-time record, and still the industry is clamoring for more.

Today, we're considering another bill on their wish list that sidesteps safety and environmental safeguards. H.R. 1229 forces this administration to unreasonably rush the permitting process for drilling activities. These permits are a final review opportunity for the Federal Government to ensure that everything is in place before an oil company drills deep into our ocean floor, but the majority is using the strain of high gas prices to push Americans into thinking that drilling is safe and that hurrying these permits will bring down costs.

□ 1630

It's as if we learned nothing from the BP oil disaster. Mr. Chairman, we cannot say drilling is safe when Congress has not taken necessary steps to strengthen protections for rig workers and the environment. We cannot say drilling is safe when the industry has yet to prove it has better means of preventing or cleaning up a spill than we saw that it did a year ago, and we cannot say drilling is safe when the government lacks the resources it needs to police an industry that for years policed itself, to perilous ends.

While the Obama administration has started acting on the lessons of the spill, Michael Bromwich, the head offshore drilling regulator, told the New York Times that his agency "still lacks the resources, personnel, training, technology, enforcement tools, regulations, and legislation that it needs to do its job properly."

Mr. Chairman, we know how to reduce the risk of oil spills. The President's oil spill commission laid out a list of recommendations for how Congress can prevent another spill from occurring. Many of my colleagues have amendments to put those recommendations in place. I hope this House will adopt them so we can say that drilling is safer.

Vote "no" on H.R. 1229. Let's not promote reckless drilling that will fail to

lower gas prices and endanger our coastlines. Let's instead strengthen safety and environmental safeguards for offshore drilling and support a quicker transition to cleaner, safer energy policy for America.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would like to inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining for both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. Then I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, when I was listening to the gentlelady from California and her colleagues, I was reminded of Mark Twain's warning that we should be careful to get out of an experience only the wisdom that is there and then stop, lest we be like the cat that sits on a hot stove lid. That cat will not sit on a hot stove lid again—and this is good—but, also, it will not sit on a cold stove lid again.

The cost of the irrational reaction by this administration to what was, in essence, a mechanical failure of a blowout preventer is horrific, as measured in unemployed families, higher energy prices, lost business to shops throughout the region, and lost royalties to the Nation's Treasury. It is said that the economic damage done by this administration in response to the oil spill could be far greater than that done by the oil spill itself, and I believe it. I would suggest a little common sense will go a long way, and this bill provides it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, earlier the gentleman mentioned Brazil. The bill before us would grant a blanket extension for leases in the gulf that are about to expire. And according to the Interior Department, this amendment would extend about 100 leases and costs about \$6 million over 10 years. Well, 12 of those leases that would be extended automatically belong to Petrobras, the Brazilian oil giant. It would, indeed, provide a windfall given from American taxpayers to the State-owned Brazilian oil giant Petrobras. Yes, this bill in front of us now.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, Representative CASTOR, who, unlike some of the debaters today, is someone who actually lives on the Gulf of Mexico.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1229.

This Republican proposal is very poor public policy. And as a Member who represents a community that is dependent on the gulf coast's economy, frankly, it is appalling for my Republican friends to press to eliminate safety standards on oil companies who want to continue to drill and come closer and closer to our beautiful beaches. Really, it is beyond the pale.

And I have to ask, did my colleagues not learn anything from this disaster?

In our economy on Florida's gulf coast, we depend on clean water and clean beaches, and when you bring up a bill like this, it feels like a direct challenge to our economic recovery. We have not recovered. The hotels and motels on the beach, the seafood industry, all the mom and pop shops who are dependent on the tourism industry, we are still struggling to come back. We want to adopt the recommendations of the oil spill commission that recommends stronger safety standards, something like that which was passed on a bipartisan basis here in the House last year.

Now to add insult to injury, my Republican colleagues recently passed a budget that gives taxpayer subsidies to the Big Oil companies. In the face of a burgeoning debt and deficit and in the face of huge profits by the oil companies, why should the American taxpayers be subsidizing the bottom line of the most profitable corporations in the world? Instead, it is time for a meaningful, comprehensive energy strategy to lower gas prices because it appears that that's what we all are in agreement to do. But to do that, it's not to eliminate safety standards for drilling. That's silly. What we should do is end the giveaways to Big Oil, eliminate the \$5 billion in subsidies and loopholes that the oil companies receive each year. Let's prohibit Wall Street speculators from artificially driving up oil prices. Let's develop super-efficient cars and clean alternative energies that will create good jobs in America and then bring down gas prices.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I caution the oil companies and their friends in Congress that the BP Deepwater Horizon blowout was only 1 year ago. Most of the necessary safety standards and recommendations of the bipartisan oil spill commission have not been adopted. No one should be pressing for unbridled drilling without ensuring that another blowout disaster would never happen again. Otherwise, many of us on the gulf coast view the blind-eyed push as a serious threat to our multi-billion dollar tourism and fishing industries and our coastal environmental resources.

Florida's long-term economic health is dependent on clean water and clean beaches and clean oceans. Our economy is struggling right now. I am confident that Florida's economy will recover, but Florida's long-term economic outlook will suffer immensely if we have to suffer through another blowout disaster.

Mr. Chairman, we need an honest dialogue on energy solutions based on facts. Americans are clamoring for comprehensive long-term energy solutions so we are less dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that anyone who reads the bill will see on the bot-

tom of page 1 and the top of page 2, "Safety review required. The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph one without ensuring that the proposed drilling operations meet all, A, critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention; and B, oil spill response and containment requirements."

So when we look at the facts, we should start with the text of the bill itself.

At this point, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

I wanted to respond to a couple of things from the other side. First of all, Mr. LANDRY and I are both from Louisiana. We are not potted plants. We are actually from a State that is on the coast. In fact, Mr. LANDRY lives, actually, on the coast. So I think we speak from experience and knowledge on that.

With respect to seafood, yes, there is a problem with the seafood. It's a perception problem. Seafood in Louisiana is the safest seafood in the world. We have just got to get that message out to the American people.

Let's talk about subsidies. We hear about subsidies. Well, you know there is a profiteer when it comes to oil: 36 to 63 cents per gallon is swept off the top. And who profits from that? The government profits from it. And what does the government do with much of that money? It puts it into so-called alternative energy with so-called phony green jobs that we are yet to see being produced, wind and solar, et cetera.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. Now, it's also been suggested, Well, perhaps we should punish these evil oil companies by taxing them. Mr. Chairman, who pays the taxes? It's the consumers. It's the American people. You add a 10 percent tax to oil exploration or gasoline or whatever, and it's us, it's we—we are the ones who will have to pay that, not the oil companies.

□ 1640

Like any company, they pass these costs along to the consumer. So I want to see gas prices go down, not up, like the other side.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member on the full committee, and someone who has done as much as anyone in this body to create green jobs in America over the decades.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much, and I thank him for his leadership on these issues. We're partners in this effort to try to move toward a new energy direction.

So last week we had a debate on the issue of whether or not the \$4 billion

that the oil industry gets in tax breaks per year from the American consumer should be taken away at this time when ExxonMobil reported \$10 billion worth of profits in the first quarter, that is just January, February and March. Shell reported \$8.8 billion; BP, \$7.1 billion; Chevron, \$6.2 billion; ConocoPhillips, \$3 billion. That's in the first 3 months of this year.

But you know what the argument is, from the Republican side, is that they would be punished if the consumer, if the taxpayer didn't also give them an additional \$4 billion in tax breaks.

So let's just look at this chart. This is how much they made as people are pulling up to the pump paying \$3.80, \$4, \$4.20 all across America. Now, you know what the oil companies could do? They could say, You know what? I think we made too much. I think what we should do in the first quarter is just lower the price at the pump so we don't make so much. Maybe we don't have to have the consumer paying \$4 a gallon. Maybe we, ExxonMobil, maybe we could have made 9.7. Maybe Shell could have made 7.8, maybe BP could have made only \$6.1 billion, maybe Chevron could have made only \$5.2 billion. In other words, maybe they each could have made \$1 billion less, and that would be \$4 billion in the first quarter.

But, no. They decide that if the war in Libya is going to take 1.2 million barrels of oil off the market, if the Saudi Arabians are going to take 800,000 barrels of oil off the market, that that's a free market. And so if the price goes up to skyrocketing heights, we have a right to take all that extra money out of the consumers' pockets. That's the free market. The war in Libya is a free market. Saudi Arabia taking 800,000 barrels off the market, that's a free market.

Now, the American consumer, they look at it and they say that's not a free market. The American taxpayers, they look at it and they say that's not the free market. We're sending over more bombers. We're sending over more troops. We're adding more to the defense budget of the country. Why would we do that? What does that have to do with the free market? What does this increase in defense expenditures and the number of young men and women that we send over to the Middle East to protect this cordon of oil tankers coming into the United States have to do with the free market?

But nonetheless, that's the argument of the Republicans and, by the way, of ExxonMobil and Shell and BP. They deserve these profits, they say, just for 3 months.

By the way, you can multiply each one of these numbers by at least four, at least the next three quarters of 2011 as well, and project ExxonMobil making \$40 billion this year and Shell 34 or \$35 billion, et cetera, et cetera.

But the Republicans say they still need the extra \$4 billion from the taxpayer pocket. So they dip into one pocket, the consuming pocket, and

they tip the consumer upside down, and they take all this money out of their pockets. And you don't see any restraint on the part of the oil companies taking advantage of the war in Libya. And then they want to dip into the other pocket of the consumer, the consumer as a taxpayer, and then they say you can't take away those tax breaks either.

So that's a very interesting position to have to defend at this point in time, especially since they're saying that they want to cut back on the benefits for Grandma on Medicare. They want to cut back the budget by 70 percent on wind and solar, on geothermal and biomass. They want to cut back the budget to help Grandma stay in a nursing home with Alzheimer's.

But one thing you should never touch, and that's the \$4 billion for ExxonMobil, Shell and BP from the taxpayers, even as they're reporting the largest profits in the history of the world that any corporation's made.

And now, today, they have the temerity to come out here on the floor and they're looking for more. What this first bill that we're about to consider does is it legislates possible intimidation of Federal safety reviewers and puts a time clock on looking at the most controversial leases.

Now, mind you, just 1 year ago in the Gulf of Mexico we were looking with amazement at the worst single environmental disaster in American history, and that is BP with no idea about how they were going to stop 4 million barrels of oil going into the Gulf of Mexico. They had no idea how to stop it. And the American people, the world was tuned into the spill cam, almost, you know, fixated on this complete lack of safety, complete lack of preparation to protect the life and the livelihoods of the people who live around the Gulf of Mexico.

So what's the response of the Republican Party 1 year later? Is it to pass a safety bill? Is it to implement the recommendations of the BP Spill Commission, this blue ribbon panel of experts that identified that there are systemic failures in the safety precautions built into drilling in the United States? Is it to deal with the fact that they identified that there are four times higher fatalities on American rigs as there are on European rigs drilling off the shores of Europe?

No. All that legislation is stopped dead in its tracks. What they argue is we have got to give, you know, kind of a shot clock. You know how in the NBA, when you're watching TV and you only have 24 seconds to shoot a basketball, and so that creates a real intensity or else you lose the ball? Well, that's kind of what they want to say now to the Department of the Interior. We're putting you on a shot clock. You have 60 days. You have 60 days to decide: Is that drilling rig safe? Have the precautions been put in place to ensure that a catastrophic accident can't happen?

And if you don't make a decision in 60 days, Department of the Interior, on a rig that's out there at 3,000 or 5,000 or 10,000 feet and off the shore miles and miles and you can't figure it out, Department of the Interior—now, mind you, this is the same company that couldn't figure it out a year ago, and they're amongst the wealthiest companies in the world. But if you, the Department of the Interior, if you can't figure out what we can do, we the company can do in 60 days, we get to have the lease and we get to go ahead.

□ 1650

It is kind of like the NBA, except the consequences aren't that your home team loses; it's that your home team loses its job, your home team loses its environment because another catastrophic accident has occurred. That's what they do with this bill. They put a shot clock on it.

So I think if the American people are looking at the absurdity of this situation with these companies, look at the companies that are lobbying for this: ExxonMobil, Shell, BP, Chevron, and ConocoPhillips. These are the companies that 1 year ago said that they could evacuate walrus from the Gulf of Mexico. They had an emergency response plan in the event of a spill. Well, the problem was, of course, that they each had put it in writing; they had each put it in as an application to the Department of the Interior to drill in the Gulf of Mexico. But walrus, as every sixth grade child knows, have not lived in the Gulf of Mexico for 3 million years. So these are the companies that we are now supposed to trust.

Put it on a shot clock, they say. Just let the Department of the Interior try to figure out everything that we are planning for Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas.

And, by the way, the way the gulf stream works is pulling a lot of that pollution, if it's bad, in God knows how many directions, and the fish that get exposed to it put into the food chain with endocrine disrupters, cancer-causing agents, potentially harming families. But 60 days is all you have got.

It's kind of like the NBA, when we think that's how oil drilling should be, too, because we trust these companies. They are obviously the most safety conscious companies that this world has ever known, because we can see how really responsible they are in dealing with consumers.

They had a chance not to charge \$4 a gallon because we are having a war in Libya and the Saudi Arabians took 800 barrels off the market, believe it or not, our friends the Saudis, over the last 6 weeks. But now we are just going to pretend that they are really good and responsible companies, and for them, so they can get all the leases that they want, they are on a shot clock—60 days.

Good luck to the Department of the Interior. Good luck to the environment. Good luck to the consumer.

Good luck to the taxpayers if another accident occurs.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we are going to have an incredible debate here on this issue, because these are the same people that just passed the budget that cut the wind and solar budget by 70 percent.

You know, if you are a kid in America and it is 2011 and you are looking at this debate, you're saying to yourself: They cut the solar and wind budget in 2011 by 70 percent, and they are giving the oil companies unlimited profits, unlimited tax breaks, and unlimited access after 60 days to wherever they want to drill off of the coastline? Now, that's an upside-down agenda.

And you have already heard some of the denigrating comments about wind and solar, which does reflect, I hate to say it, a deep-seated attitude about these renewable energy resources. But, you know, politics.

And I think America is all about the future, and the future is about wind. It's about solar. It's about moving to all electric vehicles. It's about the agenda that they just pretty much defunded in their budget that they had the votes here on the House floor.

So I would urge that we would defeat this piece of legislation.

And their legislation, they say it's all of the above, but do you want to know what it is? It's oil above all. That is really what it is all about. Give the oil companies everything they want, and slash the budget for renewables. Slash the budget for all the other new technologies that we need to enhance our future.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining to our side and if any remains on the other side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 15 minutes remaining. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, I have been listening very closely and I still haven't heard a clear answer as to how \$4 billion of additional taxes on energy companies will translate into lower costs at the pump. Now, I don't think it can be done, but I haven't even heard a cogent argument to establish that. So I am still listening, and maybe I will hear that later.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, who lives on and represents a district on the Gulf of Mexico, Mr. LANDRY.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Chairman, I do. I live on the coast. I represent most of coastal Louisiana. And what I wonder is, where were my colleagues in 2008? I was not in this body; they were.

They were worried about my shrimpers? In 2008, almost every shrimp boat from Venice to Delcambre was at the dock. Why? Because they had run diesel to just about \$5 a gallon. You see, it takes energy for those shrimpers to go out there on the Gulf of Mexico.

They worry about the tourism in Florida? There are already multiple articles in the paper that say that high gas prices are killing tourism in Florida.

This is a responsibility bill. You see, they want to punish those who make a profit while they give taxpayer money to those who fail, who are too big to fail. They punish the companies who make profits in this country while they give our money to those who fail to make a profit.

It amazes me, because what really matters here, what really creates jobs not only in my district but in everyone else's district is affordable energy. Affordable energy is what powers the U.S. economy.

If they want to bring the profits of those four Big Oil companies down, they should vote for this bill. Because when we drive the price of oil down and when we drive the price at the pump down, we are going to drive those profits down and we are going to take away our dependency on those foreign countries that are making way more profits than those private companies.

So I urge my colleagues to remember that the responsible thing to do is to vote for this bill so that we can bring the price at the pump down.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the issue of safety that has been raised a couple of times here.

I quoted from the bill text earlier to show that there, indeed, are safety requirements that have been put into the bill as part of H.R. 1229:

The Secretary will not issue a permit unless critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention and oil spill response and containment requirements, have been satisfied.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding to talk about this important legislation; because, Mr. Chairman, as I just got back home from New Orleans over the weekend, of course people all throughout the gulf coast, people all throughout the country are frustrated and angry about the high gas prices we are paying at the pump.

In south Louisiana you don't need to look any further than the area that I represent to see the devastating impact of this administration's policies, not only on high gas prices but also on jobs.

We have lost over 13,000 jobs in south Louisiana just because of this administration's refusal to let our people go back to work, people that were drilling safely, exploring for energy in America, that are literally on the verge of being put out of business because this administration won't let them go back to work where there are known barrels of oil, billions of barrels in some of these areas in the Outer Continental Shelf that are closed off because of this administration.

They say there is no moratorium anymore, but we call it a permitorium, because they don't allow companies to go back to work, hiring people, creating jobs, allowing our country to become energy independent.

If you look at the results of their policies, not only has it yielded higher gas prices at the pump, but for anybody on the other side that suggests that cutting off the supply has nothing to do with the price of oil, they need to go back and take a basic economics course.

I don't think OPEC could have developed a better policy than what they have got right now, because they are saying basically we are not allowing our people to go back to work in the United States, but the President wants to encourage drilling in Brazil. He asked the Saudis to produce more energy. We have got billions of barrels in America, and our people can't even go back to work.

So this legislation at least says, enough of this delay, enough of the foolishness and the games and blaming everybody else while gas prices continue to skyrocket. Prices have more than doubled at the pump since President Obama took the oath of office, and it is his policies that are causing this.

So I am glad that this leadership is bringing legislation to the floor here in the House to finally say we are going to do something about it; we are not going to look the other way. Our plan isn't to raise billions more in taxes so people pay even more at the pump and so we are even more dependent on foreign oil. We are actually going to make America energy independent by saying let's let our people go back to work.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying this: If you go throughout south Louisiana and you see the 13,000 jobs that we have lost; you talk to families who are hanging on by a vine; you talk to small business owners who barely can make ends meet and they are just struggling to hold on to their business, and all they want to do is go back to work, and this administration is saying "no." But, no, they want to drill in Brazil. They want our people across the country to pay higher gas prices.

There is a better way. There is an answer. There is a solution, and that is in this legislation being brought forward. I urge that my colleagues from across the country vote to lower gas prices and pass this bill.

□ 1700

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman and the others from the Natural Resources Committee on the Republican side who have spoken on this issue or are with the Energy and Commerce Committee and made great comments about how we do need to do what

we can in Congress to lower the price of gasoline. We do that by increasing production. The two go together. We don't do it by increasing taxes on the energy producers. We allow for policies to allow for more production.

We have to pass H.R. 1229 to make sure that, whether it is deliberate or not, this administration will not continue to stonewall the permitting process. It is a long and lengthy process. There are multiple environmental reviews that take place. Then to hold it up at the last and not allow for a permit to be issued is just not acceptable. All the work has been done when it becomes time to issue the permit.

So what this bill says is you have 30 days, with a couple of extensions, if necessary, to make the final decision. And you don't have to issue the permit. You can say no, if that is the best decision. Just take action, and let's have a little certainty in the business world and in the economy of our country, especially the Gulf of Mexico and the coastal States like Louisiana that are so heavily affected.

On the issue of safety, Mr. Chairman, we all do share the goal of wanting to make sure that offshore drilling is the safest in the world. Significant and fundamental changes have taken place over the past year to improve offshore drilling safety and response. Regulations have been enhanced and strengthened, standards have been increased, new technology has been developed, reviewed, tested and is being currently deployed.

BOEMRE Director Michael Bromwich came to our committee and testified in front of the Natural Resources Committee and he said, "We have confidence that offshore drilling can be conducted now more safely than it had been before and that we would be better able to deal with a blowout than we were before."

Now, if anyone on the other side of the aisle wants to act as if nothing has been changed and there have been no safety reforms imposed, they are indicting the Obama administration in saying that they have turned a blind eye to the situation since the BP crisis took place, and that is simply not true. As I said a minute ago, new regulations have been imposed and standards have been strengthened. So I am not going to sit here and indict the administration on the safety aspect. There have been a lot of safety regulations by bureaucratic regulation put into place.

This bill does acknowledge that two additional things will be part of our law when this bill passes. H.R. 1229 says, number one, the Secretary will issue a permit. The need for a permit has not been ever codified, so we are requiring that a permit has to be issued before drilling can take place. Number two, the Secretary is to conduct a safety review. That is being mandated and put into law.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1229. We are going to be looking at some amendments shortly.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act, and I thank Natural Resources Committee Chairman HASTINGS for yielding me time.

At a time when hardworking Georgians are paying \$3.88 per gallon at the pump, it is critically important that we enact commonsense energy production policies to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and create jobs. Unfortunately, the Obama Administration has adopted policies that have stifled energy production in this country, and have led to 12,000 jobs lost during the moratorium imposed in the Gulf of Mexico last year.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 1229 will end the ongoing "de facto" moratorium caused by the White House's refusal to approve permits in the Gulf by requiring the Department of the Interior to grant permits for exploration of oil and natural gas. This commonsense legislation will create thousands of jobs, help recapture \$4.7 million that the Federal Government is losing on a daily basis from a lack of energy production, and will lead us to greater energy independence.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1229.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230.

In April 2010, our Nation watched as millions of gallons of oil spilled into the Gulf of Mexico from an oil drilling rig off the coast of Louisiana. We saw photos of the disaster that ensued, the impact on our environment (including the damage caused to marine and coastal wildlife) and the devastating economic impact on communities in the Gulf Coast region. From the loss of fishing jobs and revenue from tourism to the harm of biodiversity in fragile wetland ecosystems and marine life breeding grounds, this oil spill caused immense destruction to a resource rich area.

I am concerned that without changes to the offshore drilling industry standards, a disaster like the Deepwater Horizon explosion of April 2010 could happen again. Today, the majority in the House is asking us to pass H.R. 1229 and to forget about the tragic events of last April and the inadequacies of our national energy policy in order to grant Big Oil access to the Gulf with less oversight—rushing lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico at an unprecedented pace and without proper environmental review. This bill is not only ill-advised, but it is unnecessary as well because the Obama Administration is already moving forward with the lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico with added reviews to ensure sound safety and environmental protections.

In addition, H.R. 1230 would require the Interior Department to hold additional lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico over the next 4 to 8 months and open the eastern seaboard for drilling by requiring a lease sale off the coast of Virginia this year. This bill would require the Interior Department to rely on environmental reviews for these areas done by the Bush Administration prior to the Deepwater Horizon disaster, with many of the same demonstrably flawed and dangerous assumptions and inadequate review processes as the BP lease that led to the disastrous spill in April 2010. The majority in Congress is using rising gasoline prices as an excuse to grant large, multi-national energy companies greater access to even more of our precious shores, including

on the Atlantic Coast which could affect New Jersey in the event of a spill.

I believe opening our coastal waters and protected wilderness areas to oil drilling is harmful, ineffective, and a step in the wrong direction that will damage our environment. We are currently drilling at a higher rate than we ever have and onshore production increased by 5% in 2010. Production in the Gulf of Mexico is at an all time high. Yet, of the 41 million acres of public lands now leased for oil and gas development, just 12 million acres are producing. Offshore, 38 million acres of the outer continental shelf are leased for oil and gas drilling, but just 6.5 million acres are producing. We have approved drilling leases on land where no drilling is taking place; the potential for higher production is there without expanding leasing to environmentally sensitive wildlife refuges or populated shore regions.

Moreover, the proposed drilling will not significantly lower gas prices. According to a 2009 study from the Energy Information Administration, opening up waters that are currently closed to drilling off the East Coast, West Coast and the Gulf coast of Florida would yield an extra 500,000 barrels a day by 2030, meaning that gas prices might drop a total of 3 cents a gallon. And that is years away. In the meantime, Big Oil companies continue to rake in record profits while taxpayers subsidize their costs. The American people have had enough, New Jersey has had enough and I have had enough. We need to stop Big Oil subsidies and explore alternatives.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. 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. LANDRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 after 6:30 p.m. today.

ASSESSING PROGRESS IN HAITI ACT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1016) to measure the progress of relief, recovery, reconstruction, and

development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1016

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 “Assessing Progress in Haiti Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On January 12, 2010, an earthquake measuring 7.0 on the Richter magnitude scale struck the country of Haiti.

(2) According to the United States Geological Survey (USGS)—

(A) the earthquake epicenter was located approximately 15 miles southwest of Port-au-Prince, the capital of Haiti; and

(B) the earthquake was followed by 59 aftershocks of magnitude 4.5 or greater, the most severe measuring 6.0.

(3) According to the Government of Haiti, more than 316,000 people died as a result of the earthquake, including 103 citizens of the United States and more than 100 United Nations personnel.

(4) According to the United Nations and the International Organization for Migration—

(A) an estimated 3,000,000 people were directly affected by the disaster, nearly one-third of the country’s population; and

(B) more than 2,100,000 people were displaced from their homes to settlements.

(5) Casualty numbers and infrastructure damage, including to roads, ports, hospitals, and residential dwellings, place the earthquake as the worst cataclysm to hit Haiti in over two centuries and, proportionally, one of the world’s worst natural disasters in modern times.

(6) The Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) conducted by the Government of Haiti, the United Nations, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other experts estimates that damage and economic losses totaled \$7,804,000,000, approximately 120 percent of Haiti’s gross domestic product in 2009.

(7) Haiti is the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere with, prior to the earthquake—

(A) more than 70 percent of Haitians living on less than \$2 per day; and

(B) a ranking of 149 out of 182 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index.

(8) House Resolution 1021, which was passed on January 21, 2010, on a vote of 411 to 1 expressed—

(A) the House of Representatives’ “deepest condolences and sympathy for the horrific loss of life” caused by the earthquake; and

(B) bipartisan support for Haiti’s recovery and reconstruction.

(9) The initial emergency response of the men and women of the United States Government, led by the United States Agency for International Development and United States Southern Command, was swift and resolute.

(10) United States urban search and rescue (USAR) teams were immediately activated after the earthquake and deployed from Fairfax County, Virginia, Los Angeles County, California, Miami-Dade, Florida, the City of Miami, Florida, and Virginia Beach, Virginia, to assist the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART), and New York City’s first responders asked the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)

to activate a New York City urban search and rescue shortly thereafter.

(11) A month after the earthquake, the House of Representatives unanimously passed House Resolution 1059 which expressed gratitude to these USAR units, and highlighted that the 511 United States rescue workers comprised roughly one-third of the entire international USAR effort in Haiti, and more than 130 people were rescued from under the rubble in Haiti by these units.

(12) Individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations across the United States and throughout the international community responded in support of Haiti and its populace during this crisis, sometimes in innovative ways such as fundraising through text messaging.

(13) The Haitian diaspora in the United States, which was integral to emergency relief efforts—

(A) has annually contributed significant monetary support to Haiti through remittances; and

(B) continues to seek opportunities to partner with the United States Agency for International Development and other agencies to substantively contribute to the reconstruction of Haiti.

(14) Significant challenges still remain in Haiti as it works to recover and rebuild.

(15) According to the International Organization for Migration, approximately 680,000 people remain in spontaneous and organized camps in Haiti.

(16) According to numerous nongovernmental organizations and United States contractors, the pace of reconstruction has lagged significantly behind the original emergency relief phase.

(17) The widespread irregularities that occurred in the elections held in Haiti on November 28, 2010, led to outbursts of violence which undermined the recovery efforts.

(18) On October 21, 2010, an outbreak of cholera was detected in the Lower Artibonite region.

(19) Initial efforts to contain the epidemic were disrupted by Hurricane Tomás and resulting widespread flooding, which led to the spreading and entrenchment of the disease throughout the country.

(20) According to the Haitian Ministry of Public Health and Population, as of March 28, 2011—

(A) approximately 4,766 people have died from cholera; and

(B) approximately 270,991 have been infected from the disease.

(21) According to the Pan American Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, cholera could spread to as many as 400,000 people within the first year of the epidemic, potentially causing 7,600 deaths at the current case fatality rate.

(22) The United States has provided more than \$62,523,017 worth of assistance to combat the cholera epidemic, including by assisting with stockpiling health commodities, equipping cholera treatments centers, providing public information, and improving water and sanitation systems.

(23) The efforts to combat the cholera epidemic have helped to drive the mortality rate from cholera down from nearly 7 percent to 1.7 percent of all contracted cases as of February 25, 2011.

(24) Throughout the series of crises, the people of Haiti continue to demonstrate unwavering resilience, dignity, and courage.

(25) On March 20, 2011, presidential and parliamentary elections were held in Haiti without major disruptions or problems.

(26) At the international donors conference “Towards a New Future for Haiti” held on March 31, 2010, 59 donors pledged over \$5,000,000,000 to support Haiti.

(27) The United Nations Office of the Special Envoy for Haiti estimates that nearly \$1,900,000,000 has been disbursed, with an additional amount of approximately \$2,000,000,000 committed.

(28) Haiti will need the support of the international community in order to confront the ongoing cholera epidemic and to promote reconstruction and development.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, in consultation with the heads of all relevant agencies, including the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall transmit to Congress a report on the status of post-earthquake humanitarian, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti, including efforts to prevent the spread of cholera and treat persons infected with the disease.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a description, analysis, and evaluation of the—

(1) overall progress of relief, recovery, and reconstruction in Haiti, including—

(A) programs and projects of the United States Government;

(B) programs and projects to protect vulnerable populations, such as internally displaced persons, children, women and girls, and persons with disabilities; and

(C) projects to improve water, sanitation, and health, and plans for improvements in these areas in the long-term;

(2) extent to which United States and international efforts are in line with the priorities of the Government of Haiti and are actively engaging and working through Haitian ministries and local authorities;

(3) coordination among United States Government agencies, and coordination between the United States Government and United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, and other bilateral donors;

(4) mechanisms for communicating the progress of recovery and reconstruction efforts to Haitian citizens, as well as recommendations on how these can be improved;

(5) mechanisms through which Haitian civil society, including vulnerable populations, is actively participating in all major stages of recovery and reconstruction efforts, and recommendations on how these can be improved;

(6) mechanisms through which the Haitian diaspora is involved in recovery and reconstruction efforts; and

(7) suitability of Haiti to receive aliens who are removed, excluded, or deported from the United States pursuant to United States law, and steps Haiti is taking to strengthen its capacity in this regard.

(c) **USE OF PREVIOUSLY APPROPRIATED FUNDS.**—Funding for the report required under subsection (a) shall derive from existing discretionary funds of the departments and agencies specified in such subsection.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore** (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN).

Ms. ROSLEHTINEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1016, a bill introduced by my

friend Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California which requires a report to Congress regarding the status of post-earthquake humanitarian reconstruction and development efforts in Haiti.

This bill supplements my efforts under the Haiti Act, which I introduced last Congress, to exercise greater oversight over the disbursement of U.S. assistance to Haiti to ensure that it is meeting the intended recipients and purposes, that it is advancing U.S. priorities, that it is promoting Haiti's recovery, and that it is not being derailed by waste, duplication or corruption.

This past January, Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Haiti with Secretary Clinton's Chief of Staff and point person on Haiti to observe some of the tremendous work the United States is doing and to learn about U.S. plans for the future as well.

Much progress has been seen in Haiti over the past 16 months. More than 2 million cubic meters of rubble have been cleared, there is now a better medical system and increased access to more clean water than before the earthquake, and the interim Haiti Reconstruction Commission has approved 86 reconstruction projects, accounting for about one-third of the total pledges made by international donors last year.

However, Mr. Speaker, with each stated achievement, we are reminded of how much further Haiti has to go. Hundreds of thousands of Haitians are reportedly still without safe and secure sustainable shelter. A recent U.N. report found that peacekeepers in Haiti may have contributed to the environmental contamination which could have led to the cholera outbreak, crime is reportedly on the upswing, rising food and gasoline prices will make day-to-day survival even more difficult for many of the people of Haiti, and Haiti is still dealing with lingering questions regarding the recently announced parliamentary election results.

In order for progress in Haiti to continue, it is important that allegations of election corruption are resolved quickly, that the concerns of the Haitian people are put to rest, and that the duly-elected parliamentarians are seated as soon as possible.

This weekend, President-elect Martelly is scheduled to be inaugurated; and as the new government takes office, it has its work cut out for it. The new leadership must make a commitment to root out corruption at all levels in order to build trust within Haiti and with all of Haiti's partners.

□ 1710

The President-elect's recent statements regarding his intent to pursue allegations of electoral fraud in the parliamentary election results are a step in the right direction. The government must also make certain that the Haitian people are fully consulted on the direction in which their country is heading and that they will have oppor-

tunities to create a better future for themselves and their families. Civil society and local governments must increasingly become a partner at the table of Haiti's future.

With the security situation reportedly deteriorating, it will be important for Haiti's new leaders to commit to the necessary resources to support the expansion of the Haitian National Police as well as implement updates to the criminal code and other reforms to strengthen its judicial system. I understand the United States intends to work with the new Haitian government to help Haiti become a more business-friendly environment.

As a proud representative of Florida's 18th Congressional District, I can tell you firsthand the interest of U.S. businesses, organizations, and private citizens, including the Haitian diaspora, to participate in the recovery and the development efforts in Haiti—and that only continues to grow stronger. More importantly, it is imperative that the United States take every appropriate measure to ensure that our funding and our efforts in Haiti and around the world are not squandered. This includes accountability for U.N. contractors who owe a duty of care for the civilians whom they are there to protect.

The report called for in this bill, H.R. 1016, will provide Members of Congress and the public an opportunity to see what is working and, yes, to see what is not working. I would also note that the funding that will be needed to develop this report is directed to be pulled from already appropriated funding. Further, CBO found that the cost of this report in this bill is so minimal that it did not meet the threshold of an estimate.

I would like to thank Ranking Member BERMAN and his staff for working with us on this measure. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in support of our oversight efforts, and I'm so pleased to join Congresswoman WILSON's efforts in making sure that we can provide our great partner, Haiti, with the resources it needs to build itself up.

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

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

I rise in support of this bill, the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act. A year and a half ago, on January 12, 2011, the world for the Caribbean island of Haiti and for too many of my constituents changed forever. An earthquake measuring an incredible 7.0 on the Richter scale shook the Earth in Haiti. It killed elected officials, toppled the President's palace, the Senate, and all of the Cabinet buildings. People are still missing. The effect of this earthquake is still being felt today. Basic needs such as food, water, clothing, shelter, and health services are lacking.

Thanks to our military—the U.S. Coast Guard, which performed thou-

sands of hours of rescue in the first 24 hours of the earthquake; the U.S. Marine Corps, which provided stability and protection; the U.S. Army, which helped to establish logistics and additional protection; the U.S. Navy, with floating hospitals and surgeons; and the U.S. Agency for International Development—this disaster was not the total disaster it could have been. USAID worked then and continues to work coordinating and implementing programs with other international organizations.

Adding further hurdles to the recovery operation has been the widespread outbreak of cholera last October. Cholera, a disease caused due to the lack of access to clean, clear water, has killed hundreds of Haitians and has further set back progress in one of our closest Caribbean neighbors. The people of Haiti deserve the opportunity to live in a clean, safe, and economically thriving country. The people of America deserve and want to know how their tax dollars are being spent, and need to know that the \$1.8 billion invested in Haiti will speedily facilitate Haiti's transition to a bastion of comfort and economic stability. That is why I support House bill 1016, the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act.

This bill provides for one of the first times a strong, fair, and objective accountability of how the people's money is being spent in Haiti. This report will also analyze how well the United Nations and other organizations and groups are coordinating their efforts to reduce duplication. Finally, this bill thanks the heroic efforts of Miami-Dade County's urban search and rescue teams, which hail from the 17th Congressional District of Florida, who volunteered their time, effort, and energy to save lives. These people saved lives and helped find loved ones for those trapped in the rubble of the earthquake and for those who were worried about the safety and well-being of their loved ones.

I also would like to thank respectively the chairman and ranking minority members of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, CONNIE MACK and ELIOT ENGEL, and their staff for making this happen. Representative ENGEL was kind enough to carry the language of my amendment during subcommittee consideration, and Chairman MACK and both the Democratic and Republican staff worked tirelessly toward a compromise that worked for both sides. I also want to thank our full committee chairman, and one who I am so proud of, my Florida colleague, LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for managing this language in her amendment during full committee consideration of this bill.

Perhaps a bright spot in this ongoing calamity is that Haitians recently elected a new President, Michel Martelly, with whom we expect to work arm-in-arm with to help rebuild Haiti. His inauguration is next weekend. On Saturday, I traveled to Haiti. I

met with Mr. Martelly. I met with the senators as they debated their new constitution. I'm hoping that that constitution will help guide them towards the next centuries in Haiti.

There are 1,400 tent cities—not tents; tent cities—that house 850,000 residents in the streets of Haiti. No running water and one porta-toilet for every 80 residents. Families are huddled under the tents—mostly women and children. And because the national prison was destroyed during the earthquake, armed bandits roam the tent cities and sexual abuse against women and girls is rampant. The police force is extremely compromised and not trained. The army is nonexistent. And many bodies have not been found from this earthquake. It is inhumane to send anybody back to such conditions. We must help rebuild Haiti. We must support Haiti. We must support the new President from this moment on. We must include the peasants and the agricultural community at the table of negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is an affirmation of the generosity and will of the American people to come to the aid of a country in our neighborhood that desperately needs our help. The report required by this bill should help us channel our assistance efforts to make them as effective and efficient as possible. The Haitian people deserve nothing less.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1016, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

□ 1720

Ms. WATERS. I would like to thank the gentlelady from Florida for extending time to me to rise in support of this bill.

I am now—and have been for many years—a big supporter of the people of Haiti. I am the proud author of H.R. 4573, the Haiti Debt Relief and Earthquake Recovery Act. It was that bill that freed up \$828 million that they would have had to have paid out for their debts, money that can now go toward helping with the earthquake response.

Immediately following the earthquake, there was an outpouring of sympathy from people in the United States and around the world; and I am very appreciative for what our government

did and for what the people of this country did—individuals, churches. We've not always had our politics right in Haiti, but we sure rose to the occasion with regard to this devastating earthquake that hit Haiti.

The international community pledged a total of \$9.9 billion in reconstruction funds, including \$5.3 billion for the first 2 years. Yet, more than 1 year later, little, if any, of the money has reached the people of Haiti. According to the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, 680,000 displaced people are still living in tent camps, and the conditions in many of these camps are appalling. There is a critical need for food, clean water, and sanitation facilities. A deadly outbreak of cholera has already killed more than 4,800 people and has infected more than 280,000 people. The effects of the epidemic were exacerbated by the lack of clean water and sanitation infrastructure. Foreign aid without transparency will accomplish nothing.

We owe it to the Haitian people and the American people to find out how much of this money has actually been delivered to Haiti and where that money went. That is why I strongly support this bill, which requires the President to report on the status of post-earthquake relief, recovery, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti. The report must evaluate coordination among various international agencies and donors, the extent to which U.S. and international efforts are in line with the priorities of the Government of Haiti, and mechanisms for Haitian civil society to participate in recovery efforts.

I am in awe of the strength and resiliency of the Haitian people. We owe it to them to assist them in their time of need. We also owe it to them to make certain our assistance reaches the people who need it the most.

As I said, we've not always had our act together in Haiti. Well, there has been a new election, and they've elected a President. There was a lot of turmoil and disorder around this election, but it's over now; it has been done, and we want to work with the new government to make sure that there is transparency and that we do know what happened to this money. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who is the author of this legislation.

Ms. LEE. First, let me thank the gentlelady from Florida for yielding and for her leadership on so many issues, especially as it relates to her community, her district, Haitians, Haiti, and the Haitian diaspora.

I rise in support of H.R. 1016, the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act, legislation which I authored to direct the United States Government to report on the status of humanitarian, recon-

struction, and development efforts in the aftermath of the tragic earthquake of January 12, 2010.

Let me thank Chairwoman ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership and for her assistance in helping bring this bill to the floor. I also thank Ranking Member BERMAN, Chairman MACK, Ranking Member ENGEL, the staffs of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my staff, as well as the Republican and Democratic leaders' offices for bringing this bill to the floor.

I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues. You just heard from Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS in terms of her leadership and her commitment to the people of Haiti and of so many others who have worked tirelessly in support of the Haitian people in ongoing United States humanitarian and reconstruction efforts in Haiti.

Today, we are provided with an opportunity to not only remember those who have lost their lives but to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to support Haitians as they struggle to combat the ongoing cholera epidemic and to rebuild their neighborhoods, their country, and their lives following the devastation of January 12.

Following the earthquake, many of us came together to pass a bill that I authored, H. Res. 1021. This was passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 411-1. This resolution expressed solidarity with the Haitian people and our support for the long-term reconstruction needs of the country. Through the bill on the floor today, we are provided with the next step—with an opportunity to assess the progress that we have made, the extraordinary challenges that remain, and the areas in which improvement is greatly needed.

As many of us have been many, many times over the years, I traveled to Haiti immediately following the earthquake and again in November during Haiti's recent elections. Once again, let me just say that I saw real progress being made. Of course, the cholera outbreak, an ongoing devastating setback, though, revealed the ramped-up capacity of Haiti's national laboratory. The lab was able to identify the cholera strain very rapidly, improving our ability to respond to the outbreak—a feat that would really have been impossible just a year earlier. However, significant improvements remain desperately needed.

The unprecedented relief effort has given way to a sluggish, at best, reconstruction effort. Part of this pace can be attributed to the sheer magnitude of the problems Haiti faces as well as Haiti's legal and bureaucratic hurdles, including the lack of an adequate land tenure policy. Without a doubt, though, part of the blame rests in the lack of urgency—mind you, the lack of urgency—on the part of the international community.

At the International Donors' Conference in March 2010, 58 donors

pledged over \$5.5 billion to support Haiti's Action Plan for Recovery and Development. According to the United Nations, as of March of this year, only 37 percent of these funds have been disbursed. This is unacceptable. If we are to break the cycle of disaster-emergency relief-disaster, in which Haiti has been trapped for many years, we must act with the same sense of urgency in reconstruction as we did immediately following the quake.

In addition to delivering on our promises, we must ensure that those promises are in line with the will of the Haitian people. The international community recognized early on that, if our efforts were to be sustainable, they had to reflect the priorities of the people of Haiti. The establishment of the Interim Haiti Recovery Commission was a very good idea in this regard; and moving forward, we must ensure that it is inclusive, transparent, and adequately resourced.

Additionally, we must substantially improve our communication with and the participation of Haitian civil society. The United States and the United Nations are sponsoring outreach for civil society organizations; however, many Haitians still hold the perception that recovery efforts are dominated by exclusive foreign actors. Unless civil society, which are the people of Haiti, is involved in every major stage of the post-earthquake response, this perception will remain, and it will prove detrimental to the sustainability of our efforts.

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. In this vein, we must give special priority to programs that protect vulnerable populations, including internally displaced persons—women, children, persons with disabilities, and others. We must ensure that these populations are significantly involved in recovery efforts, which reinforces their protection. The United Nations Secretary General, for example, has specifically stated that women should be involved in security decisions that affect their daily lives as a means of combating the alarming level of gender-based violence since the earthquake.

On the topic of vulnerable populations, we must take a critical look at the resumption of deportations to Haiti. Given the fragile state in which Haiti remains, I call on the Department of Homeland Security to halt deportations until it proves that its policy does not violate international human rights laws and until it demonstrates that Haiti is able to support the influx of deportees. If we are truly committed to helping our neighbors, we must ensure that we are not assisting Haiti with one hand while undermining its stability with the other.

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

□ 1730

Ms. LEE. Finally, we must continue to support the Haitian Public Health Ministry to prevent the spread of cholera, treat those affected with the disease, and build up health systems. The international community must plan for the long-term presence of this disease, unfortunately, which is now endemic, and provide the necessary resources to ensure that this planning is thorough and complete.

Throughout this unceasing series of tragedies and crises, Haitians have continued to demonstrate unwavering resilience, dignity, and courage.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity this past Saturday to go to Haiti and take a helicopter ride to survey all of the damage on Haiti and all of the hope for Haiti, all of the islands and the connecting islands of Haiti to see what was happening.

The African diaspora, which is mostly members of District 17, they all want to help rebuild Haiti. They will apply for contracts; and if dual nationality is granted, they will also run for office and lend their expertise to the recovery of Haiti.

We all know that TPS expires in June. TPS, temporary protected status, was extended to the Haitian nationals. We, along with the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, and Congressman PAYNE, were working on trying to extend that deadline for at least another year. Haiti is in no disposition to accept any further deportations.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H.R. 1016, a bill to measure the progress of relief, recovery, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, introduced by Representative BARBARA LEE of California.

Immediately following the earthquake, Congress passed a bipartisan resolution expressing our determination to aid Haiti through this tragedy. I strongly believe that our nation needs to once again pledge unwavering support to continue to lead an aggressive, coordinated effort to aid Haiti's ongoing recovery and reconstruction.

In the wake of the disaster, the American people and the global community rallied in solidarity with the Haitian people to provide one of the largest relief efforts in history. And today, nearly one and a half years after this tragedy, we must renew our support for the people of Haiti as they struggle to combat an ongoing cholera epidemic, curb post-election violence, and rebuild their neighborhoods, livelihoods, and their country.

As this legislation stipulates, President Obama, "in consultation with the heads of all relevant agencies . . . shall transmit to Congress a report on the status of post-earthquake humanitarian, reconstruction, and development efforts in Haiti . . ." and analyze the recovery efforts being made in Haiti to

date, and ensure that "our government is in line with the priorities of the Government of Haiti and actively engaging and working through Haitian ministries and local authorities" to assist the island nation in their attempt to recover.

As the representative of Florida's Third Congressional District, I have been a staunch advocate for the Haitian people throughout my congressional career of nearly 20 years, and have led numerous Codels to the island nation of Haiti. Moreover, as a Member from Florida with a large Haitian community in my district, and considering the island nation is located less than 700 miles from the Florida Keys, I feel it is my duty to do everything I can to provide assistance and improve the lives of the Haitian people.

Certainly, even before the January 12th earthquake, Haiti was the least-developed country in our Hemisphere and one of the poorest in the world. The island nation had a per capita income around \$400, horribly acute economic inequality, and over 80 percent of its 9 million inhabitants surviving below the poverty level. To me, this is entirely unacceptable, particularly given the island's proximity to the state of Florida.

In October 2009, just two months before the earthquake, I led a Congressional delegation to Haiti to meet with President René Prével to discuss issues ranging from improving the nation's infrastructure, the high unemployment rate and poor standard of living. Yet the horrific earthquake that struck last January 12th made a dire situation for the majority of the people of Haiti unimaginably worse.

Today, the nation remains devastated. A million displaced Haitians remain in tent camps. Mountains of rubble are piled in the streets, and billions in assistance pledged by the international community has yet to be delivered. Meanwhile, there have been many quests regarding the recent elections and incoming government's ability to capably lead in recovery and development efforts.

As I'm sure everyone here knows, the massive earthquake that struck Haiti killed 230,000 people, displaced an estimated 2 million people from their homes, and affected one third of the country's population. The main port, the presidential palace, the parliament, the majority of ministry buildings, more than 50 hospitals and health centers, 1300 educational institutions, and more than 100,000 homes were left in ruins. The earthquake, which came less than 2 years after a series of devastating hurricanes, left millions of people in the Western Hemisphere's poorest country living in absolutely horrific conditions.

Immediately following the earthquake, there was an outpouring of sympathy from people in the United States and around the world. American families opened their hearts and contributed millions to non-profit organizations that were working around the clock to save lives. The United States Government provided emergency medical care and distributed food, water, and tents to the displaced, and world governments committed more than \$9 billion in aid for reconstruction at a donors' conference in March, including more than \$1 billion pledged by the United States.

For my part, immediately following the earthquake, along with the local community and tremendous assistance from church leaders, we organized food and clothing drives, and encouraged people to make donations to

non-profits on the ground in Haiti. With assistance of area churches, businesses, local community leaders and nonprofit organizations, we transported seven 53-foot tractor-trailers filled with supplies with nearly \$50,000 of food, water and other items from the Jacksonville and Orlando areas to Haiti's shores, and had the Coast Guard's assistance in their delivery to Food for the Poor, a non-profit group operating in Port-au-Pays, on the north side of the island.

As a key Member of the House Transportation Committee and Chair of the Railroad subcommittee, I will continue to work hard on Capitol Hill to find ways in which the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure can provide technical assistance to the nation; in particular, in the area of rebuilding the ports, roads and general infrastructure system throughout the island. Indeed, getting the ports up and running, including improving customs procedures, is an essential element in the nation's struggle to turn the corner and prosper economically. If successfully carried out, this advancement would be a key component in the nation's efforts to successfully recover and prosper in the future, and improve the standard of living for the proud, hard-working people of the island nation Haiti.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1016, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 245 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1229.

□ 1734

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in the bill is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an

original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 1229

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 "Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act".

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

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

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 11(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) DRILLING PERMITS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation require that any lessee operating under an approved exploration plan—

"(A) must obtain a permit before drilling any well in accordance with such plan; and

"(B) must obtain a new permit before drilling any well of a design that is significantly different than the design for which an existing permit was issued.

"(2) SAFETY REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph (1) without ensuring that the proposed drilling operations meet all—

"(A) critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention; and

"(B) oil spill response and containment requirements.

"(3) TIMELINE.—

"(A) The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit under paragraph (1) within 30 days after receiving an application for the permit. The Secretary may extend such period for up to two periods of 15 days each, if the Secretary has given written notice of the delay to the applicant. The notice shall be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary, and shall include the names and titles of the persons processing the application, the specific reasons for the delay, and a specific date a final decision on the application is expected.

"(B) If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

"(i) in writing, clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not accepted and detailed information concerning any deficiencies, and

"(ii) an opportunity to remedy any deficiencies.

"(C) If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the application is deemed approved."

(b) DEADLINE FOR CERTAIN PERMIT APPLICATIONS UNDER EXISTING LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a), a lease under which a covered application is submitted to the Secretary of the Interior shall be considered to be in directed suspension during the period beginning May 27, 2010, and ending on the date the Secretary issues a final decision on the application, if the Secretary does not issue a final decision on the application—

(A) before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, in the case of a covered application submitted before such date of enactment; or

(B) before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, in the case of a covered application submitted on or after such date of enactment.

(2) COVERED APPLICATION.—In this subsection the term "covered application"

means an application for a permit to drill under an oil and gas lease under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, that—

(A) represents a resubmission of an approved permit to drill (including an application for a permit to sidetrack) that was approved by the Secretary before May 27, 2010; and

(B) is received by the Secretary after October 12, 2010, and before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASES.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED LEASE.—In this section, the term "covered lease" means each oil and gas lease for the Gulf of Mexico outer Continental Shelf region issued under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) that—

(1)(A) was not producing as of April 30, 2010; or

(B) was suspended from operations, permit processing, or consideration, in accordance with the moratorium set forth in the Minerals Management Service Notice to Lessees and Operators No. 2010-N04, dated May 30, 2010, or the decision memorandum of the Secretary of the Interior entitled "Decision memorandum regarding the suspension of certain offshore permitting and drilling activities on the Outer Continental Shelf" and dated July 12, 2010; and

(2) by its terms would expire on or before December 31, 2011.

(b) EXTENSION OF COVERED LEASES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall extend the term of a covered lease by 1 year.

(c) EFFECT ON SUSPENSIONS OF OPERATIONS OR PRODUCTION.—The extension of covered leases under this section is in addition to any suspension of operations or suspension of production granted by the Minerals Management Service or Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement after May 1, 2010.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS RELATING TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF ACTIVITIES IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE.

In this title—

(1) the term "covered civil action" means a civil action containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action (as defined for the purposes of that section) affecting a covered energy project in the Gulf of Mexico; and

(2) the term "covered energy project" means the leasing of Federal lands of the Outer Continental Shelf (including submerged lands) for the exploration, development, production, processing, or transmission of oil, natural gas, wind, or any other source of energy in the Gulf of Mexico, and any action under such a lease, except that the term does not include any disputes between the parties to a lease regarding the obligations under such lease, including regarding any alleged breach of the lease.

SEC. 202. EXCLUSIVE VENUE FOR CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS RELATING TO COVERED ENERGY PROJECTS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO.

Venue for any covered civil action shall not lie in any district court not within the 5th circuit unless there is no proper venue in any court within that circuit.

SEC. 203. TIME LIMITATION ON FILING.

A covered civil action is barred unless filed no later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which it relates.

SEC. 204. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 205. STANDARD OF REVIEW.

In any judicial review of a covered civil action, administrative findings and conclusions relating to the challenged Federal action or decision shall be presumed to be correct, and the presumption may be rebutted only by the preponderance of the evidence contained in the administrative record.

SEC. 206. LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

SEC. 207. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES.

Sections 504 of title 5, United States Code, and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (together commonly called the Equal Access to Justice Act) do not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in such a covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys' fees, expenses, and other court costs.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 112-73. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

Mr. POLIS. 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 4, strike "and" after the semicolon at line 4, strike the period at line 6 and insert "; and", and after line 6 insert the following new subparagraph:

"(C) all requirements of all applicable statutes and regulations, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, and any law protecting fishing and recreation jobs.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, following last year's BP Deepwater Horizon disaster, one would think that a foundational and critical element of any bill related to offshore deepwater oil drilling would be to improve our safety and environmental safeguards based on the lessons that we learned the hard way from a horrific national tragedy, costing jobs and reducing health and damaging the environment.

While H.R. 1229 does include a provision that states that the Secretary shall not issue a permit without ensuring that the proposed drilling operation meets critical safety system requirements and oil spill response and containment requirements, it fails to make mention of and omits requiring the Secretary to ensure that critical environmental and economic laws are adhered to, a prolific problem leading up to the Deepwater Horizon spill.

Mr. Chairman, for years an ongoing problem in issuing permits for offshore drilling has been the Department of the Interior's failure to follow requirements set out under our Nation's foundational environmental protection laws and fisheries laws. These laws, like the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Protection Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Act, protect wildlife as well as fisheries and beaches that sustain the gulf's fishing and tourism industries.

In the gulf region, the number of jobs dependent on tourism and fishing is five times the number of jobs related to the oil and gas industry.

While reforms within the Obama administration are moving in the right direction, the fact is that this bill, in its current form, leaves out a major chunk of what should be included in any safety or oversight review that we require of the Secretary, and I'm grateful for the rule for allowing a full discussion and vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a May 2010 New York Times article, entitled, "U.S. Said to Allow Drilling Without Needed Permits," outlines the roots of this problem in detail. The article clearly explains how the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Department of the Interior's drilling permit agency is required to get permits for drilling where it might harm endangered species and marine animals.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, is partially responsible for protecting endangered species and marine mammals. It said on repeated occasions that drilling in the gulf does affect these animals. That's simply science. The records show that permits for hundreds of wells, including the BP disaster well itself, were granted without getting the permits required under existing Federal law.

Federal records show that NOAA instructed the minerals agency that continued drilling in the gulf was actually harming wildlife and needed to get permits in compliance with Federal law; but, sadly, those permits were never sought.

With regard to the National Environmental Protection Act, the government has time and time again performed cursory environmental assessments, failed to integrate NEPA analyses with related Federal statutes, and even exempted entire projects from NEPA review, including the Macondo

well. In the past, the only way to ensure permits have complied with NEPA has unfortunately been through lawsuits. My amendment would require these assurances from the Secretary before the permit is issued.

[From the New York Times, May 13, 2010]

U.S. SAID TO ALLOW DRILLING WITHOUT NEEDED PERMITS

(By Ian Urbina)

WASHINGTON.—The federal Minerals Management Service gave permission to BP and dozens of other oil companies to drill in the Gulf of Mexico without first getting required permits from another agency that assesses threats to endangered species—and despite strong warnings from that agency about the impact the drilling was likely to have on the gulf.

Those approvals, federal records show, include one for the well drilled by the Deepwater Horizon rig, which exploded on April 20, killing 11 workers and resulting in thousands of barrels of oil spilling into the gulf each day.

The Minerals Management Service, or M.M.S., also routinely overruled its staff biologists and engineers who raised concerns about the safety and the environmental impact of certain drilling proposals in the gulf and in Alaska, according to a half-dozen current and former agency scientists.

Those scientists said they were also regularly pressured by agency officials to change the findings of their internal studies if they predicted that an accident was likely to occur or if wildlife might be harmed.

Under the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Minerals Management Service is required to get permits to allow drilling where it might harm endangered species or marine mammals.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, is partly responsible for protecting endangered species and marine mammals. It has said on repeated occasions that drilling in the gulf affects these animals, but the minerals agency since January 2009 has approved at least three huge lease sales, 103 seismic blasting projects and 346 drilling plans. Agency records also show that permission for those projects and plans was granted without getting the permits required under federal law.

"M.M.S. has given up any pretense of regulating the offshore oil industry," said Kieran Suckling, director of the Center for Biological Diversity, an environmental advocacy group in Tucson, which filed notice of intent to sue the agency over its noncompliance with federal law concerning endangered species. "The agency seems to think its mission is to help the oil industry evade environmental laws."

Kendra Barkoff, a spokeswoman for the Interior Department, said her agency had full consultations with NOAA about endangered species in the gulf. But she declined to respond to additional questions about whether her agency had obtained the relevant permits.

Federal records indicate that these consultations ended with NOAA instructing the minerals agency that continued drilling in the gulf was harming endangered marine mammals and that the agency needed to get permits to be in compliance with federal law.

Responding to the accusations that agency scientists were being silenced, Ms. Barkoff added, "Under the previous administration, there was a pattern of suppressing science in decisions, and we are working very hard to change the culture and empower scientists in the Department of the Interior."

On Tuesday, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar announced plans to reorganize the

minerals agency to improve its regulatory role by separating safety oversight from the division that collects royalties from oil and gas companies. But that reorganization is not likely to have any bearing on how and whether the agency seeks required permits from other agencies like NOAA.

Criticism of the minerals agency has grown in recent days as more information has emerged about how it handled drilling in the gulf.

In a letter from September 2009, obtained by The New York Times, NOAA accused the minerals agency of a pattern of understating the likelihood and potential consequences of a major spill in the gulf and understating the frequency of spills that have already occurred there.

The letter accuses the agency of highlighting the safety of offshore oil drilling operations while overlooking more recent evidence to the contrary. The data used by the agency to justify its approval of drilling operations in the gulf play down the fact that spills have been increasing and understate the "risks and impacts of accidental spills," the letter states. NOAA declined several requests for comment.

The accusation that the minerals agency has ignored risks is also being levied by scientists working for the agency.

Managers at the agency have routinely overruled staff scientists whose findings highlight the environmental risks of drilling, according to a half-dozen current or former agency scientists.

The scientists, none of whom wanted to be quoted by name for fear of reprisals by the agency or by those in the industry, said they had repeatedly had their scientific findings changed to indicate no environmental impact or had their calculations of spill risks downgraded.

"You simply are not allowed to conclude that the drilling will have an impact," said one scientist who has worked for the minerals agency for more than a decade. "If you find the risks of a spill are high or you conclude that a certain species will be affected, your report gets disappeared in a desk drawer and they find another scientist to redo it or they rewrite it for you."

Another biologist who left the agency in 2005 after more than five years said that agency officials went out of their way to accommodate the oil and gas industry.

He said, for example, that seismic activity from drilling can have a devastating effect on mammals and fish, but that agency officials rarely enforced the regulations meant to limit those effects.

He also said the agency routinely ceded to the drilling companies the responsibility for monitoring species that live or spawn near the drilling projects.

"What I observed was M.M.S. was trying to undermine the monitoring and mitigation requirements that would be imposed on the industry," he said.

Aside from allowing BP and other companies to drill in the gulf without getting the required permits from NOAA, the minerals agency has also given BP and other drilling companies in the gulf blanket exemptions from having to provide environmental impact statements.

Much as BP's drilling plan asserted that there was no chance of an oil spill, the company also claimed in federal documents that its drilling would not have any adverse effect on endangered species.

The gulf is known for its biodiversity. Various endangered species are found in the area where the Deepwater Horizon was drilling, including sperm whales, blue whales and fin whales.

In some instances, the minerals agency has indeed sought and received permits in the

gulf to harm certain endangered species like green and loggerhead sea turtles. But the agency has not received these permits for endangered species like the sperm and humpback whales, which are more common in the areas where drilling occurs and thus are more likely to be affected.

Tensions between scientists and managers at the agency erupted in one case last year involving a rig in the gulf called the BP Atlantis. An agency scientist complained to his bosses of catastrophic safety and environmental violations. The scientist said these complaints were ignored, so he took his concerns to higher officials at the Interior Department.

"The purpose of this letter is to restate in writing our concern that the BP Atlantis project presently poses a threat of serious, immediate, potentially irreparable and catastrophic harm to the waters of the Gulf of Mexico and its marine environment, and to summarize how BP's conduct has violated federal law and regulations," David L. Perry, a lawyer acting on behalf of Kenneth Abbott, a BP contractor, wrote in a letter to officials at the Interior Department that was dated May 27.

The letter added: "From our conversation on the phone, we understand that M.M.S. is already aware that undersea manifolds have been leaking and that major flow lines must already be replaced. Failure of this critical undersea equipment has potentially catastrophic environmental consequences."

Almost two months before the Deepwater Horizon exploded, Representative Raúl M. Grijalva, Democrat of Arizona, sent a letter to the agency raising concerns about the BP Atlantis and questioning its oversight of the rig.

After the disaster, Mr. Salazar said he would delay granting any new oil drilling permits.

But the minerals agency has issued at least five final approval permits to new drilling projects in the gulf since last week, records show.

Despite being shown records indicating otherwise, Ms. Barkoff said her agency had granted no new permits since Mr. Salazar made his announcement.

Other agencies besides NOAA have begun criticizing the minerals agency.

At a public hearing in Louisiana this week, a joint panel of Coast Guard and Minerals Management Service officials investigating the explosion grilled minerals agency officials for allowing the offshore drilling industry to be essentially "self-certified," as Capt. Hung Nguyen of the Coast Guard, a co-chairman of the investigation, put it.

In addition to the minerals agency and the Coast Guard, the Deepwater Horizon was overseen by the Marshall Islands, the "flag of convenience" under which it was registered.

No one from the Marshall Islands ever inspected the rig. The nongovernmental organizations that did were paid by the rig's operator, in this case Transocean.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

Although well intended, this amendment is duplicative and would add delays to the permitting process and production of American-made energy. It is the responsibility of the Department of the Interior as overseers of permitting in the gulf to ensure safe and environmentally responsible drilling in the gulf.

Since the spill last year, the Department of the Interior has made extensive changes to permitting requirements for offshore operations. Every drilling permit is required to go through multiple environmental reviews before the application can be approved. This begins with an initial programmatic environmental impact statement and is followed by a lease sale-specific environmental impact statement and continues with additional environmental reviews as drilling activities move forward.

□ 1740

In carrying out its responsibilities, the department already must comply with numerous environmental statutes, regulations, and Executive orders. These regulations include the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Fishery Conservation and Management Act. And I may have left some out. This demonstrates the redundancy in this amendment and why it is not necessary.

Administration officials and even Director Bromwich have stated on numerous occasions to both the Natural Resources Committee and the American people that they would not permit operations if they did not believe they meet all the requirements to be conducted safely, efficiently, and in an environmentally responsible manner. The Interior Department already complies with these particular environmental regulations when approving permits. And the fact that the Department is permitting operations, although at a slower pace than I would like to see, demonstrates that they have confidence in the regulations that the agency has set for offshore drilling operations. The real effect of this amendment, whether intended or not, is more delays to offshore energy production and more lengthy and burdensome lawsuits.

So, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and I urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this underlying legislation's very basic safety review provision simply doesn't address the broad swath of problems that need to be addressed by any serious offshore drilling bill. My amendment is a simple way of ensuring that the many shortcomings are at least considered by the Secretary, as articulated in Federal law, and are discussed during this debate.

Unfortunately, this bill does not take into account the lessons our country learned from the terrible BP Deepwater disaster. In addition to accepting my amendment, I certainly hope that the committee will address these problems with even stronger language in any future work it does on this bill or on the issue of offshore drilling in general with regard to safety and the environment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the proponent of this amendment in his zeal to ensure that the environment is properly addressed, but those concerns are properly addressed in the permitting policy. The problem is that we had a company with around 800 safety violations, British Petroleum, that was allowed to continue drilling, and you wonder why. Could it be that they were negotiating at the very time of the blowout with Democrats in the Senate for making the big announcement that they supported the administration's cap-and-trade bill? Could it be that they were going to be involved in the carbon credit business and would work with the administration?

Perhaps a better question than the effect on the environment is, How close will the applicant for a drilling permit be politically with this administration? Because what we see time after time is a situation of political payback. We see crony capitalism. If you're a good buddy at GE, you're going to do well. If you're on Wall Street and you contribute four to one to this administration over its opponent, then you're going to do well. You may have to endure being called a fat cat from time to time; but, otherwise, we're going to make sure your profits exceed anything you have ever seen before.

We have seen this administration rush to Libya. We have seen this administration rush, appropriately, to help our friend Japan. We have seen them rush all over the place. But when it came to really helping the gulf coast region, this administration rushed in and did more damage to people's lives by putting this moratorium on than the spill itself did. At some point, it's time for the administration to stop the political payback game.

Perhaps Louisiana would be better off if they dissociated themselves from Texas. We know that you can have 500,000 acres burned and have it be a disaster area. You can have 2 million in Texas, and they won't come to your help because this administration is partisan and bitterly so. But it's time for this administration to quit playing political games and help people where they need it in our own country, on our own gulf coast.

Let's vote "no" on the amendments and get this bill through.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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 4, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

"(3) CONSULTATION WITH INDEPENDENT SAFETY ORGANIZATION.—In making any determination under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall consult with one or more independent safety organizations that are not affiliated with the American Petroleum Institute.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we just heard a pretty good discussion here a moment ago about the safety issues in the gulf. And the legislation before us seems to ignore every one of the recommendations that the bipartisan, independent commission made about how to conduct deepwater drilling in a safe manner. Actually, BP did have a terrible record. I am pleased that my colleague from Texas pointed out the 800 violations that BP had. There was, however, a bit of a problem for at least 11 members of the gulf oil industry: They died as a result of the inattention to safety.

The proposal that I have before us deals with one of the recommendations that the commission made, and that is that there be an independent safety organization created to provide an additional level of review of the requirements that drilling be done safely. The legislation before us ignores that recommendation by the commission and basically says that the American Petroleum Institute is quite capable of doing this. Well, the independent, bipartisan commission, said, "The American Petroleum Institute is culturally ill-suited to drive a safety revolution in the industry. For this reason, it is essential that the safety enterprise operate apart from the American Petroleum Institute," and I could not agree more, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment would require that, as the Secretary is trying to determine whether permit applications meet the critical safety requirements, he must consult with an independent safety organization, and that organization must not be affiliated with the American Petroleum Institute.

Now the institute has said, No problem; we'll create our own. Well, I'm sorry, but that's not the way to provide the appropriate safety standard. We don't need to have more deaths. We don't need to have more blowouts. We need to do the drilling safely, and that it be done in a manner that ensures that lives will not be lost and that oil will not be spilled in the ocean. That's

what this amendment does by providing an outside independent organization with the requirement that they consult with the Secretary on the applications. We do not change the 50-day requirement. That remains in place; so there is a timeframe. We don't change any of the requirements with regard to losses and the rest, which I think are inappropriate; but nonetheless, we don't change that in this legislation.

I would ask for the adoption of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

I do oppose this amendment. Although well intended, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act itself makes drilling already safer by requiring that the Secretary ensure that any proposed drilling operation be subject to a safety review—it's there in the bill already—and that it meet established critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention and oil spill response and containment requirements, and this has to be done before the issuance of a permit.

□ 1750

The decision to approve individual permit applications is the responsibility of the Department of the Interior. I don't believe it should be farmed out to other organizations that may or may not have the background, the expertise, or the resources to evaluate drilling permits.

In fiscal year 2011, House Republicans voted to increase funding for the Department of the Interior in order to ensure that they have the resources to safely, responsibly, and effectively approve permits.

The Interior Department has a responsibility, as it drafts legislation, to solicit public comment; and they do take advice and counsel from all Americans, including those with expertise in these areas. However, once the standards are set, it is the responsibility of the government to enforce the standards.

Oversight is the Federal Government's responsibility, and it should not be delegated to outside organizations. Whether intended or not, this amendment would slow down and make more complicated the already lengthy and involved permitting process. So I urge opposition to this amendment, and urge opponents to vote "no" on it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. An interesting discussion from my colleague from Colorado. I would note that there are numerous examples where the Federal Government does rely upon outside safety organizations. For example, the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations provides safety standards for our nuclear industry, specifically, not allowing the nuclear power industry to do

the safety reviews, but, rather, an outside organization.

We're simply calling for a level of review that is not associated with those two organizations that caused the problem. The Department of the Interior, and I was the Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior in the 90s, has some familiarity of the comings and goings, the shortcomings as well as the strength of that Department.

This particular section of the Department of the Interior has proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that, over time, it has not been able to regulate properly the safety and other elements of the natural gas and oil industry. We need to provide an outside level of review on the safety requirements, both to keep the Department of the Interior on the proper course and the industry itself on the proper course.

That's what the amendment does. I think it makes an eminent amount of sense, and we're really talking about both environmental issues here, that is, the health of environment in the coast, which was seriously compromised, and also the well-being of the men and women that work on these oil platforms. And we know that their fate has been jeopardized in the past and should not be jeopardized in the future.

I ask for an "aye" vote on this amendment, both here and later on the floor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that there is a public comment period that is available right now, and that is a proper and appropriate forum for an outside group to make the kind of standards-related comments that would be possibly helpful.

But when it comes to actually issuing the permit, that is something that should be delegated to the Federal Government. They do have the resources. In fact, they have expanded resources to do a better job of that, hopefully, in the future.

So, for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

Mr. MARKEY. 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 4, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate accordingly):

"(3) OTHER SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations required under paragraph (1) shall ensure that the proposed drilling operations meet requirements for—

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

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

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

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

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

"(F) ensuring compliance with other applicable environmental and natural resource conservation laws, including the response plan requirements of section 311(j) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)).

"(4) REGULATORY STANDARDS FOR BLOWOUT PREVENTERS, WELL DESIGN, AND CEMENTING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In promulgating regulations under this subsection related to blowout preventers, well design, and cementing, the Secretary shall ensure that such regulations include the minimum standards included in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), unless, after notice and an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary determines that a standard required under this subsection would be less effective in ensuring safe operations than an available alternative technology or practice. Such regulations shall require independent third-party certification, pursuant to subparagraph (E), of blowout preventers, well design, and cementing programs and procedures prior to the commencement of drilling operations. Such regulations shall also require recertification by an independent third-party certifier, pursuant to subparagraph (E), of a blowout preventer upon any material modification to the blowout preventer or well design and of a well design upon any material modification to the well design.

"(B) BLOWOUT PREVENTERS.—Subject to subparagraph (A), regulations issued under this subsection for blowout preventers shall include at a minimum the following requirements:

"(i) Two sets of blind shear rams appropriately spaced to prevent blowout preventer failure if a drill pipe joint or drill tool is across one set of blind shear rams during a situation that threatens loss of well control.

"(ii) Redundant emergency backup control systems capable of activating the relevant components of a blowout preventer, including when the communications link or other critical links between the drilling rig and the blowout preventer are destroyed or inoperable.

"(iii) Regular testing of the emergency backup control systems, including testing during deployment of the blowout preventer.

"(iv) As appropriate, remotely operated vehicle intervention capabilities for secondary control of all subsea blowout preventer functions, including adequate hydraulic capacity to activate blind shear rams, casing shear rams, and other critical blowout preventer components.

"(v) Technologies to prevent a blowout preventer failure if the drill pipe is moved

out of position due to a situation that poses a threat of loss of well control.

"(C) WELL DESIGN.—Subject to subparagraph (A), regulations issued under this subsection for well design standards shall include at a minimum the following requirements:

"(i) In connection with the installation of the final casing string, the installation of at least two independent, tested mechanical barriers, in addition to a cement barrier, across each flow path between hydrocarbon bearing formations and the blowout preventer.

"(ii) That wells shall be designed so that a failure of one barrier does not significantly increase the likelihood of another barrier's failure.

"(iii) That the casing design is appropriate for the purpose for which it is intended under reasonably expected wellbore conditions.

"(iv) The installation and verification with a pressure test of a lockdown device at the time the casing is installed in the wellhead.

"(D) CEMENTING.—Subject to subparagraph (A), regulations issued under this subsection for cementing standards shall include at a minimum the following requirements:

"(i) Adequate centralization of the casing to ensure proper distribution of cement.

"(ii) A full circulation of drilling fluids prior to cementing.

"(iii) The use of an adequate volume of cement to prevent any unintended flow of hydrocarbons between any hydrocarbon-bearing formation zone and the wellhead.

"(iv) Cement bond logs for all cementing jobs intended to provide a barrier to hydrocarbon flow.

"(v) Cement bond logs or such other integrity tests as the Secretary may prescribe for cement jobs other than those identified in clause (iv).

"(E) INDEPENDENT THIRD-PARTY CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall issue regulations that establish appropriate standards for the approval of independent third-party certifiers capable of exercising certification functions for blowout preventers, well design, and cementing. For any certification required for regulations related to blowout preventers, well design, or cementing, the operator shall use a qualified independent third-party certifier chosen by the Secretary. The costs of any certification shall be borne by the operator. The regulations issued under this subparagraph shall require the following:

"(i) Prior to the commencement of drilling through a blowout preventer at any covered well, the operator shall obtain a written and signed certification from an independent third party approved and assigned by the appropriate Federal official pursuant to paragraph (3) that the third party—

"(I) conducted or oversaw a detailed physical inspection, design review, system integration test, and function and pressure testing of the blowout preventer; and

"(II) in the third-party certifier's best professional judgment, determined that—

"(aa) the blowout preventer is designed for the specific drilling conditions, equipment, and location where it will be installed and for the specific well design;

"(bb) the blowout preventer and all of its components and control systems will operate effectively and as designed when installed;

"(cc) each blind shear ram or casing shear ram will function effectively under likely emergency scenarios and is capable of shearing the drill pipe or casing, as applicable, that will be used when installed;

"(dd) emergency control systems will function under the conditions in which they will be installed; and

“(ee) the blowout preventer has not been compromised or damaged from any previous service.

“(ii) Not less than once every 180 days after commencement of drilling through a blowout preventer at any covered well, or upon implementation of any material modification to the blowout preventer or well design at such a well, the operator shall obtain a written and signed recertification from an independent third party approved and assigned by the appropriate Federal official pursuant to paragraph (3) that the requirements in subclause (II) of clause (i) continue to be met with the systems as deployed. Such recertification determinations shall consider the results of tests required by the appropriate Federal official, including testing of the emergency control systems of a blowout preventer.

“(iii) Certifications under clause (i), recertifications under clause (i), and results of and data from all tests conducted pursuant to this paragraph shall be promptly submitted to the appropriate Federal official and made publicly available.

“(5) RULEMAKING DOCKETS.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than the date of proposal of any regulation under this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a publicly available rulemaking docket for such regulation.

“(B) DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED.—The Secretary shall include in the docket—

“(i) all written comments and documentary information on the proposed rule received from any person in the comment period for the rulemaking, promptly upon receipt by the Secretary;

“(ii) the transcript of each public hearing, if any, on the proposed rule, promptly upon receipt from the person who transcribed such hearing; and

“(iii) all documents that become available after the proposed rule is published and that the Secretary determines are of central relevance to the rulemaking, by as soon as possible after their availability.

“(C) PROPOSED AND DRAFT FINAL RULE AND ASSOCIATED MATERIAL.—The Secretary shall include in the docket—

“(i) each draft proposed rule submitted by the Secretary to the Office of Management and Budget for any interagency review process prior to proposal of such rule, all documents accompanying such draft, all written comments thereon by other agencies, and all written responses to such written comments by the Secretary, by no later than the date of proposal of the rule; and

“(ii) each draft final rule submitted by the Secretary for such review process before issuance of the final rule, all such written comments thereon, all documents accompanying such draft, and all written responses thereto, by no later than the date of issuance of the final rule.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, 1 year has passed since the Deepwater Horizon accident. Yet BP, Transocean, Halliburton, and Cameron continue to argue in court which of them deserves more blame for the 11 deaths and environmental devastation.

BP continues to fight the estimates of the amount of oil spilled in order to minimize its liability. And more than 1

year after the beginning of this disaster, Congress has still not passed any legislation to improve the safety of offshore drilling and ensure that the lessons of the BP spill are incorporated into future drilling.

The co-chairs of the independent BP commission have testified before the Natural Resources Committee that the accident could have been prevented, and the commission found that the root causes of the disaster were systemic to the entire industry. Their extensive reports documented numerous specific failures of the cementing, well design and testing and maintenance associated with the Deepwater Horizon well.

And recently, the Department of the Interior's contractor, Det Norske Veritas, released its report on the forensic investigation of the Deepwater Horizon blowout preventer, and here's what they found: the results indicated that the drilling pipe inside of the blowout preventer had buckled due to the force of the blowout; and the cutting devices, therefore, couldn't fully sever the drill pipe and seal off the well.

According to the forensic report, contrary to the claims of the oil industry that blowout preventers are fail-safe devices, it seems unclear whether blowout preventers can actually prevent major blowouts at all once they are underway.

But here we are today with the Republicans bringing out legislation that has no meaningful safety protections for the industry.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

This amendment was already rejected by a bipartisan vote of the full Natural Resources Committee and, once again, I urge opposition to it. This amendment micromanages and dictates specific safety and blowout preventer standards for permit applications. Many of these standards would do little or nothing different than what is already being done by the Department of the Interior.

However, these restrictions would, if this amendment passes, be etched into law, making Congress the technical arbiter and micromanager of Outer Continental Shelf regulations, and reducing the flexibility and ability of the Department to adapt to new technology and new development in drilling safety. So if we're lagging behind developments in the industry, this would actually prevent us, or could prevent us, from adopting those new and better standards in the future.

The technical standards proposed in this amendment have not been subject to a thorough review or understanding of the impacts of such changes. This is particularly troubling when you consider that this language was written

before we even knew why the blowout preventer failed.

H.R. 1229 already takes steps to increase the safety of offshore drilling by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a safety review to ensure that the proposed drilling operations meet “critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention and oil spill response and containment requirements.” That language is lifted straight out of the bill.

So my colleagues on the other side are acting as if nothing has changed and no safety reforms have been made. By doing so, they are ignoring the facts on the ground and the actions of their own party's administration. I'm not willing to indict the administration and say that they have done nothing in this regard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, here is the BP Blue Ribbon Commission report that was conducted to investigate and to make recommendations as to what the causes were and what can be done to prevent it from happening again. Right now, nothing that is in this report has been implemented in terms of legislation here on the House floor. So I will tell you what my bill does. It will require multiple lines of defense against a blowout and ensures that these defenses are redundant so that failure of one does not lead to cascading failures of the entire system as occurred with BP's Macondo well.

First, the amendment sets minimum standards for blowout preventers, including a requirement that blowout preventers operate as intended even when the force of an ongoing blowout shifts the drill pipe out of position.

The amendment also requires new standards on safe well design and cementing to ensure multiple redundant barriers within the well against uncontrolled oil or gas blow that could lead to a blowout.

The amendment also requires independent third-party certification of blowout preventers and well designs.

Finally, the language ensures that if the Department of the Interior finds by some other measures that it has or may one day require would provide an even higher level of safety, that the Secretary can substitute those better alternatives instead.

This is the direction we should be heading in.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. I would like to point out to my colleague that one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), H.R. 56 puts into law a portion of that report. And since he is so interested in making sure that some of the information in the President's report becomes law, I certainly hope he

will cosponsor that legislation. I am sure those in the gulf would appreciate that piece.

I didn't know that he was an expert in oil and gas drilling. Because when I go back home and I talk to those in Louisiana, they tell me that they have already instituted safety guidelines above and beyond what the gentleman from Massachusetts puts forth here.

The industry is safer today than it was the day before the Deepwater accident. In addition to that, we have the ability now, today, in the Gulf of Mexico, that no one else has in the world, to cap the type of incident that happened in the Gulf.

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

I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana; I am not an expert on drilling. We are congressional experts. And that is an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms, like "jumbo shrimp" or "Salt Lake City night life." There is no such thing. We rely upon real experts.

Here are the real experts: The Blue Ribbon Commission put together to study what went wrong and what needs to be done, and that is what my amendment will do. My amendment is very close to the legislation that passed 48-0 out of the Commerce Committee last year and was later adopted by the House. So all we are doing is just reflecting what all of these experts recommended and were finally incorporated.

So we can ignore the experts, but then we roll the dice. And, once again, a part of our coastline could be held hostage to an oil company that was trying to save money but at risk of endangering the lives and the livelihood of millions of people off of the coastline off of our country.

I urge an "aye" vote for the Markey amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would close by saying that the experts that we should rely on are those that are in the Department of the Interior, Director Michael Bromwich with BOEMRE and all the way down, who have been working on this for the last year. They have extensive regulations. Some of what is proposed are actually regulations right now.

And while the bill does call for certain safety standards to be satisfied and met, we have delegated the responsibility for the exact language and implementation of those regulations to those who deal with this 8 hours a day, day in and day out, week in and week out, year in and year out. So there is a balance. We give the broad parameters. They carry out, as a regulatory agency, every last final detail.

And Congress, as has been admitted, does not have the technical expertise to foresee every single development and foresee every single problem that could arise. So while overseeing, we have to do some delegation. This bill does that. We strike that fine balance.

And the administration's department has been doing a strong job of strength-

ening the safety requirements. I do take issue with the pace of their permitting. But as far as the safety implementation, they have put very aggressive safety measures into place.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DOLD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 6, insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding paragraph accordingly):

"(3) WORST-CASE DISCHARGE SCENARIO CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall not issue a permit under paragraph (1) without certifying that the applicant—

"(A) has calculated a worst-case discharge scenario for the proposed drilling operations; and

"(B) has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the applicant possesses the capability and technology to respond immediately and effectively to such worst-case discharge scenario.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment that I propose is a very simple and a commonsense amendment. First of all, let us recall where we come from.

Title 43, section 1340, entitled "Geological and Geophysical Explorations," is what is the subject of H.R. 1229; specifically, subsection D, entitled "Drilling Permits."

Under that subsection, it states: The Secretary may, by regulation, require any lessee operating under an approved exploration plan to obtain a permit to drilling any well in accordance with such plan.

What the amendments are proposing here today and what my amendment addresses is what is set forth at page 4. And I propose that it amends after line 6 and includes a subsection 3, which addresses the worst-case discharge scenario certification. This amendment requires: The Secretary shall not issue

a permit under paragraph 1 without certifying that the applicant, first, has calculated a worst-case discharge scenario for the proposed drilling operations; and, B, has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the applicant possesses the capability and technology to respond immediately and effectively to such worst-case discharge scenario.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking here to the people, the people across this Nation and in the world who watched the worst-case scenario, what happened in the BP oil spill. What we are simply saying is that before any permit is issued, that the Secretary take the precaution of, first, having assessed what that worst-case scenario could be; and, second, that applicant who is seeking this permit has both the capability and technology, and has demonstrated as such, to address that worst-case scenario.

Mr. Chairman, it is a simple statement and it is a requirement that the people would like to see. No one wants to sit there and experience a BP oil spill again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1810

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

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

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

I do oppose this amendment because it is duplicative and unnecessary. This amendment attempts to expand upon the language in the bill that already mandates that the Secretary conduct a safety review to affirm oil spill response and containment capability prior to issuing a permit. We believe that the Department of the Interior already requires that applicants must calculate worst-case discharge before approving a permit.

On June 18 of last year, the Department issued a notice to lessees outlining the information requirements and standards to be met before a permit could be approved. In the notice it is required that a lessee "describe the assumption and calculations that you used to determine the volume of your worst-case discharge scenario."

This exact language, this exact intention has already been addressed, so I would oppose this amendment as redundant and unnecessary.

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

Ms. HANABUSA. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chair, if this amendment is duplicative, it should not be an issue, because what it does do is it contains the language that the people want to hear. The people want to hear, What is the worst case scenario? I also contend that it really does not do that. It is not duplicative.

What is contained in the bill is the statement of critical safety system requirements, including blowout prevention and oil spill response and contamination requirements. It does not say "the worst case scenario" and it does not require the applicant to show, to show the Secretary that it has the capability and the technological ability to address that. So it is not duplicative.

But to the extent that the opposer would like to say that it is duplicative, then I believe that they should not object to this because, after all, it does say what people want to hear. People want to be guaranteed that the BP oil spill does not happen again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee who has a district in the State of Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. Rarely are the goals of our country as aligned as they are now. Clearly we need economic recovery with good jobs and with good benefits for those who frankly right now have a problem with unemployment. As it turns out, we also have the goal of increasing our energy security and, lastly, a goal of protecting our environment. Now, let's just go through these in order.

As regards jobs, let's just talk about the oil and gas industry. The President, the administration's estimates of the economic impact of the moratorium and the permitorium are hundreds of thousands of jobs lost and about \$2.5 billion in lost economic activity.

This is not just the gulf coast and it is not just the oil rig workers. It is also those who work on pipelines. It is boat builders. Indeed, as it turns out, one of the boat builders in Louisiana is the largest customer worldwide of Caterpillar engines. An engine that is built in the State of Illinois using steel from the Midwest is used on the coast of Louisiana to build boats to service those rigs. Needless to say, those Caterpillar engines are not now being ordered. That steel order going to Caterpillar to build these is not being done. So the jobs that ripple out are not just in the gulf coast, but go all the way across the country.

We also have a goal to increase our energy security. Prior to Macondo, one-third of the domestically produced oil in the United States came from the Outer Continental Shelf. Since we have limited further exploration, we have lost that potential to increase our domestic supply of energy, to increase our security, to insulate us, if you will, from those issues in North Africa which are currently driving up our fuel prices.

Lastly, we have a goal to protect our environment. Oh, we all care about that. In Louisiana, we particularly care about that. We do not take this for granted. But in Louisiana, we realize you have to be both pro-business as

well as pro-environment, and we take that very seriously.

So what are the facts on this? The President right after the Macondo bill appointed a blue ribbon commission from the National Academy of Engineering. These engineers that the President picked said that the causes of the oil spill are identifiable and correctable and that a prolonged moratorium will not, will not, will not appreciably improve safety.

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

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

Mr. CASSIDY. So what we have seen since, though, is not a recommendation that the President's blue ribbon commission is right, but rather a regulatory hurdle set upon regulatory hurdle set upon regulatory hurdle. Now we have a notice to lessees which demands that which this amendment also demands, so we are going to have not just a notice to lessees, but we are going to have this amendment on top of it. At some point your hostility to an industry becomes hostility to workers, becomes hostility to our energy security and, frankly, becomes a hostility to our environment.

I oppose this amendment. I think it is bad for our workers, I think it is bad for our economy, and I think it is bad for our environment.

Ms. HANABUSA. May I inquire of the Chair as to how much time is remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii has 1¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. HANABUSA. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chair, I am sure that the gentleman from Louisiana has no intentions of saying that anyone who may want an amendment to this bill is somehow hostile or somehow anti-jobs, anti-energy security and anti-environment, because that is not the intent.

This bill has been labeled Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act. We have no objection to that, Mr. Chair. But why can't it also say Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act Safely? That is all that is being requested here.

Let's look at what happened at the BP oil spill. Let's just make sure it doesn't happen again. Another spill like that, by taking these precautions, can be avoided, and by doing that, by doing that, we will not be faced with a situation where someone from that district would say we are hostile because we are not encouraging jobs or not encouraging energy security or not encouraging the environment. This is exactly what we are trying to do. We are trying to do all of these, and it has a ripple effect throughout the Nation.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, so at this point I am going to wait and close as soon as the gentlelady is done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I request an "aye" vote on this amendment. It is a very straightforward, commonsense amendment. It addresses what the people want to hear and want to know, that we are ready to address the worst-case scenario, and the Secretary will not issue a permit until it is addressed, it is not only identified, but that the applicant has both the technological skills plus the capabilities to do it and prevent such a spill.

We are all interested in the jobs and the economic security of the gulf and all the neighboring States in that area, plus its ripple effect. That is why we want to see that it never happens again, and that is why we want the people, the people, to be confident that we in Congress have addressed their concerns.

I request an "aye" vote.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I will close by saying that this amendment, though well intended, is duplicative; and I think that has been admitted by the other side and therefore is unnecessary.

I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, strike lines 5 through 9 and insert closing quotation marks and a following period.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1820

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair.

H.R. 1229 includes language that would add a timeline to the permitting process for offshore oil and gas drilling. This provision states that, "If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the

application is deemed approved.” My amendment would simply strike this section. In other words, as it stands in the legislation before us, if for whatever reason—incomplete information, new information—the Secretary has not made a decision whether or not to approve the application, then the application will be considered from then on approved.

There are a number of provisions in this bill that could make offshore drilling less safe. My amendment is aimed at perhaps the most dangerous of those provisions. This bill short-circuits existing requirements to protect oil industry workers and those who depend on marine resources for their livelihoods and so forth. Ensuring that environmental and safety standards are met—so that the new permits will not result in a repeat of the Deepwater Horizon disaster—is really too important to allow permits to go through the door prematurely and automatically simply because of an arbitrary timeline imposed by this legislation.

Depending on the dedication of a particular Secretary to safety and environmental protection, H.R. 1229 would produce either precipitous automatic approval of an application to drill or unjustified rejection of a valid application if the review is not completed within the allotted time. Either way, the imposition of an arbitrary deadline is bad policy. It’s based on a presumption that environmental and safety reviews are worthless and that there is really no value in getting the review right.

My amendment would leave in place the permitting timeline set in H.R. 1229, creating the sense of urgency my colleagues are seeking. But it would remove the automatic approval of drilling applications after that 60-day timeline. If we’ve learned anything from the Deepwater Horizon disaster, it is that we must do more—not less—to protect those who work in the oil industry and those who depend on offshore resources and onshore resources for their livelihood.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The legislation on the floor today is designed to put Americans in the gulf region back to work and to ensure that permits are processed in a timely fashion and that bureaucratic delays are not hampering the Nation’s energy production. There are critics of the timeline that is proposed in this bill on both sides of that timeline. Some say it’s too short. Others say it is too long. It’s important that people understand that nowhere in this bill do we require the administration to do anything but reach a decision, whatever that deci-

sion might be. They may deny an application at any time in the process as long as they provide a clear description of why they are doing so.

Prior to the incident in the gulf, the administration was very capable of processing permits in 5 to 15 days on average. The 30-day timeline in the bill is significantly longer, and allows the administration extensions. In the end, the administration must reach a decision. The provision this amendment proposes to remove is the final deadline that the administration must meet and one that should be firm to ensure that decisions are made in a timely manner and that no de facto moratorium or permitorium is instituted.

This amendment, if adopted, would simply further delay offshore energy production. It would continue to allow the Department to arbitrarily impose a de facto drilling moratorium that could cost thousands of jobs and allow higher prices on energy with less supply.

I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. May I ask the Chair the time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. Each side has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, my friend from Colorado talked about the harm that this bill would do and why it’s important that the application be approved even if the review is not complete, even if the review is not yet done right. I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado thinks that maybe a student should graduate even if he hasn’t taken the exam because the semester is coming to an end. Well, time’s up. I guess we should just declare the student duly passed—even if the review hasn’t been done.

That’s a question. If the gentleman feels that a student should be deemed passed because the semester is coming to an end, even if the review of that student’s work has not been completed. I would yield to the gentleman if he cares to answer that. If not, I will continue.

This legislation might make sense if we thought there was some economic need for it, if we thought that there was some safety need for it, if we thought it was important to grease the skids and move through the environmental review quickly. But none of those things apply. This will not bring down prices. Certainly, release of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve would do more for prices at the pump than this. This won’t make a bit of difference in the price at the pump, this legislation. It certainly won’t help support an important but troubled industry. Actually, this industry is not troubled. This industry is going to take home about \$100 billion dollars in profits this year. We don’t need to grease the skids and make things easier for this industry because getting the review right would subject them to undue hardship. No. In fact, this is a

very dangerous provision in a bill that is part of the set of “Amnesia Acts.” The bill is part of these three bills that pretend that there are no lessons to be learned from 2010; the bill that pretends the gulf oil blowout never occurred; that wills amnesia on the policy of the United States so that we forget that the worst oil spill in history from which there are real lessons to be learned never occurred.

I urge passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. I want to apologize. I was confused as to whether the gentleman was asking a rhetorical question or really wanted to have a colloquy. By the time I figured that out, he had moved on to the remainder of his argument. I would have been happy to and hopefully in the future I could have a colloquy on that with him.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY).

Mr. LANDRY. The gentleman must not understand that he wants to restate the de facto moratorium that is plaguing the Gulf of Mexico with this amendment. It is exactly what he’s trying to put in place, which is allow the administration to drag its feet not only on the wells on the drilling in deep water but also on the Shelf as well. He must also be confused, because what the Democrats have proposed, what the other side has proposed in removing the tax breaks for these companies, would make oil and gas—the Congressional Research Service has reported that proposal would make oil and natural gas more expensive for U.S. consumers and likely increase our foreign dependence.

What are we here to do today? We’re here to bring relief to Americans at the pump and get the Gulf of Mexico back to work.

Mr. LAMBORN. I will conclude by saying that what this bill wants to accomplish is that the administration must reach a decision on whether a permit should be issued. This amendment proposes to remove the final deadline that the administration would have to meet and one that should be firm to ensure that decisions are made in a timely manner and that no de facto moratorium is instituted.

□ 1830

This amendment would simply further delay offshore energy production. That does not help jobs. It does not help the supply or cost of energy in this country. It would allow the Department to arbitrarily impose a de facto drilling moratorium that would cost thousands of jobs.

I oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, strike the closing quotation marks and second period at line 9, and after line 9 insert the following new subparagraph:

“(D) This paragraph shall not apply before the date the Secretary publishes a determination that the agency or bureau of the Department of the Interior that administers this section has been given adequate staff and budget resources to properly review and process every application for a permit under this subsection in order to ensure that no application is processed without thorough review.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1229 would impose an artificial and arbitrary 30-day deadline, with up to two 15-day extensions, for a total of 60 maximum days for Interior Department action on drilling permit applications. If at the end of the 30- to 60-day period Interior has not acted by approving or disapproving the permit, the permit is “deemed” approved automatically even if the environmental and safety review processes haven’t been completed. If the Secretary decides that the agency hasn’t had enough time to approve the permit, then his only choice is to deny the permit, undoubtedly leading to additional lawsuits from companies.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation doesn’t get to the root of the problem. We all know through the numerous hearings last year that one of the fundamental causes of the BP spill was a lack of not only enough inspectors but a lack of inspectors with high levels of expertise and engineering knowledge. You wouldn’t referee a game by doing away with the rules because the referee didn’t know them; you’d get a better referee.

If the Department isn’t going to be given enough resources and expertise to do the job right and on time, the Department shouldn’t be forced to do the job too fast. We should be working to make government more efficient and more effective. My amendment addresses the root of this issue by lifting the arbitrary timeline requirements if the Department isn’t given the necessary resources it needs to properly process applications expeditiously. I urge a “yes” vote on my amendment.

Mr. Chair, instead of taking this opportunity to correct the fundamental problems underlying the BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill, this bill simply moves to cut any last semblance of oversight or safeguards our country has placed on the inherently risky process of offshore deepwater oil drilling.

H.R. 1229 would impose an artificial and arbitrary 30-day deadline, with up to two 15-day extensions, for a total of 60 days maximum, for Interior Department action on drilling permit applications. If at the end of that 30- to 60-day period Interior has not acted by approving or disapproving the permit, the permit is “deemed” approved automatically even if the environmental and safety reviews have not been completed.

This is the exact wrong legislative response to the BP disaster. Rather than acting to make off-shore drilling safer and smarter, the underlying bill would make drilling faster and more reckless. Under this bill, we could actually have less rigorous oversight and review of off-shore drilling than we had before the Deepwater Horizon disaster.

By imposing an artificial and arbitrary deadline, the bill heavily biases the permitting process toward approval, placing undue burdens on reviewers to accelerate the process regardless of safety and environmental concerns.

If the Secretary decides that the agency hasn’t had enough time to approve the permit, then his only choice is to deny the permit undoubtedly leading to additional lawsuits from companies and the unrelenting onslaught of industry and Republican criticism. This bill is simply a catch 22 for the Department to either risk another disaster, or open up the Department even more to the vitriolic and false claims from industry and the Majority party of being anti-business or anti domestic energy—not that the facts have kept that misinformation from being spread in the past.

Mr. Chair, this legislation doesn’t get to the root of the problem. We all know through the numerous hearings last year that one of the fundamental causes of the BP spill was a lack of not only enough inspectors, but a lack of inspectors with high levels of expertise and engineering knowledge. Prior to the spill, the few inspectors the government did have simply had to take the oil companies’ word that everything was in order.

I’m sure we all remember when the big five oil companies were caught pointing the finger of blame squarely at BP in a hearing last year, only to have it disclosed moments later that every one of their spill response documents and other application material was not only identical, but included completely inaccurate information, listing for example walrus as a critical species for the Gulf of Mexico and citing as an emergency contact a professor from Florida Atlantic University, who had long since passed away.

We shouldn’t have to take a company’s word for it when there is so much at stake. We should ensure that the watchdogs have the tools they need to verify that everything is done properly. This is what my amendment aims to do. Congress shouldn’t set an arbitrary timeline if Congress doesn’t give the Department enough resources they need to properly do their job within that timeline.

In fact, the recommendations of the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon spill contain an entire section on “The Need for Adequate Funding for Safety Oversight and

Environmental Review,” which lists a number of policy options letting the oil companies, not the American people, foot the bill. Sadly, the underlying legislation includes none of them.

Mr. Chair, you wouldn’t referee a game by doing away with the rules because the referee didn’t know them; you’d get a better referee.

The fact is that the regulators been grossly underfunded and understaffed in the past. With the Continuing Resolution’s partial step toward reversing the “shameful” and years-long underfunding of offshore oversight, it was only half of what’s needed to do the job right. The Director of the agency that oversees permitting, Michael Bromwich, just last month said: “That is less than we need, but it is a significant sum, especially in a constrained budget environment where the funding of most other agencies is being cut. We desperately need more environmental scientists and more personnel to do environmental analysis. We desperately need more personnel to help us with the permitting process and much more.”

If the Department isn’t going to be given enough resources and expertise to do the job right, then the Department shouldn’t be forced to do the job fast. Instead of creating unnecessary catch 22’s for government, we should be working to make government more efficient and more effective. My amendment addresses the root of this issue by lifting the arbitrary timeline requirements if the Department isn’t given the necessary resources it needs to properly process applications.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will do my best to be brief.

The purpose of H.R. 1229 is to get residents of the gulf back to work in producing offshore energy. It is not only good for them; it is good for the entire country.

This amendment, whether intended or not, would allow the administration to continue to impose a de facto moratorium that would delay American energy production and keep thousands of people out of work. The residents of the gulf are simply in a holding pattern, waiting for their jobs to come back. Some of them are even seeing their jobs outsourced to other countries as rigs leave the Gulf of Mexico, bound for other parts of the world.

Now, there is an established process for the administration to propose and advocate for funding and resources, which is different from what this amendment addresses. This annual process, the budget process, provides ample opportunity for considering what is needed to safely and responsibly oversee offshore energy production. Let us note that the House Republican majority, in enacting a budget, acted to increase funding for reviewing and approving offshore permits for the current year, which was not done by the Democratic Congress last year.

This amendment would delay American energy production. For that reason, I oppose it. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 245, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—167

Ackerman	Crowley	Hirono
Andrews	Cuellar	Holt
Baca	Cummings	Honda
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Bass (CA)	Davis (IL)	Inslee
Becerra	DeFazio	Israel
Berkley	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Berman	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (GA)	Deuth	Kaptur
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Keating
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kildee
Boswell	Doggett	Kind
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Kissell
Braley (IA)	Edwards	Kucinich
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Engel	Larsen (CT)
Capuano	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Carnahan	Farr	Levin
Carney	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Carson (IN)	Filner	Lipinski
Castor (FL)	Frank (MA)	Loebsack
Chandler	Fudge	Lofgren, Zoe
Chu	Garamendi	Lowe
Cicilline	Gonzalez	Lujan
Clarke (MI)	Grijalva	Lynch
Clarke (NY)	Gutierrez	Maloney
Clay	Hanabusa	Markey
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Clyburn	Hayworth	McCarthy (NY)
Cohen	Heinrich	McCollum
Connolly (VA)	Higgins	McDermott
Courtney	Himes	McGovern

McIntyre	Rangel	Smith (WA)
McNerney	Reichert	Stark
Meeks	Richardson	Sutton
Michaud	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Miller (NC)	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (MS)
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Moore	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Moran	Rush	Towns
Murphy (CT)	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda T.	Velázquez
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Neal	Sarbanes	Walz (MN)
Oliver	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Pallone	Schiff	Schultz
Pascarell	Schrader	Waters
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Watt
Payne	Scott (VA)	Weiner
Pelosi	Scott, David	Welch
Perlmutter	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Peters	Sewell	Woolsey
Pingree (ME)	Sherman	Wu
Polis	Shuler	Yarmuth
Price (NC)	Shuler	Young (FL)
Quigley	Slaughter	
Rahall		

NOES—245

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

Shuster	Thompson (PA)	Westmoreland
Simpson	Thornberry	Whitfield
Smith (NE)	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Tipton	Wittman
Smith (TX)	Turner	Wolf
Southerland	Upton	Womack
Stearns	Walberg	Woodall
Stivers	Walden	Yoder
Stutzman	Walsh (IL)	Young (AK)
Sullivan	Webster	Young (IN)
Terry	West	

NOT VOTING—19

Capps	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Reed
Giffords	(TX)	Reyes
Green, Al	Johnson, Sam	Speier
Hastings (WA)	Langevin	Tsongas
Hinchoy	Manzullo	Waxman
Hinojosa	Nunnelee	

□ 1857

Messrs. FLAKE and TURNER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. HAYWORTH, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 240, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

AYES—169

Ackerman	Cummings	Israel
Altmire	Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.
Baca	DeFazio	Jones
Baldwin	DeGette	Kaptur
Bartlett	DeLauro	Keating
Bass (CA)	Deuth	Kildee
Becerra	Dicks	Kind
Berkley	Dingell	Kissell
Berman	Doggett	Kucinich
Blumenauer	Doyle	Larsen (WA)
Boswell	Edwards	Larsen (CT)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Lee (CA)
Braley (IA)	Engel	Levin
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Buchanan	Farr	Lipinski
Capps	Fattah	Loebsack
Capuano	Filner	Lofgren, Zoe
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Lowe
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lujan
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez	Lynch
Chu	Grijalva	Maloney
Cicilline	Gutierrez	Markey
Clarke (MI)	Hanabusa	Matsui
Clarke (NY)	Hanna	McCarthy (NY)
Clay	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Cleaver	Heinrich	McDermott
Clyburn	Higgins	McGovern
Cohen	Himes	McIntyre
Connolly (VA)	Hirono	McNerney
Courtney	Cooper	Meeks
Critz	Costello	Michaud
Crowley	Courtney	Miller (NC)
	Critz	Miller, George
	Crowley	Moore
		Moran

Murphy (CT)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)	Walberg	Westmoreland	Womack	Pallone	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Rush	Thompson (MS)	Walden	Whitfield	Woodall	Pascrell	Sánchez, Linda	Tierney
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)		Walsh (IL)	Wilson (SC)	Yoder	Pastor (AZ)	T.	Tonko
Neal	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko	Webster	Wittman	Young (AK)	Paulsen	Sánchez, Loretta	Towns
Olver	T.	Towns	West	Wolf	Young (IN)	Payne	Van Hollen	Velázquez
Pallone	Sánchez, Loretta	Van Hollen				Pelosi	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Pascrell	Sarbanes	Velázquez				Perlmutter	Schiff	Walz (MN)
Pastor (AZ)	Schakowsky	Visclosky	Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Paul	Peters	Schrader	Wasserman
Payne	Schiff	Walz (MN)	Carney	Jackson Lee	Reed	Pingree (ME)	Schwartz	Schultz
Pelosi	Schrader	Wasserman	Conyers	(TX)	Reyes	Polis	Scott (VA)	Serrano
Peters	Schwartz	Schultz	Giffords	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)	Price (NC)	Scott, David	Watt
Pingree (ME)	Scott (VA)	Waters	Green, Al	Langevin	Ross (FL)	Quigley	Sewell	Waxman
Polis	Scott, David	Watt	Hastings (WA)	Manzullo	Speier	Rahall	Sherman	Weiner
Price (NC)	Serrano	Waxman	Hinchev	Meehan	Tsongas	Rangel	Shuler	Welch
Quigley	Sewell	Weiner	Hinojosa	Nunnelee		Reichert	Richardson	Wilson (FL)
Rahall	Sherman	Welch				Richmond	Ros-Lehtinen	Woolsey
Rangel	Sires	Wilson (FL)				Rothman	Roybal-Allard	Young (FL)
Richardson	Slaughter	Woolsey				Rothman (NJ)	Ruppersberger	
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Wu				Roybal-Allard	Rush	
Rothman (NJ)	Stark	Yarmuth				Ruppersberger		
Roybal-Allard	Sutton	Young (FL)				Rush	Thompson (CA)	

NOT VOTING—22

□ 1904

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 300, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 300, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 237, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

AYES—176

Adams	Foxx	McMorris				Adams	Fortenberry	McKeon
Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Rodgers				Aderholt	Foxx	McKinley
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Mica				Akin	Franks (AZ)	McMorris
Alexander	Gallely	Miller (FL)				Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Rodgers
Amash	Gardner	Miller (MI)				Altmire	Gallely	Meehan
Austria	Garrett	Miller, Gary				Amash	Gardner	Mica
Bachmann	Gerlach	Mulvaney				Austria	Garrett	Miller (FL)
Bachus	Gibbs	Murphy (PA)				Bachmann	Gerlach	Miller (MI)
Barletta	Gibson	Myrick				Bachus	Gibbs	Miller, Gary
Barrow	Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer				Barletta	Gibson	Mulvaney
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Noem				Barrow	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Bass (NH)	Goodlatte	Nugent				Bartlett	Gohmert	Myrick
Benishek	Gosar	Nunes				Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Berg	Gowdy	Olson				Benishek	Gosar	Noem
Biggert	Granger	Owens				Berg	Gowdy	Nugent
Bilbray	Graves (GA)	Palazzo				Biggert	Granger	Nunes
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Paulsen				Bilbray	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pearce				Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Griffin (AR)	Pence				Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pearce
Black	Griffith (VA)	Perlmutter				Bishop (UT)	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Blackburn	Grimm	Peterson				Black	Griffith (VA)	Peterson
Bonner	Guinta	Petri				Blackburn	Grimm	Petri
Bono Mack	Guthrie	Pitts				Bonner	Guinta	Pitts
Boren	Hall	Platts				Bono Mack	Guthrie	Platts
Boustany	Harper	Poe (TX)				Boren	Hall	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Harris	Pompeo				Boustany	Hanna	Pompeo
Brooks	Hartzler	Posey				Brady (TX)	Harper	Posey
Broun (GA)	Hartzler	Price (GA)				Brooks	Harris	Price (GA)
Bucshon	Hayworth	Quayle				Broun (GA)	Hartzler	Quayle
Buerkle	Heck	Rehberg				Bucshon	Hayworth	Rehberg
Burgess	Hensarling	Reichert				Buerkle	Heck	Renacci
Burton (IN)	Herger	Renacci				Burgess	Hensarling	Ribble
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Ribble				Burton (IN)	Herger	Rigell
Camp	Huelskamp	Rigell				Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Campbell	Huizenga (MI)	Richmond				Camp	Huelskamp	Roby
Canseco	Hultgren	Rigell				Campbell	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Cantor	Hunter	Rivera				Canseco	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Hurt	Roby				Cantor	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Cardoza	Issa	Roe (TN)				Capito	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Carter	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)	Ackerman	DeFazio	Kildee	Cardoza	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Cassidy	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)	Andrews	DeGette	Kind	Carter	Jenkins	Rokita
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher	Baca	DeLauro	Kissell	Cassidy	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rokita	Baldwin	Dent	Kucinich	Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Chandler	Jordan	Rooney	Bass (CA)	Deutch	Lance	Chaffetz	Jordan	Ross (AR)
Coble	Kelly	Roskam	Bass (NH)	Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Chandler	Kelly	Ross (FL)
Coffman (CO)	King (IA)	Ross (AR)	Berkley	Dingell	Larson (CT)	Coble	King (IA)	Royce
Cole	King (NY)	Royce	Berman	Doggett	Lee (CA)	Coffman (CO)	King (NY)	Runyan
Conaway	Kingston	Runyan	Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Levin	Cole	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Costa	Kinzing (IL)	Ryan (WI)	Blumenauer	Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Conaway	Kinzing (IL)	Scalise
Cravaack	Kline	Scalise	Boswell	Ellison	LoBiondo	Costa	Kline	Schilling
Crawford	Labrador	Schilling	Brady (PA)	Engel	Loeb sack	Cravaack	Labrador	Schmidt
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Schmidt	Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe	Crawford	Lamborn	Schock
Cuellar	Lance	Schock	Buchanan	Farr	Lowey	Crenshaw	Lance	Schweikert
Culberson	Landry	Schweikert	Butterfield	Fattah	Lujan	Critz	Landry	Scott (SC)
Davis (KY)	Lankford	Scott (SC)	Capps	Filner	Lujan	Cuellar	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Denham	Latham	Scott, Austin	Capuano	Fitzpatrick	Maloney	Culberson	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Dent	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner	Carmahan	Frank (MA)	Markey	Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Sessions
DesJarlais	Latta	Sessions	Carney	Fudge	Matsui	DesJarlais	Latta	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus	Carson (IN)	Garamendi	McCarthy (NY)	Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Dold	LoBiondo	Shuler	Castor (FL)	Gonzalez	McCollum	Dold	LoBiondo	Simpson
Donnelly (IN)	Long	Shuster	Chu	Grijalva	McDermott	Donnelly (IN)	Long	Smith (NE)
Dreier	Lucas	Simpson	Ciциlline	Hanabusa	McGovern	Dreier	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)	Clarke (MI)	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Southernland
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Smith (NJ)	Clarke (NY)	Heinrich	McNerney	Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Stearns
Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)	Clay	Higgins	Meeks	Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Ellmers	E.	Southernland	Cleaver	Himes	Michaud	Ellmers	E.	Stutzman
Emerson	Mack	Stearns	Clyburn	Hirono	Miller (NC)	Emerson	Mack	Sullivan
Farenthold	Marchant	Stivers	Cohen	Holt	Miller, George	Farenthold	Marchant	Terry
Fincher	Marino	Stutzman	Connolly (VA)	Honda	Moore	Fincher	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Matheson	Sullivan	Cooper	Hoyer	Moran	Flake	Matheson	Thornberry
Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Terry	Costello	Inslie	Murphy (CT)	Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Fleischmann	McCaul	Thompson (PA)	Courtney	Israel	Nadler	Flores	McCaul	Turner
Fleming	McClintock	Thornberry	Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Forbes	McClintock	Upton
Flores	McCotter	Tiberi	Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Neal		McCotter	Walberg
Forbes	McHenry	Turner	Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Olver		McHenry	
Fortenberry	McKinley	Upton	Davis (IL)	Keating	Owens			

NOES—237

Walden	Whitfield	Woodall
Walsh (IL)	Wilson (SC)	Yoder
Webster	Wittman	Young (AK)
West	Wolf	Young (IN)
Westmoreland	Womack	

NOT VOTING—18

Becerra	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Reed
Giffords	(TX)	Reyes
Green, Al	Johnson, Sam	Speier
Hastings (WA)	Langevin	Tsongas
Hinchee	Manzullo	
Hinojosa	Nunnelee	

□ 1912

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, today I was unavoidably detained and missed the votes on:

Polis (CO) Amendment (#1). Requires review of permits by the Interior Department to take into consideration all applicable safety, environmental and fisheries laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment.

Garamendi (CA) Amendment (#2). Implements the independent BP spill commission's recommendation by requiring that in reviewing a drilling permit, the Secretary consult with an independent drilling safety organization not affiliated with the American Petroleum Institute. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment.

Markey (MA) Amendment (#3). Implements offshore drilling safety reforms recommended by the BP Spill Commission and would set specific new minimum standards for blow-out preventers, cementing and well design. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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. GRAVES of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, had come to no resolution thereon.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-74) on the resolution (H. Res. 257) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas

production goal, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 856

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 856, a bill originally introduced by Representative HELLER of Nevada, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from the bill, H.R. 1380.

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

There was no objection.

PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1229.

□ 1915

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, with Mrs. ADAMS (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, amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 112-73 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 9, before the closing quotation marks insert the following:

"(4) ESTIMATIONS REQUIRED IN PERMIT APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall require

that each application for a permit to drill a well include detailed estimations of—

"(A) the amount of oil and gas that is expected—

"(i) to be found in the area where the well is drilled, in the case of an exploration well; or

"(ii) to be produced by the well, in the case of a production well; and

"(B) the amount by which crude oil prices and consumer prices would be reduced as a result of oil and gas found or produced by the well, and by when the reductions would occur.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, speeding up the permitting process and thereby making it easier to drill off our country's shores in the manner that this bill does will do little to help Americans at the gas pump.

According to the Energy Information Administration, even tripling our current offshore drilling capabilities by the year 2030 would lower gasoline prices only 5 cents per gallon more than if we continued at the current levels.

At maximum output, the United States holds less than 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, not nearly enough to significantly impact the price per barrel, which is set on a global level primarily by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries that we reference as OPEC.

In reality, the United States is already producing more oil per day than it ever has, yet gas prices are still around \$4 per gallon. Though production in our country has actually increased every year since 2005, crude oil hit a record \$147 per barrel over the same time period, demonstrating that there is little correlation between drilling levels in the United States and the price of oil.

More drilling will put our businesses, as well as our environment and health, at an increased risk with little return to the average American. By itself, the United States consumes one quarter of the world's oil. What drives the price of oil more than any other factor is the large scale and high demand for it worldwide.

The only way we can reduce gasoline prices is to decrease our country's demand for fossil fuels by increasing our energy efficiency, improving the fuel mileage of our cars, and developing real renewable energy resources. Federal policies should focus on making these changes, not on dangerously restricting Federal oversight of the industry.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1920

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Madam Chairman, the intent of H.R. 1229 is to put Americans in the gulf back to work and to ensure a steady domestic supply of oil for our citizens and our consumers, thereby lessening our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

I must oppose this amendment. The effect of the amendment is that we are going to hold ourselves hostage to foreign energy unless we can prove that domestic energy meets some abstract standard and satisfies some bureaucrat.

Where I disagree with this amendment the most is the assumption that domestic energy production might not be good for America and might not be allowed. More supply cannot help but to lower prices, reduce dependence, generate revenue and create jobs. I see all these results of domestic energy production as good: good for America, good for consumers and good for our balance of trade. This is true whether the impact from a single well is sufficient in and of itself to move the price of oil prices overseas or not. The real result of this amendment would be that we don't create jobs, revenue and more energy.

For these reasons, Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Let me respond to my colleagues first by saying that I hope no one in the gulf is sitting out there holding their breath waiting for this named bill here, H.R. 1229, "Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work."

Let me talk real here about what is getting ready to happen. The Republicans will pass this particular measure. It will go to that black hole over in the Senate and never become the law of the United States. And the administration has made it very clear that if this measure were to pass, it is not going to in fact be permitted under the aegis of the President's veto, which they cannot overturn.

So while people in Mississippi and people in Louisiana are suffering floods right now, compounding all of the circumstances that they have had to put up with with the BP oil spill, here we are dillydallying, making like we are going to do something to create work in the gulf. We are not going to do one single, solitary thing, and if we could do nothing more, we ought to tell the people the truth.

If we drilled everywhere you say drill in America, we still would only have 1.97 percent of all of the oil in the world. Canada has more oil than we do,

and we get plenty of it from them. Mexico almost has as much as we do. How dare we come here and talk about 2 weeks of oil that ain't going to reduce gas none and suggest to people it's going to put people back to work. Balderdash.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I would just point out that it is skewing the statistics and not accurate to say that the U.S. only has 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. When you look at Btus, energy production, we have more energy available in this country than any other country in the world; and looking at oil specifically, we have 145 billion barrels of recoverable oil, according to the CRS. So that is much larger than what some people say.

On the point of whether the President has taken a position, this is the Statement of Administration Policy on this bill, and there is no veto threat in here. So if we are fortunate to see this bill not just pass the House but the Senate as well, I am sure the White House will seriously consider this, and I would be hopeful that it would be signed into law.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, beginning at line 1, strike section 202 (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Chairman, a little more than a year ago, the BP Deepwater Horizon oil drilling vessel exploded in the Gulf of Mexico. Over several months, millions of gallons of oil were dumped into the gulf. The oil spill caused irreparable damage to delicate ecosystems, damaged natural barriers that protect States along the Gulf of Mexico from deadly storm surge, and was devastating to local jobs and livelihoods along the gulf coast. Indeed, the oil spill caused significant harm to

my State of Florida's environment and economy from which we are still recovering.

My amendment will have no impact on the overall bill. While I do oppose weakening the Federal review process of lease applications for energy development, production and exploration of the Gulf of Mexico, the purpose of my amendment is simply to correct an injustice to the residents of Florida and Alabama in the bill as it is written. My amendment would strike section 202, which imposes an exclusive venue in the Fifth Circuit for civil actions relating to the leasing of Federal lands in the Gulf of Mexico for energy development, production and exploration.

Under this provision, litigation relating to leases on energy development can only be filed in a district court in the Fifth Circuit. And while the Fifth Circuit includes the Gulf States of Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas, two States that comprise substantial gulf coastlines, Florida and Alabama, are in the 11th Circuit, and it makes no sense that the residents of these States will have to travel to the Fifth Circuit to have their cases heard. The effect of this section would be to prevent the district courts in Florida and Alabama from considering civil cases related to the issuance of leases for energy development, production and exploration off the coastlines of these States.

Congress has no business telling courts within a State that they are prohibited from considering issues involving a lease for energy development, production and exploration that have the potential to cause irreparable environmental and economic damage to the gulf coast area of that State.

In addition, requiring these cases to be moved from Florida and Alabama to a State within the Fifth Circuit will cause substantial hardship for the parties involved in the litigation, substantial hardship for the witnesses who would need to testify, and would result in substantial costs. Striking this exclusive venue provision would ensure that Florida and Alabama courts could hear these cases and reach a just result that reflects the needs of that State.

Section 202 does provide an exception only in cases in which there is no proper venue in a court within the Fifth District. However, this exception fails to address these very serious concerns. The parties involved in litigation on leasing would first have to determine that there is no court within the Fifth Circuit that would be able to consider the case. Only after determining that there was no court in the Fifth Circuit, then the parties will be permitted to file in Florida or Alabama.

In short, section 202 will prohibit the courts in Florida and Alabama from considering and rendering a decision in lawsuits on leases for energy development, production and exploration off their coasts. My amendment would strike the section. It makes no changes to the overall bill. It provides a simple solution to address this bill's unwarranted restrictions on which courts

will be able to review these leases should they pose a threat to the gulf coast area. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

In order to ensure that there is a circuit court that is familiar with the legal issues surrounding civil actions involving gulf energy production, it is important that venue be restricted to the Fifth Circuit so that those district and appeals court judges would have the essential experience and legal precedent to fairly rule on these technical cases. For that reason, I oppose this amendment.

The Fifth Circuit, as was pointed out earlier, does include Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas, all Gulf Coast States. If various district courts and courts of appeal throughout the country were able to hear these cases, there may be a result of having no uniformity in decisionmaking, and judges who do not have as much expertise or background could be making vital decisions in which the energy security of our Nation hangs in the balance.

□ 1930

It is essential that there be one Federal judicial circuit that understands the technical aspects of these cases with judges who have a background in understanding offshore energy policies and practices. That will ensure that all cases are handled fairly and expeditiously and uniformly without any confusion or delay. By requiring all cases to go through the Fifth Circuit, we accomplish this important goal.

For that reason, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. As a former judge—and as a State and Federal judge—I would urge my colleague from Colorado to understand something. Circuit judges don't of necessity have specific specialty in the area they live. A judge may go on the bench in the Fifth Circuit and have studied patent law all of his life and know nothing about oil.

Mr. DEUTCH. May I ask how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Chair, the gentleman's opposition to this amendment is premised on a very interesting, and I would respectfully suggest dangerous, interpretation of what is our responsibility as Members of this House. The gentleman spoke of the need to have uniformity of decisionmaking. Uniformity of decisionmaking. As I understand the role of the Federal judiciary,

the role of our court system is to provide justice. The role is not to ensure that we have the same decision in every court.

My amendment simply says that if you are a judge in the State of Florida or a judge in the State of Alabama, that you are in a position just as well as a judge in Texas or these other Gulf States to make a determination about how the law should be interpreted—the idea that judges have to have a sufficient background, and that if courts throughout the country were able to hear these, we would not be able to reach a logical conclusion.

The fact is we're not asking courts throughout the country to hear these cases, Madam Chairman. We're asking the judges within the States whose coastlines would be dramatically affected and have been affected in the case of spills like the Deepwater Horizon.

Madam Chairman, I would respectfully suggest that if our goal here is to seek justice, then we must seek justice in those courts in the States that have seen the damage.

I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. If the gentleman wanted to make sure that the judges of Alabama and Florida were included, then maybe the amendment should have been written that way, and I think we would have a strong point of debate and that would be a legitimate item to discuss. However, that's not how the amendment is drafted. The amendment talks about letting in judges of the entire country, circuits of the entire country. For that reason, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. DEUTCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. I would like to confirm. Therefore, if the language in the bill were very clear that for cases to be brought affecting the leasing and the exploration of oil in the gulf, that if those cases could be brought in any of the Gulf States, including Florida and Alabama, then the bill's sponsor would not oppose this amendment?

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I would say that we would have a more legitimate issue to debate. We could go into that. But it's too late, the amendment doesn't say that. And so that's not an option in front of us.

Mr. DEUTCH. So just to confirm, the gentleman's position is that in fact the courts in Florida and Alabama are just as well equipped to hear these cases as are the courts in Texas and the other Gulf States.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would say that those judges certainly would have a closeness to the situation that would be helpful. But the circuit, I believe it's the 11th Circuit, includes a number of other States that are not as situated like Alabama and Florida. So in choosing the Fifth Circuit, all the States there are Gulf Coast States.

Mr. DEUTCH. If the gentleman would yield for one final question, I would also note that while the Natural Resources Committee has acted on this bill, this provision very clearly should have been debated in the Judiciary Committee where all of these issues could have been worked out. It is for that reason, given what we have to work with, that I would again ask for adoption of my amendment, which helps to bring justice and some clarity to what is otherwise a murky provision in this piece of legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, my understanding is the Judiciary Committee did not have any problems with this particular revision. But having discussed all the issues around this amendment, I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment as the designee of the maker of the amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 11, strike "EXPEDITION" and insert "QUALITY ABOVE SPEED".

Page 9, line 14, strike "expeditiously" and insert "justly".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, this amendment, the scrivener of same, is JARED POLIS, our colleague from Colorado. I can't resist, however, departing from the preparation that he has undergone to suggest that if my other friend from Colorado's logic is followed, then I gather that the circuit courts of the United States, all 13 of them, must be the courts of last resort. And if you followed your logic to its conclusion, I guess we would eliminate the United States Supreme Court because, of course, those nine people wouldn't know anything about what the circuits had done, wherever they came from.

Madam Chair, when reading this bill, and particularly the section on judicial review, the phrase "rush to judgment"

came to mind to Mr. POLIS, because that's exactly what this bill directs our courts to do. Instead of hearing and deciding a case based on the case's merits, this bill tells the courts that speed, not justice, should be their top priority.

Madam Chair, the integrity of any law enforcement is only as good as the court's ability to review and enforce it. We all learned in civics class that one of the strengths of our Nation is its system of checks and balances. Passing legislation that tilts the courts in favor of one side or another is hardly in line with this most fundamental of American values, yet this is what much of what H.R. 1229's judicial review section does.

Mr. POLIS' amendment that I offer as his designee is a modest amendment that promotes the integrity of that review and the integrity of our Nation's principle of fair and impartial courts. H.R. 1229 as a whole gives an even greater handout to the well-funded legal teams employed by the big oil companies, at the expense of protecting our health, our communities, our environment, and justice in general.

The underlying bill in section 204 states: "The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible." Exactly who does it help when the courts are directed to make decisions in haste at the expense of research and deliberation? It only helps those who can afford teams of high-priced lawyers and lobbyists who know where and when to push the pressure buttons of influence.

My colleague's amendment simply replaces the word "expeditiously" with the word "justly," as the courts should be deciding cases based not simply on speed but on the law. Undoubtedly, the judicial review provisions in H.R. 1229 have been included to promote the misleading argument commonly used by the majority party and the big oil companies alike that frivolous lawsuits by local communities and environmentalists strangle the industry and stall domestic drilling. Yet quarter after quarter, oil companies continue to reap record profits and are developing more domestic energy than ever before. Exxon actually is ahead of us. They're in the business of talking about gas while we around here are dilly-dallying about oil.

Furthermore, this misleading hard-luck story leaves out a critical fact—that the industry is just as active in using the courts to get its way as any public health or environmental watchdog. But the industry has much more money for such legal actions, already giving it an unfair advantage.

□ 1940

In fact, recent lawsuits have been filed against the government by Alaskan oil companies to overturn critical habitat restrictions, by oil companies against the EPA for ethanol standards, and numerous suits against the Depart-

ment of the Interior by industry over the temporary ban following the BP disaster.

Let's remember that the point of judicial review is to ensure that the law is followed and to provide a check and balance when it is not. The underlying bill is, in effect, saying that following the law no longer matters. It doesn't matter if justice is served or if a case is heard properly. It only matters if it appears that way.

Madam Chair, the east front of the Supreme Court building contains the following inscription: "Justice, the guardian of liberty." Should any company in our country have the right to pursue profits and the prerogative of our capitalist system? Of course. But even our Founders recognized that this should be done within the confines of the law. Justice, meaning impartial courts and stringent checks and balances, is the guardian of our liberties and freedom as Americans. Instead of promoting a rush to judgment and a blind rubber stamp within the courts, we should, instead, promote integrity and a system of rigorous checks and balances, as these are truly fundamental American values.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Let's stand back and look for a moment at the big picture. This administration has been held in contempt of court for slow-walking permits and is currently trying to appeal a Federal judge's warning that ordered them to act on stalled deepwater permits. While the administration continues to hold up the permitting process, thousands of Americans remain unemployed, and American energy is locked up.

This legislation encourages courts that are hearing permitting cases to act as expeditiously as possible. Environmental groups are already working to prepare lawsuits aimed at stalling and holding up offshore energy production. This bill encourages the courts to work expeditiously so that lawsuits can be settled quickly.

Now, in seeking to replace the word "expeditiously" with "justly," we are doing something that is totally unnecessary. Those of us supporting this bill already assume that the courts will act justly. That's what they're appointed for, and that's what we expect and require them to do. So it is superfluous and unnecessary to say that they have to act justly when that's what they're going to do. At least that's our assumption over here anyway. Yet we need to say that they act expeditiously as well as justly because of the slow-walking nature of this current administration's approach to permitting.

The effect of this amendment, were it to be adopted, would slow down Amer-

ican energy production at a time when prices are skyrocketing. We need judges to move cases in an expeditious manner so that we can use American energy. This bill ensures that everyone will have their day in court, but it also ensures that the slow walking of permits by this executive branch will not continue.

I urge a "no" vote and for my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 112-73.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, beginning at line 3, strike section 207.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, H.R. 1229, in my opinion, is an irresponsible giveaway to the oil industry, which has taken enormous profit at American taxpayer expense. Section 207 of the bill repeals the Equal Access to Justice Act, thereby eliminating the awarding of attorneys' fees to litigants bringing successful legal challenges, be they expeditious, just or not, to offshore oil and gas activities, making this kind of litigation prohibitively expensive.

As the BP oil spill demonstrated, there has been a lack of Federal oversight of the drilling industry. Consequently, legal challenges have become the only enforcement mechanism for many related laws and regulations. Removing the judiciary system from the equation makes it even less likely that large oil and gas companies will comply with environmental and safety standards. Let me insert something here.

As to the commission that was set up under BP, a colleague of mine on the Rules Committee said that BP has been accountable. Only 3.8 percent, \$3.8 billion of the \$20 billion, has been left to 177,000 claimants. That ensures, among other things, that by 2013, at the expiration of the commission's term, there will be money left over.

Guess what my friends at Fox News reported? They reported that the money goes back to BP. How crazy can we be around here?

Eliminating the awarding of attorneys' fees means the traditional groups that bring lawsuits on environmental

or safety grounds, such as fishermen, small business owners and environmental groups, will no longer be reimbursed for the cost of successfully litigating these kinds of claims. The idea that the bill will somehow eliminate an excess of lawsuits is ridiculous. Since litigation is by its nature so expensive, these cash-strapped plaintiffs usually only bring those lawsuits with the most likelihood of success. Without the possibility of receiving attorneys' fees, legal challenges will effectively become impossible.

Madam Chair, section 207 of H.R. 1229 only helps large oil companies avoid having to comply with U.S. law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

The Equal Access to Justice Act provisions in this bill are necessary to avoid costly delays to domestic energy development based on the extreme anti-energy agenda of a few groups. The Equal Access to Justice Act was intended to allow people and small businesses with limited financial means the ability to challenge the actions of the Federal Government. However, it is now being abused by deep-pocketed special interest organizations.

For example, in 2005, the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council received nearly \$200,000 in taxpayer dollars after suing the Federal Government in an offshore energy project in California. The Sierra Club has annual revenues of \$85 million, and the Natural Resources Defense Council has annual revenues of over \$100 million.

There is no justification for forcing the American taxpayer to pay the attorneys' fees of special interest groups that have ample funds of their own. Wealthy, ideological groups opposed to more American-made offshore energy can continue to sue to their hearts' content, but taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill.

I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. Taxpayer dollars should not go to lawsuits being filed by special interests that are making millions and millions of dollars in annual revenue. I urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, when you're flabbergasted, the easiest thing to do is to not say anything else. I just can't believe that we're doing this useless legislation while people in the gulf are hurting the way that they are. It's senseless.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chair, the Equal Access to Justice Act restrictions in this bill is necessary to avoid costly delays to domestic energy development based on the political agenda of a few groups.

EAJA was established in 1980 as means for small businesses and individuals to seek judicial redress from wrongful government action.

It allows for party's to seek reimbursement of attorneys' fees from the taxpayers.

Payment of these fees comes directly of out agency budgets, in this case the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

EAJA was intended to allow people and small businesses with "limited financial means" the ability to sue the Federal Government without having to worry about the costs associated if they prevail.

However, it is being abused by deep-pocketed organizations with a political agenda.

For example, in 2005 the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council received nearly \$200,000 dollars in taxpayer dollars after suing the Federal Government on an offshore energy project in California.

The Sierra Club has annual revenue of \$85 million dollars, and the Natural Resources Defense Council has annual revenue of over \$100 million dollars.

There is no justification for forcing the American taxpayer—particularly those on the gulf coast—to pay the attorney's fees of political advocacy organizations that have ample funds of their own.

That is not what EAJA was intended to accomplish, and restricting its use in this bill is both necessary and appropriate.

Environmental groups can continue to sue to their hearts' content—and they will because suing the Federal Government is their modus operandi—but taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1950

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN) having assumed the chair, Mrs. ADAMS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico, had come to no resolution thereon.

JOBS AND THE MAKE IT IN AMERICA AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ADAMS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr.

CICILLINE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening about jobs and particularly about the Make It in America Agenda, but before I begin, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan to begin this conversation.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Thank you, Representative CICILLINE.

I represent the city of Detroit. In fact, the congressional district that I represent includes metropolitan Detroit. Over the last 10 years, metropolitan Detroit has lost more jobs than any other metropolitan area in this country, but it wasn't just Detroit and its metropolitan area that's lost jobs. Other areas, other cities, other metropolitan regions in the country have lost millions of jobs over the last 10 years.

Now, during this same timeframe, this country has been investing our tax dollars to build bridges, to repair roads, to build hospitals, sewer systems, schools, to build industrial parks that will promote more business, to actually develop businesses and free enterprise models that are successful. Now, many of the American people may not have seen the benefits of this type of investment because all of the work that I am talking about that was funded by tax dollars was done in Afghanistan, and the people who directly benefited from these projects were the people of Afghanistan.

My position is this: we need to create jobs in America. We need to keep the jobs that we have here so they don't go overseas like they have in the past. In order to do that, I'm proposing let's take a share of the money that's intended to go to Afghanistan, redirect it to the United States to create jobs right here, jobs for the American people, because we're the ones that actually need it, and it makes sense. The money that we are investing in Afghanistan comes from U.S. taxpayers. Let's spend it in a way that benefits the taxpayers and creates jobs right here in the United States.

Now, I do understand that we've got to stop terrorism from breeding in other countries, and we certainly don't want other safe havens for terrorism to develop overseas. But in light of the fact that bin Laden is now gone, I'm asking this Congress, this administration to reassess our mission in Afghanistan. Let's take a part of the over half a trillion dollars—and that's trillion with a "t"—in military assistance that we've spent in Afghanistan over the last 10 years, let's take a share of that and return it home to protect our people right here in the United States.

Yes, we are at risk of a terrorist attack, but more than likely that risk is increasingly coming from within the U.S. So let's fully equip and fund the first line of defense against terrorism in this country, which is our first responders. It is our local police, our local firefighters, our local emergency

medical providers that we call on to help protect the American people. So I'm proposing let's take a share of that military assistance that's going to Afghanistan, and let's invest it in our local police, fire, and emergency medical providers to protect our citizens right here at home.

Then, finally, over the past 10 years, taxpayers have invested nearly \$30 billion—and that's billion with a "b", so we get these figures clear and the magnitude of our investment—we invested nearly \$30 billion in Afghanistan for non-defense spending, much of it going toward economic development and civilian assistance. Let's take a portion of that funding and redirect it to the United States to create jobs right here.

My point is this: it takes money to create jobs, and more accurately, it takes public funds that can be leveraged effectively to create the investment that yields jobs. We've been spending that money for over a decade in another country. Bin Laden is now gone. Let's reevaluate our role in Afghanistan, and while we're doing that, let's take a share of our precious tax dollars—people, this is your money and we need it right now—to create jobs, to fight foreclosures, to invest in manufacturing. It is our manufacturing capacity that made our country strong, that created the best products that were sold around the world. It's our manufacturing strategy and capacity that transformed the city that I represent, the city of Detroit, from the motor capital of the world to the arsenal of democracy back in World War II.

Metro Detroit and this country's ability to innovate and create and manufacture saved this country and saved this world from fascism. If we invest a portion of the money right now that we're spending overseas in Afghanistan and winding down in Iraq, and we invest it right here in cities like Detroit and Elkhart, Indiana, and Louisville, Tennessee—these are other cities that also have lost a lot of jobs—we can make America stronger.

We want to fight terrorism. We need to be a strong country, but the strength of our country comes from within. It comes from protecting the American people, and the most effective way to do that: invest in homeland security, support our local police and fire, and invest in jobs in America so that U.S. citizens can be financially stable and hopefully prosperous. This is how we built this country in just a little over 200 years into one of the greatest countries human civilization has ever known. We've done it by investing the people's money into the innovation and capacity to create jobs. It's through investing in the U.S.

I know I've been going on a little bit longer, but my point is this: I'm asking the American people who are watching tonight, call your Member of Congress, ask—demand, if you wish—that a share of your money that's going overseas right now be returned back to you to create jobs here, to protect our home-

land, and also, to reduce our overall debt and deficit.

□ 2000

We've been spending the money, over \$500 billion alone in the last 10 years in Afghanistan. This administration is slated to wind down that expenditure. Let's take a portion of that back to help our people, to make America strong again.

And you know why it's so important for America to be strong and not some other country? Because we believe in democracy. We, the people, actually have a voice, through folks like me, who you hired. I have the constitutional duty to be your voice here, not just for metro Detroiters, but for all of you who understand the value in manufacturing. That's the reason why my dad risked everything 80 years ago in the midst of the Great Depression to leave his homeland in India, to come here as a dream so that he could live his life as fully as he chose it and to raise a family. I am his only son, and he was so honored to see, many decades ago, the first Indian American elected to Congress. And I am here too as a legacy of an immigrant's courage to make a difference for himself, his family, and his country.

My point is this, people: It's our money. And you work hard for that money. And yes, we invested it overseas because we were trying to stop the people that were determined to wipe us out. And we got the ringleader. We took him out. Let's take a share of our money back and return it to our people. Let's create jobs here. Call your Member of Congress. Do it tonight. Leave them a voicemail message. Tell them, We need you, as a Member of this body that's constitutionally committed to represent the people, we need you to use a share of our money to help American families become financially stable again and to help this country's economy really endure in a prosperous way to help bring democracy and freedom throughout the world. I really am just so committed that we take a share of our funds right now to create jobs here.

I was born and raised in the city of Detroit, and it's heart-breaking to see what's happened to Detroit. But also too, there is so much promise there in Detroit because we still have the greatest talent in manufacturing. We have great research universities there in Michigan, including Wayne State University that I'm proud to represent. And we have the plants and the land to actually build new manufacturing operations. This country has the superb ability to innovate and outwork and out hustle and outsmart any of the competition around the world. All we have to do is this: return some of our money, our tax dollars, back to the U.S. so that we can prosper again.

Some of us are doing well, but I know overall—and I will close—that many American families are not feeling that financially secure, and I understand

that. Look, I have been through hard times myself as a young man. That's why I am stressing the fact, turn a share of our tax dollars back to our people so we can do what's best, innovate, invest, and create jobs.

Thank you so much. God bless America.

Mr. CICILLINE. One of the things I know that we all share as new Members of the Congress, as freshmen, is that we've been here for about 4 months, Madam Speaker; and we've had conversations and debates about cutting Pell Grants and cutting Head Start. We've endured attacks on women's health and NPR, attacks on the environment, and most recently, efforts to end Medicare as we know it. We really haven't had before this Congress a jobs agenda, at a time when Americans are suffering from some of the highest unemployment in a generation.

We all recognize that we need to cut spending, we need to be responsible in our management of the national debt. One of the key ways that we can do that is to grow our economy and get Americans back to work. And I believe, Madam Speaker, that one of the key ways that we can do that is to rebuild the manufacturing base in our country. There is no way we can maintain our position as a great economic power without making things in America. Making things in America is really a key part to rebuilding the economy of this country.

My home State of Rhode Island is one of the States that have been hardest hit in this economic downturn. Rhode Island was the first New England State to enter the recession, and it's currently facing the fifth-highest unemployment in America. But Rhode Island has a strong tradition of manufacturing. It's the birthplace of the American industrial revolution. This helped build the middle class and provided good-paying jobs for working families. In fact, Rhode Island used to produce one-third of the costume jewelry in the entire United States, yet our manufacturing sector has been really hard hit, especially in these particularly difficult economic times. According to the Alliance for American Manufacturing, there were 71,100 manufacturing jobs in Rhode Island in 2000; and by the year 2008, that number had dropped to 47,900. Rhode Island lost 15 percent of its manufacturing jobs during the period of 2008 to 2009 alone. And from 2001 to 2008, Rhode Island lost 10,500 jobs due to trade with China.

When was the last time, Madam Speaker, that you went into a store and found something made in America? Manufacturing jobs all across this country have seen a steep decline, from 20 million jobs in 1979 to about 12 million today, and the middle class has been left behind. And that's why this past week, when we launched the Make It in America agenda, I became so hopeful about this Congress' attention on manufacturing. This agenda is really about reversing manufacturing job

loss. It's about investing in good-paying jobs, world-class education, top-notch research, and sound infrastructure. We need to create an environment that encourages American manufacturers to innovate, grow, keep, and create good jobs here in the United States. When we Make It in America, our middle class will succeed. This agenda is based on the conviction that when more products are made in America, more families will be able to "make it" in America. The agenda is really intended to create the conditions to help American businesses produce goods here, to innovate, and create jobs.

It also includes being smart about the investments we make, to out-educate, to out-innovate, and out-build our international competitors. The President has already signed six Make It in America bills into law, many of them which enjoyed bipartisan support because business and labor leaders alike recognize that the Democratic agenda of making it in America is good for our country and is central to the future of our competitiveness, our jobs, and our leadership in the world.

This past week, we outlined a series of bills that represent really a cross-section of the legislative package, a dynamic agenda that will continue to evolve during the 112th Congress but is really focused on how we support the manufacturing sector again. Some of these bills have already been introduced. Others will be introduced in the coming weeks. The agenda includes the development of a national manufacturing strategy, directs the President to work with industry leaders, labor leaders, other stakeholders to develop a national manufacturing strategy for our country, to set appropriate benchmarks and measurements. Every other nation we're competing with that is serious about manufacturing has a national manufacturing strategy. The agenda also includes the Build America Bonds, expanding the Build America Bonds, the creation of a national infrastructure development bank.

If we're going to compete in the 21st century, we need to have an infrastructure which supports that competition. We need to have roads and bridges and transit systems and the ability to move information to compete in the 21st century. It includes making the research and development tax credit permanent and more generous to encourage job creation. It includes the creation of small business startup savings accounts, a reform of the Chinese currency system to give our American manufacturers a fighting chance to compete in the global marketplace. And it includes the Make It in America Block Grant, which I have drafted. This is a block grant which will help American manufacturers retrofit their factories, retrain their workers, buy new equipment, increase their exports, and make their facilities more energy efficient so that they can compete more successfully in the 21st century.

□ 2010

It's an ambitious agenda, but it's really about recognizing that we have got to start making things again in this country; that manufacturing was an important part of the history of America, an important way we built up the middle class in this country and became a world economic power.

We can no longer act as if manufacturing is not important. We need to make things here again so people can go into stores and buy things made in America. We need to start exporting goods made in America all over the world because we make the best products, we have the best workers, and stop exporting jobs.

This is an agenda which I hope will earn bipartisan support, that will be a key to helping rebuild the economy of our country and rebuilding our strong manufacturing base.

Madam Speaker, I think the most urgent priority we face is getting Americans back to work. Americans have been very hard hit in this recession. Members hear it all the time from constituents back at home. What are you doing to get people back to work, to get this economy back on the right track?

This Make It in America agenda, I believe, provides a real opportunity to again rebuild the manufacturing base of this country so that we can make things here again, and so that American families can make it as well.

At the same time, in addition to investing in this agenda, we also need to invest, as the President said, in education so that we can out-educate, so that our kids can compete, not just with the kids in the neighboring town or the next State, but kids in China and India and Germany and all over the world. That's who they're competing with in the 21st century. And we need to make sure they have the tools and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy.

In addition, we have to invest in science and research and innovation so we can continue to make the new discoveries, make the new inventions, create the new products that will allow us to lead the world and to again maintain our position as a world economic power. And that's why we think about the balance that we have to strike in managing the serious responsibility of reducing spending, eliminating programs that don't work, cutting waste, and at the same time, investing in the things that are necessary to keep our country strong—education, innovation and infrastructure.

And so, Madam Speaker, I hope that this Congress, the 112th Congress, will be known as the Congress that restarted and reinvested in making things again in America.

I know that my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) has focused as well on creating jobs, bringing some balance to our Federal budget, and understands the urgency, particularly in coming

from one of our great New England States, of rebuilding and manufacturing.

I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you for yielding.

I just came here to advance statements by our fellow freshmen and my neighbor from Rhode Island because here we are in a virtually empty Chamber, sitting here talking about jobs.

Before I became a Member of Congress, just a few months ago, my job, and I was fortunate to have one, was the job of a district attorney. Now, the intricacies of that job are not well known, but one of the responsibilities we have in our State is, when there is an unattended death, a death that, for instance, did not occur in a hospital, it's important that that be investigated for any indications of foul play from a criminal standpoint. So, as a result, the troopers attached to my unit and my prosecutors reviewed the deaths of people.

I must say, just to put this in context in a very personal sense to me, one of the most tragic and heart-wrenching parts of that job was coming upon the scenes of suicides. And in the course of that, over the last couple of years, we actually saw situations where people, depressed, hopeless, took their own lives. And they left indications that I won't get into as to the reason they did that.

So many of those people were out of work, chronically out of work. Their homes were falling apart. Their families were falling apart, and hope had been extinguished. There were notes. There were indications. There was the way you go back and talk to a family and say what brought the person to this to make sure you knew just what happened.

That is the most powerful way, I think, that you can understand why we are here in this Congress trying to put people back to work. We have to do everything we can do in our power to do this. To be out of work is human misery, and it's a misery that extends to spouses, sons and daughters; conversations where one of these instances where the person that took their life was told that they would never be able to afford to go to the college they were accepted to.

So when we have this discussion here in this Congress, I hope we don't continue to have this discussion about jobs in empty Chambers. I hope it becomes the focal point of our open sessions because, frankly, there hasn't been enough of that discussion.

I came here imbued with a sense of challenge and responsibility, that I would do everything that I could to try and stop this human misery from occurring in families and individuals. So I hope as we go forward and we look at Make It in America, we look at other platforms and policies to try and put people back to work, we don't forget

these aren't people just called our constituents. These are real people, people suffering more than they ever should.

In my own district, as people are ready to go through the tourist system and the wealthier people come to celebrate their vacations, they're doing it in a region where the unemployment is 16 percent, and too many people are out of work.

I hope, as we go forward, that as freshmen, we come forward and remember what we said in the campaign just a few months ago, focus on what we said we would do. And I hope that kind of freshman enthusiasm is contagious, and I hope we're having robust discussions about putting people back to work, not here in an empty Chamber but in a full Chamber with ideas teeming so that we can accomplish that very important mission.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the distinguished gentleman and my good friend from Massachusetts, and I think it is a really important point that he makes tonight.

We talk about the urgency of job creation and about the enormity of the challenges facing our country. But behind all of these numbers and the unemployment rate, these statistics, are real families and real people who we see every single day in our districts all across this country, who are anguished and worried.

People often describe the American people are angry. I don't see anger. What I see in the American people is anxiety. People are worried about the future. They're worried about whether or not this economy is ever going to get on the right track, whether or not we are going to really be successful in growing jobs and getting people back to work. And they look at the proceedings of this Congress and they say, Where's the conversation about creating jobs? Where's the emphasis on putting Americans back to work? And they grow more anxious.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for reminding all of us that we're here fighting for real people who are counting on us to do the right things to get them back to work, to get this economy back on track and to put our country's fiscal house in order. These are big challenges, but they're challenges we have to meet.

I will end by, again, reminding everyone that this agenda—and I want to really acknowledge the leadership of our minority whip, STENY HOYER, who really has led the charge on Make It in America and the legislation that's contained in that agenda, specific bills which I hope will earn bipartisan support, that really get at this issue of how we grow the manufacturing base in this country, which provided such strong support to the middle class and a real opportunity to fulfill the American Dream and to ensure that America can compete internationally and sell our goods all over the world.

I hope we can come together in this Congress and work quickly to pass the

legislation that is part of the Make It in America agenda so that we can be sure American families can make it.

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

□ 2020

PRICE OF GASOLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMASH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, with all the issues that we deal with here in Congress, the American people deal with other issues at home. Some of those issues are connected, and some of those issues they don't see the connection. But they do wonder about something.

They wonder about the fact that gas prices in some places in this country January of 2009, when the President came into office, were unleaded \$1.32 a gallon; mid-range, \$1.42; super range, \$1.52. Gas prices in April of 2011 over here somewhere in this country, looks like it could be Texas because our numbers are about there, \$3.99 for regular, \$4.09 for mid-range, \$4.19 for the super, the ethyl, as they used to say in the old days.

So since the President has taken office, something that affects every life in this country: the price of gasoline. Because whether we like it or not, whether we come up with alternative energy sources or not, whether we have new ideas about high-speed trains, subways, elevated railways, buses, the majority of the people in the United States move around by automobile; and the majority of those automobiles are driven using one of two fuels, either gasoline or diesel.

Now, neither one of these charts shows a diesel price; but amazingly enough, back when I was a youngster, diesel was the cheapest fuel we had available. But diesel prices are no longer cheap. Diesel prices are competitive, usually around the mid-range price of gasoline. But there are people who have good reasons to drive diesel vehicles. And so whether we like it or not, whether it fits our congressional legislative program or not to have gasoline and diesel being the fuel that moves people around this country, it is a fact. And you may think otherwise all you wish, but it is a fact.

There are no wind cars where you hook a sail up and hope that the wind is blowing towards Washington, DC tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock so everybody can get to work. It is not happening.

So everybody gets up and everybody goes out, and most everybody, unless they have one of the brand-new electric cars, starts their vehicle with gasoline or maybe diesel, and they go to work or they go on vacation or they travel to see their relatives, or whatever the purpose of their trip.

So let's be frank. Until we come up with alternative sources that move people from point A to point B in the United States of America, we are bound to gasoline and diesel. And in the 3-year track record of this administration, we have seen, I understand it is reported, the highest gasoline prices in the history of the country, even higher than the famous Jimmy Carter days when Jimmy Carter had us waiting in long, long ration lines and paying extremely high gasoline prices. At \$4 a gallon, I think we topped even the numbers that came under President Carter almost two decades ago.

So here we are, we have gone full circle in a Democrat Presidency, and here we are back with the issue of gas prices.

Now, why are gas prices so important to people? Because it is how we get where we are going to go. If you are taking your kid to soccer game or to baseball practice or football practice or lacrosse up here in the East, or track and field, or whatever your young people are doing, you have got to get them there; and in most instances they can't walk and they can't ride a bike. They have to go in an automobile. And when you move them from game to game, they go in automobiles. And when they go to take their tests for entry into college, they have to go to an independent location. Many times they travel there by automobile.

You have to pick up the laundry. You have to pick up the groceries. You have to do a million things; get the kids to school on time, get the kids home from school, take the wife out on a date. Unmarried people are dating, and that's part of their date costs. And at a time when we have some of the highest unemployment in modern times, we bumped back above 9 percent, I understand now, so there is a lot of people out of work.

Those people who are out of work, some of them are drawing unemployment, and some of them are just trying to figure out a way to make do until they can find another job. And to have a roughly \$3 increase per gallon in the cost of their fuel to move them around the country, people feel that immediately. It is literally sticker shock to go in and start filling up your tank.

I have a fairly small tank in my car. My wife's got a little larger tank, so more of a sticker shock. I drive a hybrid, so I'm getting some pretty good gas mileage. But still, I watch that thing go up to \$54 to fill up my tank and watch my wife's go up to \$65, \$70 to drive.

I have a daughter who is working part time and going to college. Sometimes she has to go for testing; in fact, today she went for testing in a town about 40 miles from where we live to take a test, and it is a full tank of gasoline up there and back for her in the little car she drives, or almost. And she works hard. She will work all day and maybe 2 days at her job to pay for a tank of gasoline. So it immediately affects your budget.

But it is not just the cost of this fuel to the individual. It is the fact that it is killing the recovery in this country, this new increase in gasoline costs and fuel costs.

Now, we move goods from one place to the other. In Texas we are blessed to have the Rio Grande Valley where we produce wonderful fruits and vegetables, and we compete around the country with our fruit and vegetable crops. But the prices of those things are going up, and they are going up very quickly. All of a sudden, you are seeing tomatoes are \$2.50 a pound.

Now, you say how do you know this? One of the great questions they always like to ask a Congressman is, what is the price of bread in your town? What is the price of milk? Because they think that we don't know. Well, I can assure you, my wife will back me up on this, I have shopped for our family in the grocery store since the day I got married, and I continue to do so.

We live away from town, and usually I would be leaving my work in town and it was easier for me to grab the groceries than for my wife to drive 8 or 10 miles from where we live out in the country into town. So I can honestly say I watched avocados go from \$1 apiece to \$2 apiece in 2 days in Round Rock, Texas, at one of the better stores where the prices are kept low where we regularly shop. I'm fortunate enough to have a job, but there are people who don't. And avocados may be a luxury to some people. That's just an example that I noticed because it shocked me to see them double in price in a 48-hour period, and so I thought about it.

□ 2030

But that's not all. The price of everything is going up. Now, why is that? Transportation costs. We move our products to market and we move our products to wholesalers, retailers, and it all takes transportation, and that transportation has now almost trebled in costs in a very short period of time.

People say, why? We hear from our Democrat colleagues here in the Congress, the "why" is the evil oil companies, the evil major oil companies, and they name names; ExxonMobil, ConocoPhillips, Chevron. I will not use all the names. There are a bunch of them, and they get used every day in this Congress. They are making horrendous profits and they are the cause of gasoline going up. But the price of oil is going up, and that is part of why prices go up.

The thing is we don't know. We all speculate to some extent. But I think it is a pretty easy, commonsense position to take that the more supply we have with the demand, and we are the demand capital of the world on burning gasoline and diesel. We outshine anybody else on the face of this globe in the use of those products. And we have relatively cheap prices as compared to the other countries, especially those countries that have no production. They can get very expensive very quickly.

Until very recently, there was no oil or gas at all to amount to anything in what we now call Western Europe. Today, there is. They have found it offshore. They have found it on the land in Holland, in Norway and other places. Norway is, I think, something like the third biggest producer of offshore oil in the world now. They are doing extremely well and running their economy in a very frugal manner. They are very smart people and they should be commended. We should do so well.

I happened to go to Norway with Chairman Obey with the Appropriations Committee when the Democrats were in control, and we went to see the offshore production in Norway. They are doing a good job. But the prices for gasoline are probably three times as much in Europe as they are here, and in other places even more.

But it makes sense that the law of supply and demand always works. It's kind of like gravity, the law of gravity. If you drop something, it's going down. Well, the law of supply and demand has been proven over and over and over to be what drives the market for anything. So if we have the opportunity to increase our supply in this country and we have the demand, then why wouldn't that have an effect on our price? I think that is a reasonable thing to talk about.

The Obama administration has, I would say, a dismal record in assisting us in finding oil and gas. Of course, we are all familiar with the fact that we had a bad oil leak in the gulf, and nobody in any way is saying that was good. In fact, that was a terrible, terrible thing to our environment, a terrible thing that panicked the country to some extent, especially some of the southern States that border on the Gulf of Mexico, and it messed up some beaches pretty nastily and probably had some effect on the wildlife and sea life in the ocean. We will probably be learning in the future how much.

As a result of that, we put a moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. But oil and gas is found in the Gulf of Mexico, especially oil, but to some extent natural gas, in abundance in some places, and many of those places are deepwater. Deepwater drilling is extremely expensive. The rigs are \$1 billion, with a "b," piece of equipment, and the cost of drilling those wells is very expensive. But they are successful. We have had wells, even the BP well that blew out was putting out a phenomenal amount of oil. If that had been sealed and that production had been put into play, it would have had an effect on the availability of oil in the United States. Just that one well would have had an effect. But they put a moratorium on that, and the decrease in oil production from this decreased the amount of production by 360,000 barrels of domestic oil per day.

The Obama administration has leased less offshore and onshore acres for energy production than any other President since Ronald Reagan. In 2009, the

administration indefinitely delayed leases for oil shale in the West, which kept these resources off limits. Over 2 trillion barrels of oil from oil shale are currently sitting idle due to these delays. The Obama administration has kept all new offshore exploration off limits until at least 2017. That is over 80 billion barrels of oil in the Atlantic, Pacific, Alaska and Gulf of Mexico.

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, which could be transporting 2.2 million barrels of oil per day, is running at less than one-third capacity because companies cannot get permits to produce oil in Alaska. The administration has essentially shut down production in the State by withholding the necessary permits. The Keystone XL pipeline, which could eventually bring 1.5 million barrels of oil per day to America, is being prevented by endless delays by the State Department.

America is the third largest oil producing Nation in the world. The above actions are a clear sign to the world that we are closed for business. If we are closed for business and we are number three, then how much more valuable does that make the product that number two and number one and those behind us are producing, therefore driving up the cost of that product? The less you have in the market, the higher the cost, if there is a demand, and there is clearly a demand worldwide.

In fact, one of the things you are seeing on the price of oil is the fact that at one time we were the biggest market by far. In fact, the Europeans really didn't even come close to being the market for oil and gas that the United States is. But today these booming new upcoming economies, China, the fastest growing economy in the world right now, do you think they can have that fast growing economy without energy? Of course not.

Energy is the driving force behind manufacturing. It is the driving force behind development of a nation. Those folks need to get where they need to go just like everybody else does, and they have many of the innovative things that America is starting to talk about today.

The Secretary of Transportation has just let out a bunch of money to build some high-speed rail. China already has high-speed rail, the highest speed rail in the world. They have speeds of up to 250 miles per hour. We are not even going to come close to that on our rail projects. But they are still now the biggest competitor for trying to make forward purchases. They are trying to buy future purchases so they can ensure they have the fuel they need in the future to meet their demands.

We have a product that we sell for that. They are called "futures" on the exchange, and you are buying oil to be delivered at a later time at a set price. And when futures become in big demand and when the price of oil in the future is looked at by countries and by industries to make these purchases ahead of time to get cheaper fuel to

run your industry, then it drives up the costs in the market. The market goes up. Something is in demand and the market needs it not only today, but sees a projection to need it in 6 months, in a year, in 5 years and in 10 years, and they are willing to pay for the right to purchase it at a certain price, the prices go up.

□ 2040

That's the market. So I think that, first off, we're not ever going to get anywhere if we don't have an energy plan that is about all energy in the United States. And I would argue that with the use of the regulations and the failure to lease and the failure to lift moratoriums, and even after you lift moratoriums, failure to give drilling permits, all the things that this administration has done, it has been an anti-oil and gas industry—and I'm sure coal, also—and anti-hydrocarbon administration. They don't deny that at all. They are anti-hydrocarbons. They don't like coal. They don't like oil and gas. They are opposed to them. And through regulations and through failure to do the necessary leasing they are keeping closed natural resources that are available to Americans. And, hey, let's get this straight. Before the Middle East; before Russia, and the Soviet Union prior to that; before offshore Norway, before onshore Holland; before the North Sea; before the Gulf of Mexico; before Indonesia; before all these places where we now produce oil and gas, we started out by producing oil in Pennsylvania. We later made a huge gigantic oil find in Texas. And Texas is now defined by oil and gas by many.

We are the pioneers of oil and gas in the world, the United States of America. All the improvements in drilling procedures and in closing down wells, in saving oil without blowouts, in fighting oil fires, in any category you can come up with to do with oil and gas, the United States of America has led, as it usually leads in all things, but it has led in the oil and gas industry. We are the experts. In fact, when we went to Norway and asked the Norwegians what they would do if they had a blowout like the British Petroleum blowout, they said, We'd call the experts; the people in the United States. The companies that are drilling the wells, they're the experts, not us. Then why all of a sudden in this administration have we decided that a major industry in this country is of no consequences because you want to change the way the American people get around, and you want to change the way we do business in this country? So you hold votes on the floor of this House, whether it's something called cap-and-trade, and it fails—passes the House; can't get through the Senate. Dies. So you do it with regulations. Just get the regulators to shut them down and that will do just as good as passing cap-and-trade.

You want to know what this does to you folks that are looking for a job.

Well, Texas, at one time in the very near past, within the last year, had the lowest unemployment in the Nation until we shut down drilling offshore and along the gulf coast, and we lost tens of thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands of people, that are connected with this industry. And it's not just the greasy drillers that drill the oil wells. It's the food service people that bring it out there. It's the helicopter people that transport people. It's the shipping industry that transports the fuel. It's the pipeline industry that puts it in the pipeline and delivers it. It's the refining industry. All of these people are affected when you shut down the local source, which is what this administration has done. And then we say to ourselves, Why has the price of gasoline gone up? Well, it seems to me part of the problem has got to be an administration hostile to this very industry. It's awfully hard when the regulators, EPA and others, have painted a target on your back to prevent you from producing.

We've made a phenomenal natural gas find in this country. We have found, which if I had told you this 4 years ago that we would bust up rocks and find natural gas, you would say that I needed to have some serious psychiatric examination, because it makes no sense to anybody that you can bust up rocks and produce natural gas. But we've discovered shale gas. And now, although we've got shale gas in Texas—and we're mighty proud of it—this shale gas now touches multiple States in this country. It goes right up through the South, right up through the Midwest, right up into Pennsylvania, where they have already done some serious shale oil work. And I know there's some up in New York State, although they don't seem to be interested in producing it.

So a belt of product stretches all the way across our country. Natural gas. And yet immediately there's some people who are telling you, I can smell that gas in my water well. Well, I've got news for you. Natural gas doesn't smell. So if you smell that gas in your water well, you've got a city gas line leaking someplace in your house, because you put the smell in the gas when you sell it to the retail customer so you can smell the gas if it's leaking in your house. But there's no smell of natural gas. But people have come up here to Congress and said, They drilled a well right around the corner from me, and now my water smells like natural gas. It doesn't make sense because natural gas doesn't smell. I can tell you that from personal experience it does not smell because I have dug up the machine on a job I had that smells. That was one of the nastiest jobs I ever had, because you got that smell all over you, but that's a different story. We need an energy policy that works, not an anti-energy policy.

Let's look at an anti-energy policy. Year One, 2009. February 4, 77 Utah oil and gas lease areas withdrawn from de-

velopment. One of the things we talk about is Alaska, we talk about Texas, we talk now about Pennsylvania, we talk about many other places where there is now production. But what we don't talk about because we haven't been able to get in there to do it is the basin which Utah sits in the middle of, but it goes up into Idaho, it goes over into Wyoming, it goes up into Montana. There's a large potential field and discovered field in North Dakota of oil and gas. But the Utah oil leases were withdrawn from development. February 10. These were all actions of the administration. Offshore leasing plan delayed for 6 months.

February 25, shale oil research and development leases delayed in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah. March 30, 3 million acres of Federal land removed from energy production by Omnibus Public Lands Management Act passed by a Democratic Congress. June 29, 29 million acres of Federal land removed from solar energy development plans, leaving just 670,000 solar acres. So even the so-called clean energy is having roadblocks by this administration.

Uranium mining blocked for 2 years on 1 million acres of land in Arizona. That was in July. August, 24,000 acres in Wyoming oil and gas leases withdrawn. September, new Outer Continental Shelf lease plan postponed until 2012. October, 60 of the 77 Utah oil and gas leases permanently canceled. November, Obama administration found to have approved the least oil and gas leases annually ever recorded in the United States history. So in the first year of this administration they started out with a clear policy of getting rid of our energy, not going after our energy. Even solar.

Year Two. January 6, new regs issued to restrict oil and gas development on Federal lands. January 26, Virginia offshore leases delayed.

□ 2050

January 28, restricted shale oil lease terms, cutting industry offers 85 percent. February 1, \$40 billion in oil and gas industry tax and fee increases introduced in FY 2011 budget proposal. February 17, the administration unilaterally shuts down Yucca Mountain, the Nation's only repository for spent nuclear fuel, jeopardizing the future of nuclear energy.

That's not oil and gas, but that's energy.

March 12, 61 Montana oil leases withdrawn. March 31, majority of Outer Continental Shelf closed to future production. May 6, ban on all gulf drilling over BP spill. July 12, President defies Federal court order overturning the gulf drilling ban. October 12, the President finally says gulf drilling ban lifted, but refuses to issue new permits, keeping a de facto ban in place in contempt of Federal court. November 18, Interior Department plans no new gulf leases until 2012. December 1, the administration reinstates the illegal gulf

drilling ban to introduce the entire Pacific/Atlantic Coasts, Eastern Gulf, and parts of Alaska.

So they reinstated the ban to cover the whole coasts of the country. Oh, yes, we've got one more here—year three, 2011.

January 14, revoked West Virginia coal mine permit, costing 250 American jobs. February 2, a Federal judge finds Interior Department in contempt of court over de facto drilling ban. February 15, announced further delays to U.S. oil shale production by deciding to re-review the current rules for commercial oil shale leasing. February 28, continued the de facto drilling ban while issuing a token deepwater permit. March 4, the President appealed the Federal court ruling to issue stalled deepwater permits.

When I saw that shale oil, I saw my friend from Pennsylvania stand up. I yield to my good friend whatever time he may need to talk about the great things that are happening in Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Texas for hosting this hour.

I actually do think this administration has an energy policy, and it's all about shutting down all of the domestic use of the resources we've been blessed with in this country. It's about cutting our supply, eliminating our domestic supply.

When I looked at your chart you had in terms of gas prices reflecting 2009 and 2011, I know at the White House the President is asking the Attorney General to put together a task force and is trying to find the bad guys of who's causing gas prices to be so high right now, which are pushing over \$4 a gallon. There's only really one thing that impacts gas prices, and that's supply and demand, and demand around the world is going up. As you really captured nicely in the documentation, Congressman, the problem is that this administration has shut down access to domestic supply, and we're making us more and more foreign-dependent. Right now, with what's happening in Libya, we only get 2 percent of our oil resources from them. Just that 2 percent with what's happening in that country, we're seeing gas prices now push over \$4 a gallon.

I'd like to contrast that with the shale gas that you talked about because, in Pennsylvania, we are blessed with it. Also, let me claim my heritage. I have the privilege of representing Titusville, Pennsylvania, where Edwin Drake drilled that first well 151 years ago, and we're very proud of that. Also, the 17 counties I represent in Pennsylvania are right in the heart of the Marcellus natural gas shale, and in the middle of one of the worst recessions we've had since the Great Depression, gas prices—and you captured them—are spiking at just record heights. If we had a chart there that showed natural gas prices, it actually is a record low. It's a little over \$4

a cubic foot. Normally, in importing our domestic gas from other countries, natural gas would probably be somewhere around \$11 or \$12 a cubic foot, but today, it's \$4-something a cubic foot in the middle of the worst recession. This winter was a tough winter in Pennsylvania, and the folks all over the State, including those in center city Philadelphia, are paying some of the lowest gas rates, which is only because natural gas is domestically produced.

It just speaks to the importance of a strong domestic supply program, but the policies of this administration make that almost impossible for our oil. They're going after natural gas, trying to stop that as well, and that is driving up costs. I find that it's not only so terribly damaging on our economy and jobs but that it's just immoral when we've been blessed with these resources. They were provided to us for a purpose, which was to be able to use them and go after them and do it as good stewards, and we know how to do that today.

Mr. CARTER. If my friend would yield just for a minute, what is the unemployment rate in Pennsylvania right now?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. The unemployment rate is lower than the national average is. I have a couple counties in particular. Tioga County is one of them, which is in the heart of the Marcellus natural gas. It is probably the first time in history that that county's unemployment is below both State and national averages, and it's because of the natural gas industry.

Mr. CARTER. It's because of those new jobs that were created by this marvelous find in Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is, and all the related jobs. Absolutely. You're right.

It's not the drilling jobs, but it's the hotel jobs and it's the restaurant jobs. I've got manufacturers right now that are sitting with jobs that they can't fill. We hear a lot about unemployment, but these are good jobs. They pay a significant amount of money per hour with good benefits. It's a great employer, and they're sitting there with these job openings, looking for folks to fill them. Now, some of the people they've had working for them have moved on into the gas field, and they've created new opportunities. So producing domestic energy produces domestic jobs, and it's so important.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time for just a moment, a lot of people don't realize that, when you're talking about the production of oil and gas, there is much more to putting up a rig on a piece of land than just driving out there and putting it up. You build roads. You build fences. Road builders don't drill a single drop of oil or gas, but they build the roads. That's a job. That's multiple jobs. In Louisiana, in the marshy parts of the country, they used to build wooden roads to get out to these rigs. All this creates jobs for

all the side industries of the oil and gas industry. Just like any other industry, there are side industries that feed the big industry, and they all create jobs in a country that dropped below 9 percent but has now jumped back this month above 9 percent again, after one of the longest stretches of high unemployment in the country. I'll just use my family as an example.

My daddy was born in Kentucky, and my mother was born in Tennessee. In fact, where my mother lived may be pretty close to being underwater right now. In fact, she lived right close to the river in Tennessee. In the Great Depression, there were no jobs in their part of the country, but there were jobs in Texas because of the oil industry, so they both came down to Texas to get jobs in the oil industry. Now, they both ended up in the oil industry, but they started out where my mother was in the secretarial pool for business and my daddy was a teacher, an accounting professor; but they got jobs in the oil business, and it was always good to our family.

I don't lay any bones about it. I was raised in an oil and gas family, and my dad was a gas man. I've seen it make our State prosper, and of all the producing States that I've ever visited, they've prospered. Look at what it has done for Alaska. Look at Louisiana. Look at New Mexico and Oklahoma and what it has done for those States and those economies. To take and target an industry and go after that industry the way this administration has done—but not only that, I don't even understand the Yucca Mountain deal. I don't understand the no uranium leases. Now the President, in a couple of speeches, said we'll switch to nuclear. I think that may have changed now since the Japan disaster.

□ 2100

But we can't do it without uranium. There's a new process, you maybe could, but that's a different story. Historically, you can't do without uranium. You've got to have the location to store spent fuel. Americans need to wake up and say, wait a minute, we need energy.

I just was talking to people today that said the EPA was going to try their best to shut down wood-burning fireplaces. My gosh, I mean, how are we going to get warm? You guys up north, how are you going to get warm in the winter time if you're going to take away your coal and your natural gas and the price of oil is going to be through the roof and you can't afford that? You can't even burn wood in your own fireplace? What's wrong with this picture?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, you're right. The demand side impacts gas prices as well, and it has been very well documented that two countries in particular are increasing their thirst for oil, and it's going to drive up the demand for oil worldwide, and that is China and India. It's expected just

within the next few years the demand for oil is going to go up 10 to 12 million barrels a day. That's in addition to what the world is using today; and if that occurs and we don't increase our domestic supply, we don't have a board big enough to show where that red line is going to climb to in terms of gas prices.

It is absolutely critical. That's why I'm so proud. I'm on the Natural Resources Committee. We passed out of there a matter of a number of weeks ago not one but three pieces of legislation. Last week, the House passed out of the House of Representatives H.R. 1229, Putting the Gulf Back to Work Act. This week we're going to be working on H.R. 1230, Restoring American Offshore Leasing Act, and that will make a difference.

Now, critics will say, oh, well, it would be a year or more until you produce one barrel of oil once we pass that act, and that is true because it takes awhile to get that rig set up and get it produced, but we only have to look back to 2008 when President Bush and this Congress finally lifted the Outer Continental Shelf ban moratorium, and on the day that that was lifted and Congress lifted that and we gave the approval to go ahead with issuing permits again, on the day they voted on it, the price of gas in 2008 was four-something a gallon. The very next day it was two-something a gallon.

It makes a difference. It communicates that America is willing to use its own resources, that America is not going to be dependent on the Middle East, on Libya, and on Saudi Arabia, on places that are so volatile today that we don't know if there's a revolution or demonstrations or riots or terrorism that we're not going to have access to that 30 percent of our energy resources that we use today.

The best predictor of future performance is past performance. So we know if the Senate does the right thing and passes these acts that we're going to have and will pass out of the House of Representatives and the President signs it, gas prices will come down; but, unfortunately, the best predictor of future performance is past performance, and under this administration, they're going to continue to limit and eliminate our Americans' access to the domestic resources that we have right here in this country.

Mr. CARTER. The great surge in the cost of gasoline that we were just talking about, that surge was the result of basically two things. You named one of them. The other one was they had a small fire in an Illinois refinery, but the speculators look and they say, we're fighting capacity shutdown and we have a limited refining capacity because we haven't built a major refinery in this country in 25 years.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Right.

Mr. CARTER. Because of the burdensome rules we've come up with and the fact that we can't permit them. So

they look at refining capacity and they look at the other issue, and they say, wait a minute, if there's not a shortage now, there's going to be, and they run the price up. Then when that opens up, hey, the market gets back to normal again, and every time that happens the driving public of America suffers. They're suffering today, and they're suffering on top of the highest unemployment, longest period of high unemployment in modern times just about.

This is one of those what we call kitchen-table issues, when the family gathers around the kitchen table to figure out how they're going to make the budget work especially if Mom or Dad are laid off. One of the things they're looking at is the cost of that fuel, fuel to heat their homes or cool their homes. Down where we come from, we want it cool. They look to see how much it's going to cost them to get to and from school, to and from work, how they're going to conserve energy, maybe they're going to car pool. They're making these kinds of decisions, and yet the government seems to be making these gigantic decisions to shut off supply and then wonder why we have an energy crisis in this country.

This is not rocket science. This is the law of supply and demand. We have the biggest demand. If we can't meet our demand, we've got to go to foreign oil. If there's a fight in Libya, we may not use much of that foreign oil right now, but somebody else does; and if it's at risk, then they are going into another market to get their oil and that makes our market go up. It's all worldwide market in our oil and gas.

I don't understand why people think they're gouging you. They're making excessive profits, and I understand the payment on CEOs and I am not defending any payment on CEOs in any industry. It's not just the oil industry that pays big bucks for CEOs; but if you look at the history of the oil and gas industry, their percentage on investment is lower than most average manufacturing facilities, somewhere between 6 and 8 percent return on their investment. And you say what investments? Well, I think I said earlier, those offshore drilling rigs that drill in the Gulf of Mexico and now have all been moved off the coast of Africa, Indonesia and off the coast of Brazil, those rigs cost \$1 billion, and they can cost you operational-wise in a 24-day period almost \$1 million to operate. They are expensive. And if you hit nothing but dust when you get down to the bottom of that well, you have blown a whole lot of money out the door, and that's just lost. Then you drill the next well to try to get it back. We've gotten better at looking for it and finding it, but it's still a gambler's business when you get down to it.

But this is caused by the government to a great extent. You can't create an environment of uncertainty in any market, I don't care what the market is. If you create the idea of uncer-

tainty, it affects the market. It also affects the psyche of the people, and that's kind of what I don't think they're getting.

So their solution is to tax it. If it moves, tax it. The problem with that is do you really think the CEO of Exxon is going to pay the taxes if we increase taxes on the oil and gas industry? No. You and I are going to pay those taxes when we fill up our tank. If you go and ask the question, they will tell you at your local filling station. They used to publish it in Texas on the pump how much of a gallon of gasoline was taxed. It's a whole bunch. Direct and indirect tax make up a large amount of the cost of gasoline, always have, and I come from a time where we used to have 19 cents a gallon gasoline in Texas. Try that on for size. I could go buy a dollar's worth of gas and drive all week.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I think a point in terms of the profits that oil companies make, it really is what most industries, whether it's a manufacturer or service industry, make right around 6 to 8 percent; but yet you have to answer who is benefiting from that. I would find it hard to believe that there's not a lot of Americans that benefit from that because their pension programs are investing in the portfolios they may have. Their pensions are investing in those types of companies and benefiting from that 6 to 8 percent margin that these companies are delivering.

Those who will speak against using oil, they say, well, we don't have enough. We use so much, but we only have 2 percent of the proven reserves. Here's the facts. Frankly, when they define proven reserves, they just look at conventional. They don't look at unconventional. They don't consider shale gas. They don't consider shale oil. They just look at conventional reserves. Then they really don't look at probable.

□ 2110

For probable, there is 10 to 20 times that much available in terms of probable. And then when you get the estimate, there is enough oil out there to really, I think, meet the needs of this country for as long as we need to. Now, I'm not saying forever because I think at some point, there will be a new energy source that comes along. It may be generations until we get that. It may be hydrogen-fueled cars. I don't know what it is, but we are going to have that kind of new science in the future. But we have plenty of oil to meet our needs right now.

In terms of natural gas, what we know now from all the reserves in Texas and Pennsylvania and the Outer Continental Shelf and, frankly, throughout the West, we have at least 200 years of natural gas, and that's just what we know about. And the unknown is—but it's pretty consistent—is that the technology gets better and better

and better. It's only with the advent about 60 years ago of the development of horizontal drilling that we have been able to really access the full potential that we are getting now on natural gas. I know that the engineers and the scientists out there are looking at new and better ways to get out more of this resource that God has really blessed us with as a country.

I think we really do need an energy policy in this country, and it ought to be one that is centered around the full use of and access to domestic energy resources. We ought to be doing the research too, obviously, for new development. And energy efficiency is important as well, whether it's transportation or heating or electricity or appliances being more energy efficient with it. But those three things alone, all centered on domestic use of energy resources, that's the kind of energy policy this country needs.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I agree with you 100 percent. It's the same thing when we took over this House floor 3 years ago in the dark because they turned out the lights on us, turned off the mics, and we talked for about 2 or 3 weeks on, what we want is all of the above. We are for every energy resource that is available, but we want that energy resource to be as available as possible to be competitive in the market. I mean, everybody's got their own little bailiwick. And corn farmers love ethanol, but it's got to compete. Sun has to compete. Wind has to compete.

They invariably call us oil and gas guys "anti-wind people." Wrong. Texas has the largest wind farm in the United States. There's no State with more of those wind turbines than the State of Texas because out in the West, the wind blows all the time. It's like a gold mine for wind. What do you think Boone Pickens is talking about when he's talking about all that wind energy out there? And his idea of putting natural gas-burning cars on the road is a good idea. I support it. Because when we hear that now with the discovery of shale gas and the ability—we just started to tap it. It is just a small part of the future.

By the way, it would be real interesting to find out if some of our colleagues that are so opposed to natural gas, if they knocked on his door and said, Sir, we would like to talk to you about making a lease for a share of the profits on drilling for natural gas on your property. And I wonder if they would say, Oh, no. I wouldn't take that, those hundreds of thousands of dollars that I might make from you developing that resource. No, I don't believe in that stuff. I don't think so. Whenever you produce wealth, wealth enhances a nation. And your natural resources are a part of the wealth of the Nation, always have been and, my friend, they always will be.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I just want to come back to the point you talked about in terms of ethanol,

wind, solar. It could be anything. Anytime that you take a new energy to commercial level, commercialize it, but you do it artificially, you do it with subsidies, you use taxpayer dollars to sustain it in the market, that's just wrong. And it's not real. If something is ready for prime time, if it is ready to be commercialized, it will stand on its own. It will create a market that people want to come and buy it and use it. So as we look forward to an energy policy, I think we need to be very careful about what we artificially commercialize, what we subsidize.

Natural gas is real. Oil is real. Both of them will stand on their own. It doesn't need subsidies in order to provide energy for folks. It will do it in a way that is market proven. But there are other markets out there—and you've named a couple of them—that if we take away those subsidies today, they would collapse. They wouldn't exist. So, frankly, I think that's a disservice to the American taxpayers.

Why are we commercializing energy resources? You know, I do believe in research; and that's where our focus should be, as opposed to prematurely commercializing something that doesn't stand on its own. I have a lot of appreciation for the national energy labs in this country. They are scientists. They don't have an agenda. They are just looking for that new energy source, and they are very credible in what they do. And that's where our emphasis should be, not prematurely commercializing energies that are unsustainable. We really should make sure we invest in research and development.

Mr. CARTER. Within the last 3 years, I have met two different individuals—one of them very recently—who have a scientific plan to refine garbage at your garbage dump, solid waste, normal throw-it-in-your-garbage-can stuff, go out there and, through a multiple process, produce gasoline and capture all the CO₂ to be used—in Texas we take CO₂, put it back down in the ground in old wells, and reenergize those wells to bring more oil to the surface. And the leftovers, after this burning process to create the gasoline, refine the gasoline out of garbage, leaves an ash that is good to plow into fields in certain parts of the country to refurbish the fields.

That's the kind of thinking we want. That's great. That's a good idea. And because we're talking energy and we're having energy policy, those good ideas come to the fore. That's what we want. That's how we're going to solve this problem. But we're not going to solve it by shutting down what we have now in hopes that there is going to be this miraculous overnight discovery that's just going to make everything great, like we find some kryptonite or something, and it runs the whole country. Wrong. It ain't going to happen.

This is a frustrating time for those of us that are in energy-producing States because we have people that literally

don't like the production of energy, but they complain about the production of energy. They want to tax it.

By the way, the majors, the big boys, they don't get subsidies on their stuff. That's for wildcatters. They drilled, but most of their production is overseas. And we, to some extent, by having bad energy policy in the United States, we have driven people to the benefit of other people in the world. Nobody thought about drilling off the coast of Australia or drilling off the coast of Indonesia, which is a very unstable volcanic area over there, until they were kind of pushed out of American waters. And then they started looking in places like the North Sea, off the coast of Africa, Nigeria, Indonesia; and these are now major production fields. They've benefited from our lack of foresight under some administrations to continue to enhance our native industry. More power to them. That's good for them. But we have it here too.

I still think there is plenty of oil in Alaska and lots of it. And they haven't even started looking for natural gas up there. They probably have got as much natural gas as anybody. There's an international thing going on; most people don't even know about it. I learned it from the Coast Guard. Because of the receding ice from the North Pole—and I won't get off into global warming here today, if that's it—whatever it is, because it's receding, there is now a waterway. There is now a northwest passage across the top of North America. You can sail from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Also, if that water stays open, you can drill for natural resources there. The unclaimed international water gets claimed by who puts the most activity in that water. And one of the questions is, the Russians are pouring in ships and trawlers and other things into that whole area up there, the part we claim is so much. The Canadians claim so much. But there is a lot more that seems to be developing. And why are they after it? It's not for fish, my friend. It's oil and gas.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for joining me.

□ 2120

DISPELLING THE POLITICAL FOLKLORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I actually didn't intend to do this this evening, but I got so frustrated with a number of the things I've been watching, both on television and from our brothers and sisters in this body, it became time to actually bring some of the slides we actually do in our town halls back in Arizona. I like to refer to it as a combination of truth on the

numbers and also dispelling some of the political folklore that is rampant, both in this town.

I'm going to say a number of things this evening that I promise you will offend all sorts of Members, all sorts of this Washington, D.C. But, look, I'm a freshman. I've been here 140-some days, and Washington, D.C., has systemically not told the truth to the American people. I don't know if they're fearful of looking the American people in the eyes and saying, Look, here's what we've done to your future, your kids' future, your grandkids' future is so scary that they don't get reelected.

Well, I got elected to come here and do the numbers, and so my goal is very, very simple. The numbers are straight up. The numbers come from 2010 on a lot of the charts, so we know exactly what was actually spent. On a number of charts outside that, we're also going to use the President's numbers.

But let's run through this. We were just watching Judge CARTER a couple of minutes ago walk through some of the economic impacts of what happens with drilling. I'm going to even touch, through this, on the folklore of, well, let's go tax Big Oil and what it actually produces.

First of all, the slide right next to me, this one we put together just to make it simple and visual. Imagine a country that borrows 42 pennies, 42 pennies out of every dollar we spend. We all know that's not sustainable. We can't do this. You couldn't do it in your family budget. Think of it. Over the last couple of years, it's been tough out there. Your family, my family, we all cinched our belts. The American families got tough and did what was necessary.

What did the Congress do? What did this government do? What did Washington, D.C., do? They just kept spending. But the way they spent is they found people who were willing to buy U.S. sovereign debt, and they kept borrowing. And today we now borrow 42 cents out of every dollar.

Now, why is that so terrifying? Well, it's terrifying because you start to realize the speed the debt is growing, and then you start to understand some of the other drivers in that debt.

One of the things that happened January 1 this year, you know, what was the big change? Baby boomers. Every 8 seconds, someone turns 65 in this country for the next 18 years. So think of that. Ten thousand a day for the next 18 years.

That's why you see many of us around here saying we need to tell the truth how devastatingly ugly these numbers are, and that if we step up and deal with it now, we can fix it. But you can't deal with it with a bunch of silly rhetoric.

So let's walk through some more of these slides.

Right here is the 2010, and you see this blue. The blue is, we'll call it mandatory spending, entitlements, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, inter-

est on the debt. But look, when you step up, when you step up to what is functionally four budget years from now, because we just did the 2012 budget, looking at 2016, you start to realize the growth in the spending, the growth in the entitlements. One of the things that keeps not being shared with the American people is, when you look at our 2010, and the 2011 number here would be out a little bit further, we don't take in enough revenue today to even cover the mandatory spending. If you see our revenue line, it cuts through right about here.

So think of that. Every dime of defense is borrowed. Every single dime of discretionary is borrowed. And we're about \$100 billion short on even covering the entitlements, the mandatory spending. We borrow a little piece of those dollars that go into the entitlements, and it continues to explode in the future years.

I know these are a lot of slides, but when we get down to the ending part, I think you're going to find some of them sort of fun. But we first have to walk through sort of an understanding of the pie chart.

This is 2010. 2010, the mandatory spending was sitting about 63 percent, 62 percent of all the spending in government. Defense Department, other discretionary. And when I said "all the spending in government," understand things like Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac aren't even part of this. They're off the books on this.

Now, when you look at this line here, that blue, look how fast it starts to move up. In 2016, it goes from here, where we're about 63 percent, and now we hit 72 percent. Think of that.

We just did what? The 2012 budget. 2016, four budget cycles from now, the mandatory spending, the entitlements are consuming 72 percent of our budget. The amazing thing is, in that cycle, the money that is going to discretionary, actually, we predict to go down in those 4 years.

So you start to understand the mandatory is consuming what we are. You get folks who start to raise their hands at some of the town halls and say, well, why not just raise the marginal tax rates? Let's go out and tax everyone a little bit more.

There's some fascinating math on that, and we've got 60 years of history looking at it. This is one of my favorite charts. For someone that wants to follow this, you can actually go—and I have a tough last name—it's Schweikert.house.gov. You'll see these charts on there.

This is when we had very high marginal tax rates back in the forties, fifties, early sixties, very high marginal tax rates. Over here is where we have very low marginal tax rates. And there's this normalizing effect. There's actually a couple of Ph.D.s who've written very detailed papers on this normalizing effect. Or even during times of very high marginal tax rates and very low marginal tax rates, guess

what happens? We take in about 18.2 percent of gross domestic product.

I don't know. Maybe in the math out there, maybe in the logic out there, maybe in the human nature there, when you tax people a lot, they find other ways to take their income. Maybe when you tax them low, they are willing to work more hours. But somehow, high marginal tax rates, low marginal tax rates, we basically take in the same percentage of gross domestic product, of GDP. It hits that 18.2 percent.

So when folks look at you in the eye and say, oh, just raise marginal tax rates—we're going to tax the rich more; we're going to tax everyone more—it doesn't do it. It doesn't take care of this massive debt that is consuming us as a people.

What you have to do is you have to grow that line, which is the size of the economy. You must grow this economy. Because as you start to look through these numbers, you come to the realization, yeah, we have a huge spending problem. But we can never cut enough. We have to grow, because it's two sides of this pendulum, and both of them have to be in motion. We have to grow, we have to cut the spending, and we have to deal with the reality that the mandatory spending, the entitlements, are eating us alive.

□ 2130

Let's actually start to walk on some of what I would like to refer to as political folklore.

When we hold many of our town halls back in my district, and I am blessed to represent Arizona's Fifth District. It is an amazingly wonderful place. It is Scottsdale and Tempe, Fountain Hills, Ahwatukee, and Mesa, and we will often get hands that will pop up in the back of the room and say, "Mr. SCHWEIKERT, or DAVID, why don't we do this. If we go out there and tax Big Oil, we could balance the budget. Right?"

They mean well. I believe the participants at our town halls really mean well when they raise that hand, because they have seen members of this body tell them that, and they haven't been told the truth.

When you look at the numbers, here is 2011, hard dollars. You can call them subsidies, you can call them depletion allowances, you can call them incentives to drill and produce more petroleum products, but the gray here is fossil fuels. And just for comparison, we also put the \$8.72 billion of the subsidies that go into green energy. But for the fun of it, let's just talk about this part right here, the \$2.44 billion that is in 2011.

Well, think about this. If you are borrowing about \$4.7 billion every single day, how can a Member of Congress look in the camera, look at you, and say, "Well, if we would just tax Big Oil more, maybe that would help solve the debt problem?" It doesn't even make a drop in the bucket.

We can have a little fun with this, because I have been trying to find a way

to talk about big numbers. I was blessed in my previous life; I lived in a world of big numbers. But how do you visualize \$1 trillion? How do you visualize \$1 billion? How do you visualize \$1 million for many people? So we have been playing with the idea of, Let's make it time.

So your government right now is borrowing about \$4.7 billion every single day, every single day. So let's just think about it, \$4.7 billion every single day. Those taxes on Big Oil—let's make it this. Let's make it taxes on all. Let's just remove those depletion allowances, those tax credits, which are also tied to depreciation that all other businesses get. But let's just wipe them all out. Guess what it buys you? It buys you about 2.2 minutes of borrowing a day.

Now, how many of you feel like you have been told that?

You know, once again, we are engaging often around this place in political theater instead of math. That's been one of my greatest frustrations in my short time here: I wish I saw more Members carrying around their financial calculators so they could look the American people in the eye and tell them the truth.

But think about that. The whole, we will call it, fossil fuels subsidies, tax credits, depreciation allowances, incentives to drill would buy you about 2.2 minutes a day. Oh, come on. And that's just assuming that every dollar came in, and you didn't slow the economy down and didn't slow energy drilling down or energy production down. So this is just throwing your hands up and saying, let's just pretend for a moment that we got rid of those, and it becomes pure income.

Let's actually go to the next level, because there's always that other person that raises their hands and says, "Well, DAVID, I have heard that if we would go out and we would tax the rich more." Remember, that lame duck Congress last December extended what a lot of folks call the Bush tax cuts. Now, around here we often call them the Bush-Obama tax cuts because President Obama is the one who signed them in December. But they extended those tax cuts. And weren't those tax cuts for the rich, and wouldn't that balance the budget?

Well, back to that small problem called math. Let's pretend for a moment that they hadn't happened, and let's pretend that it didn't slow down the economy, and let's pretend every dime that some folks have predicted came in. A lot of this place operates in a fantasy world. Why can't we? So we never had the tax extensions that happened in December. What would it buy you? Well, we once again borrow \$4.7 billion every single day. It would buy you about 28 minutes. Think of that, 28 minutes.

So now I'm at my town hall. I've had two hands go up. The first one saying, "Well, DAVID, if we would tax Big Oil, then that would balance the budget."

Well, what did we learn on the last slide? That was about 2.2 minutes of borrowing every day.

And then the other hand goes up saying, "If we would tax the rich more." As a matter of fact, why don't we do in this slide that tax extenders never happened, so everyone, rich, poor, middle class didn't get the benefit of that extension of the tax cuts last December? Well, guess what. That buys you 28 minutes.

So think about it. We are doing really well here. We are up to 28 minutes plus 2.2 minutes. So now, let's see, what if we do this, because there's always the other hand that goes up and says, "DAVID, I bet you we could balance the budget and wouldn't have this debt and deficit if we did this: We tax Big Oil. And those Bush-Obama tax extenders that happened last December in the lame duck session, we never had that, because those help the rich. Oh, and by the way, if we had never had the wars, you know, if we didn't have Afghanistan, if we didn't have Iraq—and I believe actually in our number here it didn't even have Libya—we could balance the budget then. Couldn't we?"

So we actually, literally a couple hours ago, sat down and said, Let's add it up, and let's make it on a per hour basis so the American people can understand the crazy spending that's going on around this place and how fast the numbers are eroding on us.

Back again to our math: We borrow \$4.7 billion every single day. And let's go back to our pretend world. Every dime of those oil subsidies and depreciation allowances and tax credits come in, and it doesn't actually slow down jobs or the economy and every dime of those taxes were to come in. Even though probably if you did that, you would slow down the economy and people would work less and you would have less dollars. But we are living in our fantasy world here. And because we didn't have the wars, none of that money would be going out the door, even though certain portions of that are actually already built into the defense budget. But every dime that is equated to Iraq, Afghanistan, and now Libya.

What would it buy us? Well, we are borrowing that \$4.7 billion a day. Guess what? It buys you 3 hours of borrowing.

Think about what you have heard around here, and how many people you have seen walk up in front of a microphone and a camera look you in the eye and say, "Well, if we did these things, we wouldn't have this debt?" They are not telling you the truth. All those together are only 3 hours of borrowing.

And, let's see. If I remember correctly, there's like, what, 24 hours in a day? I'm looking for some honest discussion about the other 21 hours a day. You've got to go back to those first boards that I put up and have an honest discussion about entitlements, about the mandatory spending, because they are what are exploding on us.

They are what are consuming us as a people.

We can do this. We can save the future for our kids and our grandkids. We can make sure that these programs exist. But we have to do it rationally, and we have to for once do it honestly, fact-based, maybe someone actually holding a calculator. Because the rhetoric around here, the political folklore around here, when they are willing to look you in the eyes and base their whole world on something that only buys you 3 hours of borrowing a day, you are not being told the truth.

We try to add literally two to four slides a week. We are engaging in a little project. We are a freshman office, but we have some very smart young people who are very good with their calculators, and we are trying very hard to find a way to make these gigantic numbers digestible so we can all understand them so we can have a rational conversation of how we save our country.

If you will go to Schweikert.house.gov, you are going to find a number of these slides. As a matter of fact, all of them are on there, and every week, I promise you, there are going to be more coming. And maybe if we all start to tell each other the truth about the math, we can actually tell the truth about how we are going to save the country.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1480. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Etoxazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0063; FRL-8867-5] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1481. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Escherichia coli* O157:H7

Specific Bacteriophages; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0274; FRL-88668-4] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1482. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Agency, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glyphosate (N-(phosphonomethyl)glycine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0988; FRL-88666-8] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1483. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's "Major" final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulations Z; Docket No. R-1393] (RIN No.: 7100-AD55) received April 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1484. A letter from the Director, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updating Regulations Issued Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (RIN: 1215-AB13, 1235-AA00) received April 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1485. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; Federal Funding for Medicaid Eligibility Determination and Enrollment Activities [CMS-2346-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ53) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1486. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List; Deletion of the Speigelberg Landfill Superfund Site [EPA-HQ-SFUND-1983-0002; FRL-9291-6] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1487. 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; Indiana; Stage I Vapor Recovery Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0545; FRL 9295-1] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1488. 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; Indiana; [EPA-R05-OAR-2010-0998; FRL-9295-3] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1489. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R04-OAR-2006-0130-201111(a); FRL-9293-4] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1490. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0743; FRL-9279-1] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1491. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0139; FRL-9292-9] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1492. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0909; FRL-9294-9] received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1493. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program [CG Docket No.: 10-51] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1494. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Decatur, Illinois) [MB Docket No.: 10-264] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1495. A letter from the Deputy Chief, CGB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010, Section 105, Relay Services for the Deaf-Blind Individuals [CG Docket No.: 10-210] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1496. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Improving Public Safety Communications in the 800 MHz Band New 800 MHz Band Plan for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands [WT Docket 02-55] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1497. A letter from the Assistant Chief, Broadband Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Fixed and Mobile Services in the Mobile Satellite Service Bands at 1525-1559 MHz and 1626.5-1660.5 MHz, 1610-1626.5 MHz and 2483.5-2500 MHz, and 2000-2020 MHz and 2180-2200 MHz [ET Docket No.: 10-142] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1498. A letter from the Division Chief, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of the Emergency Alert System [EB Docket No.: 04-296] received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1499. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of Additional Changes from the Annual Review of the Entity List; Removal of Person Based on Removal Request [Docket No.: 110222154-1181-01] (RIN: 0694-AF13) received April 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1500. A letter from the Financial Assistance Program Manager, Office of Acquisition and Property Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's

final rule — Department of the Interior Implementation of OMB Guidance on Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (RIN: 1093-AA12) received April 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1501. A letter from the General Counsel, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conferences's final rule — Disclosure of Records or Information received April 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reorganization of Regulations on Control of Employment of Aliens [EOIR No. 166F; AG Order No. 3260-2011] (RIN: 1125-AA64) received April 10, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1503. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Krewe of Charleston Mardi Gras Boat Parade, Charleston Harbor, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1151] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1504. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ninth Coast Guard District Sector Realignment; Northern Lake Michigan and Lake Huron [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0929] (RIN: 1625-ZA29) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1505. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Havasu Landing Regatta, Colorado River, Lake Havasu Landing, California [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1506. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Duluth Ship Canal, Duluth-Superior Harbor, MN [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1030] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1507. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Cruise Ships, Port of San Diego, California [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0038] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1508. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Mavericks Surf Competition, Half Moon Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2010-1093] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1509. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Patriot Challenge Kayak Race, Ashley River, Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0039] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1510. A letter from the Commander, US Coast Guard, Deputy CG-0943, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Great Lakes Pilotage: 2011 Annual Review and Adjustment

[Docket No.: USCG-2010-0517] (RIN: 1625-AB48) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1511. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Events in Northern New England [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0110] (RIN: 1625-AA08; AA00) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1512. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Hydroplane Races within the Captain of the Port Puget Sound Area of Responsibility [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0996] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1513. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Dredging Operations; Delaware River, Marcus Hook, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0127] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1514. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Miami International Triathlon, Bayfront Park, Miami, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1515. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Hudson River South of the Troy Locks, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0794] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1516. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Buffalo Bayou, mile 4.3, Houston, Harris County, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0100] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1517. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflatable Personal Flotation Devices [USCG-2011-0076] (RIN: 1625-AB60) received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1518. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — General Regulations Governing U.S. Securities; Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds (Department of the Treasury Circular, Public Debt Series No. 1-93); Regulations Governing Book-Entry Treasury Bonds, Notes and Bonds Held in Treasury/Reserve Automated Debt Entry System (TRADES) and Legacy Treasury Direct; Regulations Governing Securities Held in TreasuryDirect received April 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1519. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System — Update for Rate Year

Beginning July 1, 2011 (RY 2012) [CMS-1346-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ23) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1520. A letter from the Regulation Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Value-Based Purchasing Program [CMS-3239-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ55) received May 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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. REED: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 257. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that each 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program offer leasing in the areas with the most prospective oil and gas resources, to establish a domestic oil and natural gas production goal, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-74). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRAVAACK (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 1801. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for expedited security screenings for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for the furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 1803. A bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to improve truck parking facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1804. A bill to prohibit discrimination in State taxation of multichannel video programming distribution services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1805. A bill to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 1806. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that Bluefin tuna may not be treated as an endangered species or threatened species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1807. A bill to provide for the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and acquisition of refined petroleum product, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALTMIRE (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1808. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs to develop and demonstrate 2 small modular nuclear reactor designs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1809. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to ensure health care coverage value and transparency for dental benefits under group health plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1810. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to encourage research and carry out an educational campaign with respect to pulmonary hypertension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1811. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1812. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to establish a small business growth pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax benefits to large oil companies and distribute the amounts raised to licensed drivers in order to provide relief from high gas prices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 1814. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny certain tax benefits to persons responsible for an oil spill if such person commits certain additional violations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEST, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1815. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lena Horne in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 1816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 1817. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for the development of State statistical literacy plans and to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants for statistics-related teacher professional development and the improvement of statistics education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 1818. A bill to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 1819. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for State management of population segments of gray wolves in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1820. A bill to fight criminal gangs; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLATTS (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 1821. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 1822. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for appropriate procedures under such title for verification of citizenship status; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1823. A bill to modernize, shorten, and simplify the Federal criminal code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1824. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to make modifications with respect to the board of directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.J. Res. 57. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing the States to call a limited convention solely for the purposes of considering whether to propose a specific amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. LONG):

H. Res. 255. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that

effective sharing of passenger information from inbound international flight manifests is a crucial component of our national security and that the Department of Homeland Security must maintain the information sharing standards required under the 2007 Passenger Name Record Agreement between the United States and the European Union; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H. Res. 256. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of May 8, 2011, through May 14, 2011, as Williams Syndrome Awareness Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 258. A resolution honoring and supporting women in the Middle East and North Africa for their bravery and leadership and calling on the United States Government and the international community to recognize their vital role in democracy movements and promote the rights and empowerment of women and girls in the region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Res. 259. A resolution recognizing Chief Master Sergeant Donald G. Robinson, Jr., for his service in the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H. Res. 260. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H. Res. 261. A resolution expressing commitment to the objectives of the Program of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 262. A resolution supporting efforts to raise awareness, improve education, and encourage research and treatment of the psychosocial needs of children, adolescents, and young adults diagnosed with a childhood cancer and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. CRAVAACK:

H.R. 1801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1804.

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, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 1806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution which allows the Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 1808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

And

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 1811.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:
H.R. 1813.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 1815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 in Article 1 relating to the general welfare of the United States and Clause 3 of Section 8 in Article 1 relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and as further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 1817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. McKEON:

H.R. 1818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 1819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this legislation is found in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 1821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce) and clause 18 (relating to laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution of the foregoing powers).

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 1822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1823.

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, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Eighth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1824.

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 regulate interstate commerce, as found in Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 57.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. LANDRY.

H.R. 23: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 27: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 44: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 49: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 50: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 85: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 104: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 139: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRUJALVA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WU, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FARR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. CHU, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHAY, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 140: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 142: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 178: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 186: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 190: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 191: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 198: Ms. MOORE and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

H.R. 238: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 328: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 365: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 420: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 422: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 432: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 440: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 452: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LANDRY, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 457: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 459: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 466: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 511: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 530: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 567: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 575: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 589: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 607: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 613: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 631: Mr. RUSH, Mr. MORAN, Ms. CHU, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 640: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 674: Mr. ISSA, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 676: Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 679: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 683: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 689: Mr. INSLER.

H.R. 704: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 718: Mr. BARROW, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 721: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 743: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 749: Mr. INSCRELL.

H.R. 750: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 780: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 798: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 802: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 812: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 820: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 822: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 831: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 835: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 838: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 854: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 870: Ms. MOORE and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 876: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 883: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 894: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 905: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 938: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 941: Mr. CRITZ, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 942: Mr. TIBERI and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 959: Mr. BENISHEK.

- H.R. 965: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 972: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 987: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 990: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 991: Mr. BOREN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
H.R. 992: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 999: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1000: Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 1002: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WEST, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 1004: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1016: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1017: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1031: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1041: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 1044: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1048: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1057: Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1058: Mr. PETERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1074: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1085: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1089: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1106: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1149: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1159: Mr. PAUL, Mr. HALL, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1161: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 1187: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1206: Mr. TERRY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1259: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1262: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1278: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1284: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1338: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1340: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1342: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1351: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WU, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1386: Mr. TERRY, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1388: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1391: Mr. BERG, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1397: Mr. KIND and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1399: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1402: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1406: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1407: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1412: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1418: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1419: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1421: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1425: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1426: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1439: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1444: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1466: Mr. BACA and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1475: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1477: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1484: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1498: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 1500: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1515: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MORAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1530: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1533: Mr. GRIMM, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1538: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1547: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1558: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1571: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1574: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WU, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1579: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. POLIS, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1585: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1587: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1588: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1591: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1609: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. REED, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1619: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1620: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 1621: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ISSA, and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1637: Mr. QUAYLE.
H.R. 1639: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1649: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1681: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1683: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 1686: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1689: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1700: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1705: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1715: Mr. LONG and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1716: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1723: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 1735: Mr. OLVER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1744: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1748: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1755: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1774: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1775: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1788: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1791: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MICA.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. RIVERA and Mr. STIVERS.
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 20: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Res. 25: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. TIPTON.
H. Res. 111: Mr. OLVER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. BUERKLE.
H. Res. 137: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KIND, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 157: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. OLVER.
H. Res. 165: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 177: Mr. MORAN and Ms. LEE of California.
H. Res. 198: Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 227: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. UPTON.
H. Res. 228: Mr. LONG and Ms. JENKINS.
H. Res. 234: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 239: Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 241: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 244: Mr. WEINER and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H. Res. 254: Mr. LAMBORN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HASTINGS of Washington or a designee, to H.R. 1231, the Reversing President Obama's offshore Moratorium Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1380: Mr. PEARCE.