

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1613, OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2231, OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2410, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 20, 2013, THROUGH JULY 5, 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1613) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Grayson of Florida or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee

on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-16. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2410) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: section 717; section 718; the words "or any other" on page 64, line 13; the words "or any other" on page 65, line 9; and section 740. Where points of order are waived against part of a section, points of order against a provision in another part of such section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire section. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from June 29, 2013, through July 5, 2013—

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

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

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 6. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

SEC. 7. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 6 p.m. on Wednesday, July 3, 2013, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014.

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

□ 1240

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to our good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who I certainly hope is feeling better than the way he's walking today, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act of 2013, as well as H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, and makes several specific amendments in order to each bill which are germane and compliant with the rules of the House. This proposed rule also provides for an open rule for consideration of H.R. 2410, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies bill.

These energy bills, if enacted, will help foster responsible development of our abundant offshore domestic energy resources and will do so in an environmentally responsible manner. H.R. 2231 would help reverse some of the current administration's energy policies, which are stalling responsible offshore lease development on the Outer Continental Shelf. This legislation would require that the administration implement a new 5-year leasing plan, including 50 percent of the areas that have been previously identified as the most promising in oil reserves and natural gas.

The average American consumer has seen their energy bill double since this

administration started. A gallon of gas was under \$2 when the President was first sworn in. It's now routinely more than \$4 a gallon—and continues to climb. And yet the administration deliberately stalls and blocks job-creating, energy-producing projects like the Keystone pipeline for the responsible development of coal and tar sands reserves we have on our public lands, including in my own State. This actually hits the middle class and the poor class the worst.

H.R. 2231 will streamline the current bureaucracy handling these leases and will also implement a fair and equitable revenue-sharing plan for coastal States. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that passage of this bill will reduce net direct spending of the Federal Government by \$1.5 billion over the next 10 years. So, in essence, you have a bill that makes us more energy independent, drives down the cost of fuel for U.S. families, helps reduce the cost of the Federal Government, and produces an estimated 1.2 million jobs. I think, by most standards, that would be considered a fairly good bill.

Likewise, the other bill in the rule, H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, will provide for improved Federal management and oversight of energy resources which straddle international boundaries. Passage of this act will implement an agreement we already have with the Government of Mexico on how to handle development of these resources, including revenue-sharing concepts, as well as ensuring that the United States companies that are investing will develop their resources but not be imperiled by actions that may be taken later on by the Government.

Finally, the resolution also provides for a modified open rule for consideration of H.R. 2410, the fiscal year 2014 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bill, which continues what was common when I first arrived here and then stopped but was then reinstated and continues to be reinstated by Chairman PETE SESSIONS—having open rules on our appropriations bills.

I'm appreciative of the Rules Committee chairman's leadership in this regard. I'm also appreciative of the hard work and dedication of the bill's sponsors. First, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Washington, also chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee (Mr. HASTINGS), as well as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), for his leadership on the Agriculture appropriation bill. In short, this is a fair and good rule dealing with good pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, these are good bills. I urge their adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Utah, my friend (Mr. BISHOP), for yielding the customary 30 minutes to me.

This rule provides for the consideration of three bills, as enunciated by my friend from Utah. However, the only thing that these bills have in common is that they're overwhelmingly partisan in nature and fail to address the most pressing challenges facing our country. Bottom line: we should be doing all that we can to help struggling Americans get back on their feet.

The first bill, H.R. 1613, had been relatively noncontroversial and could have been addressed under suspension. But instead, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to take the partisan route by including a provision that waives the Securities and Exchange Commission natural resources extraction disclosure rule of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, which requires the disclosure of payments from oil and gas companies to foreign governments. I just simply don't understand why this poison pill was added.

Similarly, H.R. 2231 opens up new, unsafe drilling off the coasts of 14 States at a time when domestic energy production is booming. Furthermore, the bill does virtually nothing—and I asked that question of our colleague, Mr. DUNCAN from South Carolina—to implement key safety reforms in the wake of the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster and constrains the statutory review process for offshore drilling.

This is a part of the Republicans' "drill, baby, drill" energy policy agenda. While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to bring bills like this to the floor which contain huge giveaways to Big Oil, it is clear that they're not interested in doing a thing to protect worker safety, the environment, or the tourism and fishing industries. It is astounding that Congress would move forward to open new natural gas and oil leases when this institution has not acted on the recommendation to improve the safety of offshore drilling. If we didn't learn anything at all from BP, we're not ever going to learn anything. The successor to the BP spill commission recently gave Congress a D-plus grade on its legislative response to the spill.

Before opening any new leases, we should enact legislation to improve safety and eliminate or adjust the liability caps upward. We have a pitiable liability cap now of \$75 million.

It is time to get real about energy policy. We need to invest in the development of renewable resources, which would reduce our impact on climate change and move us towards true energy independence. These two bills today aren't about gas prices or job creation. They're about bolstering the Republicans' political base and lining the pockets of Big Oil and gas CEOs.

Republicans' refusal to address the sequester and insistence upon limited cuts in the Homeland Security, MilCon/VA, and DOD appropriations bills leave all the other nondefense measures like H.R. 2410 before us today with inad-

equated funding levels. The refusal by my friends on the other side to appoint conferees to reach a bipartisan compromise on the budget and end the sequester has left us with this disastrous agriculture bill that we saw last week. As my Republican colleagues very well know, there are \$214 million in cuts to Women, Infants, and Children, or WIC, funding, which will prevent 214,000 eligible applicants from receiving the nutrition they need.

□ 1250

Furthermore, there are \$284 million in cuts to Food for Peace that will result in 7.4 million fewer people receiving food aid from the United States. Mr. Speaker, I'd really laugh, except the prioritization of partisanship and politics over responsibility has become par for the course in the Republican-controlled Congress.

As I pointed out before, just last week the Republican partisan farm bill was scuttled. Traditionally—I'm here now 21 years, and that bill, at times that it was brought appropriately, was a bipartisan piece of legislation. Draconian cuts and work requirements imposed upon programs that benefit the poorest among us effectively killed any chance of the FARRM Bill passing. Rather than see passage of a strong, bipartisan bill, Republicans deliberately made it unpalatable to even strong agriculture supporters like myself. These are not the priorities of a Nation that cares about its poor. These are the priorities of a Republican Party that cares only about itself.

The poor are not villains. Many are trapped in inescapable situations due to circumstances totally beyond their control and largely, in many instances, by our making here in this institution. Mr. Speaker, it's hard to pull yourself up by your bootstraps when those bootstraps, without any nourishment, may be the only thing you have to eat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the author of one of the bills in here, as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation covered by the rule.

Mr. Speaker, in our country today, millions of Americans continue to search for work, the national average price of gasoline is \$3.50, and rising costs of everything from electricity to food to health care makes it tough for families and small businesses to make ends meet. But instead of providing relief for struggling Americans, President Obama yesterday announced a plan that will inflict further pain and cause further damage to our struggling economy.

The President's latest attempt to unilaterally impose a national energy tax will cost American jobs and will increase energy prices. Now, in stark

contrast to that, Mr. Speaker, Republicans are advancing solutions to expand access to affordable energy in order to create jobs and to lower energy costs. The bills the House is considering this week are necessary because of the Obama administration's persistent and destructive attacks on American energy production. The President's latest efforts to impose new energy taxes and government red tape follow 4.5 years of erecting American energy roadblocks.

H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, will unlock our offshore energy resources that are being held captive by this administration. The differences are clear between the President's current no-new-drilling-and-no-new-jobs plan and the Republican pro-energy, pro-jobs offshore drilling plan. The President's 5-year current offshore leasing plan keeps 85 percent of offshore areas under lock and key—Mr. Speaker, keeps 85 percent under lock and key—effectively reinstating the moratoria that were lifted right before he took office.

The Republican drill-smart plan would open new areas containing the most oil and natural gas resources, allowing for new energy production in parts of the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. The President's plan refuses even to let Virginia develop its offshore resources until after 2017 and cancels a lease sale that would have allowed them to go offshore 2 years ago.

The Republican plan supports the bipartisan wishes of the Virginia Governor, the congressional delegation, and the public by requiring an offshore lease sale to be held.

The President's plan suppresses American job creation and economic growth. Our plan, Mr. Speaker, in contrast, would create 1.2 million jobs long term and would generate \$1.5 billion in new revenue. This Republican approach is exactly what our country and our economy needs right now.

We can do better than what the President outlined yesterday that stifles American energy production and raises energy costs.

I urge adoption of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would say to my very good friend and namesake, if you can do better, do it.

I'm very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) with whom I serve on the Rules Committee.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week, the FARRM Bill failed. It failed in large part because of Republicans' nasty attacks on America's nutrition and anti-hunger programs.

Notwithstanding the experience of last week, in this rule the House is considering debating the agriculture appropriations bill, a bill that not only underfunds the WIC program, but actually makes it more difficult for low-income women to receive breastfeeding counseling.

Mr. Speaker, it's as if the Republican leadership hasn't learned from its mistakes. WIC is a critical program that provides food and nutrition counseling for low-income, pregnant and breastfeeding women, as well as for newborns and infants. It is an important and successful program. It is a key program that helps pregnant and breastfeeding women stay healthy through proper nutrition and actually helps prevent many health issues associated with poor nutrition.

Despite the program's 39-year successful track record, the Republicans decided to include WIC in their sequester plan. Unlike SNAP—which, thankfully, was excluded from the sequester and every single major deficit reduction plan—the WIC program was subjected to the sequester. And the FY 2014 agriculture appropriations bill includes a major cut to the WIC program.

The cuts to WIC in this bill could result in over 200,000 pregnant mothers and infants losing access to nutritious food. And tapping into the reserve fund isn't going to cover everyone; 55,000 moms and kids will go without the nutrition that they need.

And WIC is so severely underfunded that the breastfeeding counseling program—a cornerstone of this program—is zeroed out. I guess I shouldn't be surprised that this House of Representatives would promote such anti-women, anti-mother, anti-child legislation. After all, this is the same House that allowed an all-male Republican majority in the Judiciary Committee to write and promote legislation that attacked a woman's right to choose. And by the way, President Obama is threatening a veto of the agriculture appropriations bill in large part because of these draconian cuts. I would say to my Republican friends: stop your assault against poor people in this country.

Now, this agriculture appropriations bill would be bad enough on its own. It would be better if the Appropriations Committee would redraft the bill at pre-sequester funding levels so we're not forced to choose between programs like food safety and WIC, for example.

But what is particularly egregious about this rule that we're considering is what is not included. What's not included is a fix to the upcoming doubling of the student loan interest rates. Congress is going to leave for the 4th of July recess on Friday; yet interest rates are scheduled to double if Congress doesn't act before July 1.

We need an immediate fix to this problem; but instead of working to prevent penalizing millions of students who are looking for help paying for college, the Republican leadership is forcing the House to debate tired, rehashed bills like offshore drilling expansion that have no chance of becoming law. Instead of pushing legislation that helps banks and lenders make even more money, we ought to help the middle class, we ought to help our students.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the comments that were just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts about a program which does fund \$6.7 billion in the WIC program and was passed unanimously by voice vote from both parties in the Appropriations Committee.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the sponsor of one of the bills that is part of this rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I rise today in support of two of the bills that are under this rule, H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, and H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. Both these bills do three things—they provide for jobs; they provide for energy security; and they provide for national security.

Let's put Americans to work harvesting the resources that we have here in this country, and let's meet our energy needs. Because as Admiral Mullen said, there can be no national security without energy security. Let me repeat that: there can be no national security without energy security.

□ 1300

Let's open up these offshore areas that we have resources under and let's produce American energy here at home, putting Americans to work to provide for our energy needs.

I specifically rise to talk about H.R. 1613, which implements the Obama administration's own agreement, an agreement signed in Los Cabos by Secretary Clinton and Foreign Minister Espinosa from Mexico that says: Do you know what? There are resources under that shared boundary out in the Gulf of Mexico, the boundary shared between the United States and the country of Mexico; resources that can be explored and produced to meet our energy needs here at home working with our southern neighbor—Mexico—to share those resources and share the revenues.

Let's do it the right way. Let's do it with the American safety standards and American environmental standards that currently apply to American energy companies producing in the Gulf of Mexico. Let's require those Mexican companies to comply with those standards and then let's share those revenues. This is the right thing.

H.R. 1613 will implement that agreement, but it will do something else. It will remove the uncertainty and provide for American competitiveness when you're competing with foreign countries such as Mexico. This is the right thing for America. Put Americans to work, meet energy needs, and meet our national security needs. That's why House Republicans have focused on an all-of-the-above American energy strategy, and these bills are part of that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill.

The so-called Offshore Energy and Jobs Act is nothing more than another old idea that will not become law. We have voted on a form of this legislation every year since the majority has been in control of this House, yet the same thing happens every time: it goes absolutely nowhere. Instead of working on new, more sustainable energy ideas, we find ourselves here yet again wasting our time on another misguided, destructive, and unnecessary drilling bill.

I'm particularly dismayed that the bill, yet again, expands drilling in areas where voters have unequivocally said they don't want it. The devastating 1969 oil spill in Santa Barbara, California, galvanized our State against any more offshore drilling. That's why California permanently banned new oil and gas leasing in the State waters they control in 1994.

This majority here, which gives lip service to respecting states' rights, has chosen, yet again, to override the will of voters in my district and my State by mandating immediate oil and gas lease sales off the coasts of Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, despite our well-known, long-standing bipartisan opposition.

Later this week, I will be offering an amendment to strike these provisions, and I appreciate the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order. But expansion of drilling in southern California only scratches the surface of what's wrong with this bill. Simply put, it's a solution without a problem.

Drilling, both onshore and offshore, has been expanding rapidly in recent years, and is showing no signs of slowing down. Last year, domestic offshore oil production was higher than it was at the end of the Bush administration. Oil production in the United States increased more last year than at any point since the inception of the oil industry in 1859.

The Obama administration has offered, and continues to offer, millions of acres of public lands offshore for oil and gas exploration and production.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAPPS. Yet, despite this expansion under the Obama administration, nearly 85 percent of the offshore acreage already under lease by the oil industry is not producing. Instead of recycling bad ideas and expanding drilling in areas where voters don't want it, we should be working together on a responsible, clean energy policy for the 21st century. This bill is just more of the same dirty energy policies of the past.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will have a lot to say about the deficiencies to these two bills over the next 2 days. But today the Republicans are purporting two things: lower gas prices and reduce the deficit. They would have us believe this bill would do that. They're saying high gas prices are due to the fact there's not enough offshore oil drilling.

Nothing could be further from the truth. There's actually a glut of oil in the Gulf region. It's all waiting in storage because, oh, the refineries are doing routine maintenance. Why are they doing that? Well, because it's the height of the driving season for the American people, therefore, they can gouge the consumers by pretending, oh, there's just no other time we could clean the refinery. It doesn't have anything to do with oil supplies. It has to do with a lack of refining capacity artificially manipulated and speculation on Wall Street.

Secondly, they say they're addressing the deficit, that this is going to provide additional revenues in the future. In fact, they are so concerned about the deficit they would not allow an amendment I attempted to offer, supported by a number of west coast Members—three Governors of the Western United States—that would have protected the west coast from the mandatory drilling in this bill. They said that might preclude future revenue from future leases that might be let by a future President, and they said we might not get \$1 billion 30 years in the future because of your amendment.

However, there is an amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative CASSIDY, who will mandate a diversion of \$500 million a year of revenues flowing to the Treasury to the Gulf States for the next 30 years. Yes, we are going to forego or give up \$15 billion of revenues to the Treasury, creating \$15 billion more debt and deficit for the American people, but they waived the rules. That doesn't count.

This all kind of reminds me a little bit of George Orwell, the way the Republicans cynically manipulate the rules around here. As he said: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others."

So Republican amendments that create debt and deficit are exempt from the rules, and Democratic amendments to protect the west coast, which does not want this mandatory oil drilling, because it might forego some potential possible future revenues, are not made in order. This is not for real. This is not an honest process.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to realize how the GAO's and the OMB's facts are not inaccurate and also how rules that were waived for this bill have been waived for the same reason in prior pieces of legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule that would allow the House to hold a vote on the Student Loan Relief Act. If Congress doesn't act by July 1, undergraduate students in this Nation, all over this Nation, will see a hike in their student loan interest rates.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the remarks by the gentleman from Florida that we would have an opportunity to vote on the student loan bill to make sure that we don't do what millions of American students and their families have asked us not to do, and that is, they don't want us to double their debt. But in less than 100 hours if we don't get the vote that Mr. HASTINGS is talking about, in less than 100 hours, millions of American college students may see their student debt increase because of the Republican obstructionism. It's unfortunate that it's come to this. This issue shouldn't be partisan. It's about doing the right thing on behalf of millions of students and their families all across the country.

It's a simple choice. We can help students achieve an education, one that they can afford, and the skills that they need to be successful, or we can put more hurdles in their way and increase the already skyrocketing debt burden that students absorb as they graduate from college.

□ 1310

It has been more than a year of ignoring this issue. A year ago, we were in this position, and a year ago, we voted to keep the student loan rate at 3.75 percent. Nothing has been done until recently, and then the Republicans came up with an idea that was really bad. It was worse than doubling the interest rates on July 1. It was more expensive to the students than doubling the interest rates. It's not a smart solution. It's a terrible solution—it's terrible for students; it's terrible for their families.

After a year of ignoring this issue, the Republicans foisted this harmful idea onto the House floor, and when the Republican bill hit the floor, they refused to allow a vote on a rational plan, like the Courtney bill, that stops this doubling of the interest rates and allows this Congress to examine and develop a long-term solution as part of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

Despite trumpeting that their plan was the same as President Obama's proposal, when the Democrats offered President Obama's actual plan, they blocked that vote, too. So they won't keep the interest rates from doubling,

and they won't do a plan that they said is just like theirs. On July 1, those interest rates are going to double on millions of students as they start this school year in August and September.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. The time for obstruction has passed. It's time to keep the rates low and to work on a long-term solution. It's time to stop asking college students and their families to bear an unfair burden of paying down the Bush deficits.

The Democrats have chosen to stand with the students and families who are trying to access the American Dream. We can do this. Millions of families and students have asked us: don't double their debt. Yet, on July 1, because of the Republican obstructionism, that's what's going to happen to these students. It's very unfortunate. It adds an additional \$1,000 to the 4 years of college. We should not do that at this time, in this economy, for these students and families.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself 1 minute.

I appreciate what has been said even though it has very little to do with the bills that we will be discussing in these next couple of weeks.

Especially as a former teacher, I understand significantly what it does to student loans and situations. I understand significantly how now 5 years ago Congress passed legislation that cut out the FFEL Program, which actually helped kids in their being able to afford their college workability. We consolidated all of our efforts with a program, an idea, from the 1980s, which was a bad idea then and is a bad idea now.

Unfortunately, this House has dealt with this issue. On May 23 of this year, we passed a bill that solves this problem, and we sent it over to the Senate. For some reason, I feel uncomfortable or at least tired of being held accountable for the Senate's inability to actually deal with legislation sent to them that solves problems and then have to take the responsibility back here. The House has dealt with this issue, and we did it in a responsible, reasonable way. The Senate has refused to.

So often what we have found as gridlock here is not necessarily between Republicans and Democrats as we pass a whole lot of bipartisan bills on this floor. It's between the Senate and the House. I wish it were different and that we could compel the Senate to act responsibly, but the Senate has not and the House has.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I do appreciate the gentleman for yielding to me.

I rise to actually speak about an issue that I think we should be addressing today and at this very moment.

With student loan interest rates set to rise in only 5 short days, the time to act is now. It is unacceptable that we have not yet brought up a bill for a vote that can be passed by both Chambers and signed into law.

With tuition rising rapidly and with far too many families and students struggling to make ends meet, middle class families are finding it more and more difficult to pay for college. When I'm home each weekend in Iowa, I hear from countless students and parents who cannot understand why we can't seem to get this done.

This should not be a partisan issue. We need to address student loan debt in the interest of our economy. We must prepare our students for the kind of good-paying middle class jobs that will drive our economy forward, and we must do so in a way that does not saddle them with a lifetime of debt, which prevents them from fully participating in the economy.

I could not have gone to college and would not be where I am today without low-interest student loans and other financial assistance programs that were available to me. It's critical that we get this done now. I am willing to stay here and work until we get this done. We cannot allow the House to recess and leave our students in the dust to face this rate hike.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a friend of mine, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the chart next to me clearly states, we are now 4 days and counting until, by law, the interest rate for the subsidized Stafford student loan program will double—from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The real chart should probably be 3 days because that's how many legislative days the House and the Senate are in session. Incredibly, we are debating issues which hardly have the same time sensitivity and which clearly are tone deaf to what American families all over the country are really concerned about.

There are 7.5 million college students who use the subsidized Stafford student loan program. They are going to see their rates double. The total gross cost in terms of added interest is about \$4 billion. This is at a time when student loan debt is \$1.1 trillion—higher than credit card debt, higher than car loan debt. Incredibly, this deadline is just being completely ignored by the majority despite the fact that millions of students are making life decisions as we speak as they begin to enroll for next fall's semester.

The bill which the House majority passed on May 23 is a bill which tied rates on a variable basis to Treasury notes, which, by the way, have been

going up like crazy over the last 3 weeks and which the Congressional Budget Office has now analyzed and told us will result in debt costs that will be worse than if Congress did nothing and allowed the rates to double to 6.8 percent.

The solution is obvious. Extend the lower rate, 3.4 percent. My bill, H.R. 1595, which is the subject of the previous question, has 195 signatories for a discharge petition. A substantial group of Members in the House is ready and poised to move. It did get 51 votes in the Senate. It did actually move in the Senate, and the President has said he will sign it. If there is any path forward for those 7.5 million students, it's H.R. 1595. Let's do it. Let's act. Let's turn this countdown clock off. Let's help America's young students afford and pay for a critical need for their future—higher education.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inform my colleague from Utah that I have no further requests for time, and I would ask whether or not he has additional speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Other than brilliant verbiage from myself, you've got it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am looking forward to the brilliant verbiage.

Following on from the previous discussion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment, which has been discussed, in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I am tempted to take the 8½ minutes and, perhaps, not offer as much brilliant verbiage but at least add, without hyperbole, the continuing concern that all of us should have.

I agree with my friend from Utah when he points to the fact that there has been legislation that has come out of the House of Representatives, regardless of who was in the majority, and that it has gone over to the other body and nothing has transpired. But when the American people look at Congress, they are not looking just at the House of Representatives or just at the United States Senate—it is all of us—and it is our responsibility here in the House, particularly as the body that has the Ways and Means Committee, which generates the financial circumstances of this country that ultimately is voted on.

□ 1320

It's our responsibility, in my judgment, to undertake to answer one simple question regarding this loan thing:

Why is it that college students are going to be required to have loan obligations that raise their loans from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent when Bank X and Bank Y can borrow money from each other for little or nothing at all? That does not make any sense.

We can't do these children this way in this country, and we have an absolute responsibility to all of them to give them the opportunities that many of us had. People here in this House that have come here by way of student loans and some of them have had those opportunities, why not give these children that chance?

Mr. Speaker, the most common critiques of this Congress have been bipartisanship and dysfunction. This rule today for these three bills shows that the Speaker and majority leader are perfectly content with that characterization of their work. Congress doesn't have to be this way.

It isn't always like this. It wasn't like this when I came here in 1992. It was not like this for the greater portion of a decade after I came here in 1992. Instead of appointing budget conferees, instead of passing a farm bill in a bipartisan way, instead of fixing the pending student loan interest rate, instead of replacing the sequester that has been monstrosity all over this Nation hindering our economic recovery and instead of preventing us from yet another game of chicken, which we will be doing sometime in the fall over the debt ceiling, we're considering three purely political bills that will only create more partisanship among us and might, I add, ain't going nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, Congress can and must do better.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the opportunity of being part of a debate that covered a smorgasbord of ideas. Let me just respond to several of those that have been presented in the last lead-up to the vote on this particular amendment.

As I said before, I'm a teacher. I care greatly about education. I'm especially frustrated with the way Congress has passed or handled the student loan provision.

Several years ago, while the Democrats were in control—I'm trying not to be too partisan, but they were in control—we changed the law that dealt with student loans to consolidate that authority within the Federal Government. By doing so, we crushed private-State partnership plans that were an excellent avenue for loans that students could use. They could get breaks depending on their repayment habits. It was a marvelous program, but it was stopped in an effort to try to consolidate everything here within Congress. Since that time, we have played silly games of brinksmanship that deal with what the rate should be and what the rate might be.

We have a bill that this body passed on May 23 in plenty of time to extinguish this issue, plenty of time for the Senate to debate it, amend it, send it back to us, appoint the conference, go through regular process, if the Senate wished to do that. Instead, the result is the Senate has basically turned their back on the issue and said, We'll let it go over the cliff one more time.

You see, it shouldn't have been that way. If we had not changed the policy back when we passed a bill in the previous leadership of this House, we wouldn't have had this problem in the first place. What this House tried to do is say this is a silly approach going into the future. Let's come up with a policy towards student loans. If we have to consolidate them, if the Federal Government has to have their control and grasp over the entire thing, we should do it in a way that provides some kind of flexibility and some kind of rationalization so it can ebb and flow in the future as the market requires it to do.

We passed a bill not just that allowed them not to double, but we passed a bill here on this floor which solved the problem. The fact that the Senate does not wish to solve the problem is something that I find sad. But we solved the problem, and we did it in a timely fashion.

The great speeches that I heard today—and they were very good and their verbiage was better than mine—should be given over in the Senate where it can do some good.

I also want to talk about a couple of other issues that I've heard, that these particular bills in this rule would violate states rights' agreements, even though the issue at hand is only those waters and coastal waters that are a part of the Federal preserve and does not talk about State waters whatsoever.

We talked about in H.R. 1613 a poison pill being inserted into that provision that exempts Dodd-Frank. Somehow I wish we could actually go back to the person who actually inserted that provision in there because it was Secretary Hillary Clinton. That's part of the negotiations we did as a country with the Mexican Government; and it's logical that it is in there because it gives some protection to U.S. companies that, if that language was not in there, could be forced either to violate Federal laws or violate foreign laws and face civil penalties or cease to operate in foreign countries.

I can understand why the Secretary of State at the time did negotiate that portion that is in there. That's not the poison pill. That's simply what is in the negotiated settlement. All we're doing with this bill is enacting it, putting it into place, and allowing us to move forward with what has been simply negotiated on resource areas that straddle international lines.

I'm also somewhat frustrated with the statement that we might as well use the leases that we currently have.

I'm also frustrated because we have had a great deal of increase in production of oil and gas, and it's all happened on private and State lands.

I happen to represent a State that has almost 70 percent of it controlled by the Federal Government. I have enormous amounts of resource potential in my State, but it is controlled by the Federal Government. So even though areas where private property and States have been able to increase the revenue to their States and increase the total amount of petroleum productions that we have, my State has seen the exact opposite.

If you go onshore to the areas that are controlled by this administration, the Federal lands, the amount of parcels that have been offered since 2005 are down 88 percent. The amount of acres that are offered for development of resources are down 85 percent. And what is most sad is the amount of revenue that is produced both to the State and to the Federal Government from onshore development since 2005, which is down 99 percent.

A lease is simply not, as has been stated, the green light to start drilling. A release simply says you start the process. And part of the problem with the releases both onshore and offshore has been the inability of the Federal Government to do so in a reasonable fashion. On onshore lease development there is regulation that says it must be done in a 6-month period of time to move forward from the initial sale and to which the lease is then offered so the company can start its drilling process. Yet in a survey done by GAO, 91 percent of the time, that 6-month standard has not been met onshore.

Part of H.R. 2231 is a reorganization of the administrative function that deals with how these leases are developed and how they proceed going forward. By taking one agency, which has had a very poor record and dividing it into three with specific responsibilities, we think we can streamline this process and make sure that what we are doing on the Outer Continental Shelf is far more effective than what we are doing on Federal lands onshore, where all we are having is stalling delays and a lack of production and a lack of revenue coming from them.

It was once said to the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee that if he had a better idea, do it. In all due respect, he has a better idea. That better idea is the two bills before us right now, H.R. 2231, and the other bill, which is H.R. 1613. Those are good ideas. They will move us forward. They're the things we ought to do to prepare.

I think it's a great rule that is allowing that and allowing the appropriation bill to come through in an open rule, allowing anyone who has an idea that he or she wishes to bring to the floor the opportunity to do so.

With that, this is a fair rule. It deals with an appropriations process, as well as two bills that are good bills that

will help people. Especially after yesterday's speech, we should have an energy policy in this country aimed at helping middle class Americans, not one that simply says, freeze in the dark, especially if you're poor. That's the best thing we are going to be able to do.

□ 1330

These bills move us forward. We should vote for them. With that, having failed at my effort to give you good verbiage, in which case I'm sorry you're holding the cane there, I hope you're using that only to navigate around this floor and it will not become a weapon in the future.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 274 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 8. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1595) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 595 as specified in section 8 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the de-

mand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—194

Andrews	Capuano	Crowley
Barber	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Barrow (GA)	Carney	Cummings
Bass	Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis, Danny
Becerra	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Chu	Delaney
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Clay	DeBene
Bonamici	Cleaver	Deutch
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Braley (IA)	Cohen	Doggett
Brown (FL)	Connolly	Doyle
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Duckworth
Bustos	Cooper	Edwards
Butterfield	Costa	Ellison
Capps	Courtney	Engel

Enyart	Lipinski	Rangel
Eshoo	Loeb sack	Richmond
Esty	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Fattah	Lowe y	Ruppersberger
Foster	Lujan Grisham	Rush
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Gabbard	(NM)	T.
Gallego	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Garamendi	Maffei	Sarbanes
Garcia	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Grayson	Markey	Schiff
Green, Al	Matheson	Schneider
Green, Gene	Matsui	Schrader
Grijalva	McCollum	Schwartz
Gutiérrez	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Hahn	McGovern	Scott, David
Hanabusa	McIntyre	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Heck (WA)	Meeks	Shea-Porter
Higgins	Meng	Sherman
Himes	Michaud	Sinema
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Sires
Holt	Moore	Slaughter
Honda	Moran	Speier
Horsford	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Takano
Huffman	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Israel	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Tierney
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Titus
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Tonko
Kaptur	Pallone	Tsongas
Keating	Pascarell	Van Hollen
Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Vargas
Kennedy	Payne	Veasey
Kildee	Pelosi	Vela
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kind	Peters (CA)	Visclosky
Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)	Walz
Kuster	Peterson	Wasserman
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Waters
Larson (CT)	Polis	Waxman
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Welch
Levin	Quigley	Wilson (FL)
Lewis	Rahall	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Clarke	McCarthy (NY)	Neugebauer
Fincher	McCaul	Sessions
Johnson, E. B.	McMorris	Smith (WA)
Maloney,	Rodgers	Watt
Carolyn	Nadler	

□ 1357

Messrs. PERLMUTTER, HIGGINS, GENE GREEN of Texas, and VELA and Ms. DUCKWORTH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. CAPITO was allowed to speak out of order.)

WOMEN'S CONGRESSIONAL SOFTBALL GAME

Mrs. CAPITO. To my colleagues, tonight is a very exciting night for the women of the House, the women's softball team of the House—and the men of the House, and really all families across America—for our fifth annual women's softball team. Our game is tonight at 7 o'clock at Watkins Field.

I am the cocaptain of the team with my esteemed colleague from Florida. And we have trouble agreeing on a lot of things, but I know everybody in this room today will want us to win because our opponents are the press.

So I want to just briefly say thank you to everybody who's been involved in this. We've had a lot of great coaches and we've had a lot of outside help. We've had a lot of fun getting to know each other again and even better.

I'd like to yield to my cocaptain who hatched this idea and have her talk a little bit about why we're doing this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you very much to my cocaptain, the gentlelady from West Virginia, and to all of our sisters on the Congressional Women's Softball team.

The gentlelady from West Virginia is absolutely right; we may not always agree in the boundaries and walls of this room, but I think all of us can agree that we want to defeat the common adversary—that is, the press corps.

We have been out there for the last 2 months at 7 in the morning two or three times a week. None of us can believe that we actually all get out there at the crack of dawn to make sure that we can build our skills, build camaraderie, make sure that we come together around a true common purpose. We also thank our adversaries, whom we will defeat tonight when we take the field and make sure that we take the trophy back for the women Members.

We've only won one out of the last four games, but the fifth time is a charm. This is the fifth annual game. It happens to coincide with my own 5-year anniversary of being a survivor of breast cancer. And the importance of this game is really that we all are focused on raising money for an incredible charity, the Young Survival Coalition. We are headed for a record-breaking fundraising year.

I want to thank the majority whip in particular for making sure that the schedule accommodated everybody coming to the game. This is going to be a fun family event. Bring your kids. We have face painting and a fun zone and all kinds of food and a great time. We have already presold more than 1,000 tickets before we even get to the door.

So thank you so much. Come cheer on the women Members tonight at 7 o'clock, Watkins Recreation Center, 12th and D Southeast. Take the Eastern Market or Potomac Avenue Metro.

On to victory for the Congressional Women's Softball team.

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 187, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—235

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash

Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus

Barber
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)

Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)

NAYS—187

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)

Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette

Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

Garcia	Luján, Ben Ray	Rush
Green, Al	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Green, Gene	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Grijalva	Maffei	T.
Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean	Sanchez, Loretta
Hahn	Markey	Sarbanes
Hanabusa	Matheson	Schakowsky
Hastings (FL)	Matsui	Schiff
Heck (WA)	McCollum	Schneider
Higgins	McDermott	Schrader
Himes	McGovern	Schwartz
Hinojosa	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Holt	Meeks	Scott, David
Honda	Meng	Serrano
Horsford	Michaud	Sewell (AL)
Hoyer	Miller, George	Shea-Porter
Huffman	Moore	Sherman
Israel	Moran	Sinema
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Jeffries	Napolitano	Slaughter
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Speier
Kaptur	Negrete McLeod	Swalwell (CA)
Keating	Nolan	Takano
Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kennedy	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Pascarella	Tierney
Kilmer	Pastor (AZ)	Titus
Kind	Payne	Tonko
Kirkpatrick	Pelosi	Tsongas
Kuster	Perlmutter	Van Hollen
Langevin	Peters (MI)	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Veasey
Larson (CT)	Pingree (ME)	Vela
Lee (CA)	Pocan	Visclosky
Levin	Polis	Walz
Lewis	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Lipinski	Quigley	Schultz
Loeback	Rahall	Waters
Lofgren	Rangel	Waxman
Lowenthal	Richmond	Welch
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Lujan Grisham	Ruiz	Yarmuth
(NM)	Ruppersberger	

NOT VOTING—12

Clarke	McCarthy (NY)	Nadler
Fincher	McCaul	Neugebauer
Johnson, E. B.	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Maloney,	McMorris	Watt
Carolyn	Rodgers	

□ 1409

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 289 on Ordering the Previous Question, H. Res. 274, A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1613—Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, H.R. 2231—Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, and H.R. 2410—Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 290 on Agreeing to the Resolution, H. Res. 274, A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1613—Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, H.R. 2231—Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, and H.R. 2410—Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 270, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 270

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-132) on the resolution (H. Res. 277) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I call up House Resolution 277 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 277

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE FORTY THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, from the Committee on House Administration,

submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-133) on the resolution (H. Res. 278) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Forty Third Congressional District of California, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I call up House Resolution 278 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 278

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Forty Third Congressional District of California is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1864) to amend title 10, United States Code, to require an Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1864

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

SECTION 1. INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS OF RETALIATORY PERSONNEL ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO MAKING PROTECTED COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING SEXUAL ASSAULT.

Section 1034(c)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “sexual harassment or” and inserting “rape, sexual assault, or other sexual misconduct in violation of sections 920 through 920c of this title (articles 120 through 120c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), sexual harassment, or”.