

Senator Richard Moore from Milford, Massachusetts.

Representative Fernandes and Senator Moore are being honored this week with a prestigious Environmental Merit Award from the EPA for their tremendous work they have done to combat phosphorus pollution in their communities.

When studies showed that the phosphorus levels in the Charles River at nearly double the healthy standards, these two men immediately recognized the dangerous impact this would have on the region's cities and towns. They came up with a simple, direct, and creative solution that worked for families and businesses alike. Most importantly, they got it through the State house and the executive chamber, delivering real results in record time for their constituents.

That's par for the course for these two local leaders, who have proven time and again that they are the best of the best when it comes to public service.

As dedicated as they are diligent, as creative as they are compassionate, they seek every day to do better and more for their communities they represent. I am honored to work with them, to recognize them, and to call them friends.

#### PANCREATIC CANCER

(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, in recent years, the medical research community has made great strides in treating cancer. However, not every form of cancer has shown the same progress. Some forms remain just as deadly as they were decades ago.

Among the deadliest is pancreatic cancer, with a survival rate of only 6 percent. By comparison, the survival rate of all forms of cancer is now 68 percent, up from 49 percent in 1975. Last year, Congress passed and the President signed the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, a bill to focus research on pancreatic cancer and other problematic types of the disease.

With new plans to attack the disease and new resources, we can make progress. I met recently with a constituent who is battling the disease and with another who has lost multiple family members to it, and they have hope despite the tough road ahead.

With newly focused work, we will hopefully see new therapies and new drugs attack pancreatic cancer in the coming years, greatly improving the rate of survival.

#### SENATE PASSAGE OF IMMIGRATION BILL

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

Mr. VARGAS. I rise today to speak on the pressing and important issue of immigration reform.

Yesterday, the Senate took a necessary step forward in the effort to enact comprehensive immigration reform. Now it is imperative that the House put politics aside and that we work together to reach a compromise that will benefit our country, strengthen our economy, and allow 11 million people to step out of the shadows.

The House must enact immigration reform that is fair and reflects the highest values of our Nation. We are a country of immigrants, and how we treat those who aspire to be citizens reflects our democracy's commitment to uphold the moral principles upon which our Nation was built.

I urge the Republican leadership to bring the Senate bill to the House so we can finish the crucial work the Senate began and finally fix our immigration system.

I also want to thank all of the faith groups that keep praying for all of us to pass a comprehensive bill. It is obviously working.

#### OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2231.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) kindly take the chair.

□ 0917

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 27, 2013, amendment No. 7, printed in part B of House Report 113-131, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL), had been disposed of.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 113-131.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

##### TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS SEC. —01. PROHIBITION ON LEASING IN BRISTOL BAY OFF THE COAST OF ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, the Secretary of the Interior may not issue any oil and gas lease for any area of the outer Continental Shelf (as that term is defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.)) in Bristol Bay off the coast of Alaska.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, title III of this Act shall have no force or effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to remove from the bill provisions that would mandate leasing off of the fabulous Bristol Bay area of Alaska.

Now, I've said this bill is a little bit like Groundhog Day because we have passed it before, and we talked about that yesterday, but this is about a bizarre version of Groundhog Day and why I am forced to offer this amendment.

□ 0920

Actually, after the Exxon Valdez oil spill, I traveled up to the spill with then-Subcommittee Chairman GEORGE MILLER and saw what an extraordinary mess had been created, something that in those cold waters is very difficult to deal with and very persistent and caused tremendous damage to the fisheries. Congress chose then, in 1989, under President George H.W. Bush, to revoke the leases in the Bristol Bay area in order to protect this \$2 billion a year fishery.

In fact, the American people, the taxpayers of the United States of America, paid \$100 million to buy back those leases that had been sold in the 1980s. That moratorium remained in place until then-President George W. Bush lifted the moratorium.

The Obama administration has done the right thing and reversed George W. Bush's decision and excluded Bristol Bay from drilling in the 2012-2017 OCS leasing program. So we had the first President Bush agree that a permanent protection of that area was warranted because of the \$2-billion-a-year renewable fishery and other precious resources, the cold water, the difficult conditions. George W. Bush then reversed that, and President Obama has reinstated a moratorium.

Now this bill would mandate leasing off of Bristol Bay. Obviously, there's always division over these issues, but there is strong public opposition to drilling in Bristol Bay—55 tribes, Native Alaskan associations, and fishing organizations are opposed to the drilling in that area. National environmental groups like Trout Unlimited, Wild Salmon Center, and Natural Resources Defense Council also support this amendment.

This is a precious and irreplaceable area. One major spill in that area would devastate the environment, the fishery that supports thousands of jobs in Alaska. Actually jobs all up and down the west coast of the United States are dependent upon the fabulous fishery of Bristol Bay, both the commercial and the sport fishing. I have guides in Oregon who spend their summers in Alaska guiding in the Bristol Bay area. It attracts people from around the world.

We should not put this extraordinary resource at risk in this bill for some possible, potential future oil revenues in a State which is already quite rich in oil, where the former Naval Petroleum Reserve has been leased but, as in the case of many leases that the oil industry holds, is not developed. That is why it was the Naval Petroleum Reserve. There are known and large resources under that area of Alaska. The balance is clearly in favor of protecting this area, not another area to drill given the resources already available in Alaska.

I had to do a so-called “pay-for.” Last night we passed the Cassidy amendment, which increases the Federal deficit by \$15 billion—excuse me, \$14,999,999,970—over 30 years by lifting the cap on revenue sharing with the Gulf States. That's costing, they say, \$1 less than \$500 million a year. That didn't have to be paid for. They waived the rules. But because I want to protect this fabulous resource, they're saying you're forgoing potential possible future revenues for the government, you must pay for it. So unfortunately, given that, I had to move to strike title III so we could protect this resource.

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

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

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

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

My good friend from Oregon talked about Groundhog Day as to the nature of this bill. I can say, “Well, here we go again.”

Instead of debating ways to create jobs, to enhance revenues, and to secure our Nation from a national security standpoint, we are back to debating a moratorium on offshore drilling that will lock away America's energy resources. Specifically, this amend-

ment would close a wide area of Federal waters from drilling off the State of Alaska. But this amendment doesn't just lock away America's resources, it also eliminates State revenue-sharing provisions in the bill.

President Obama has already closed the North Aleutian Basin through Presidential moratorium, closing off jobs and economic diversity to the people of Alaska through 2017. The underlying legislation does not in any way modify this unscientific Presidential closure or modify the existing Presidential authority. It does, however—and this is important, Mr. Chairman—provide that if this region contains some of our Nation's greatest potential for energy, that we should open that area for the future. I know that logic is sometimes lost in this town, but in all honesty, Mr. Chairman, we should be drilling offshore in those areas where we know the most resources are located or potentially located.

The Natural Resources Committee has heard testimony time and time again about young people leaving Alaska to chase jobs elsewhere. We have also heard from the Aleutians, such as the Aleutians East Borough mayor Stanley Mack, who spoke of how the opportunity for drilling in the southern portion of the North Aleutian Basin could be a real economic benefit for their communities.

This economic diversification is even more important when you consider the petitions of extreme environmental groups proposing massive fishery closures across Bristol Bay and the region, or the potential for the declaration of a no-fishing national monument in those areas, or the grave threat posed to fishing in Alaska in the north Pacific by President Obama's executive order on ocean zoning, where bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., will decide what happens and what doesn't happen in ocean areas off Alaska and other States.

Finally, this amendment also eliminates revenue sharing for all coastal States, preventing Alaska, Virginia, South Carolina, California, and others from receiving a share of any energy development off their shores.

This important provision is about bringing fairness to the Outer Continental Shelf revenue sharing instead of limiting it to only four States. Right now, only the Gulf States have that privilege.

When gas prices climbed to \$4 a gallon in 2008, the American people strongly supported lifting the Nation's offshore drilling bans, and that support ran across the political spectrum, from Independents, to Republicans, to Democrats. And that broad support for expanding offshore drilling, frankly, continues to this day in this country.

This amendment would start us down the road of imposing new moratoriums on America's offshore, which is the opposite of what Americans want. And let me make this point, Mr. Chairman, and I said this several times in the com-

mittee. If there is a poster child of a State that was promised something when they got statehood and the reverse is being done, it's got to be Alaska.

I know there's controversy surrounding the potential in the Bristol Bay, but it's not unanimous on either side. But those in Alaska certainly should be the ones that are integrally involved in that decisionmaking process. But, no, here we have today an amendment from a Member of Congress, who has every right to do it, but from the Lower 48, dictating what's going to go on in Alaska. Again, that to me solidifies the poster child of a State really not getting what it should be getting from its resources after statehood.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to defeat this amendment. And as I understand the gentleman from Oregon has yielded back his time, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

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

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

□ 0930

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 113-131.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

#### **TITLE —JUDICIAL REVIEW**

##### **SEC. .01. TIME FOR FILING COMPLAINT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any cause of action that arises from a covered energy decision must be filed not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the covered energy decision. Any cause of action not filed within this time period shall be barred.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a cause of action brought by a party to a covered energy lease.

##### **SEC. .02. DISTRICT COURT DEADLINE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—All proceedings that are subject to section .01—

(1) shall be brought in the United States district court for the district in which the Federal property for which a covered energy lease is issued is located or the United States District Court of the District of Columbia;

(2) shall be resolved as expeditiously as possible, and in any event not more than 180 days after such cause or claim is filed; and

(3) shall take precedence over all other pending matters before the district court.

(b) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH DEADLINE.—If an interlocutory or final judgment, decree, or order has not been issued by the district court by the deadline described under this

section, the cause or claim shall be dismissed with prejudice and all rights relating to such cause or claim shall be terminated.

#### SEC. 03. ABILITY TO SEEK APPELLATE REVIEW.

An interlocutory or final judgment, decree, or order of the district court in a proceeding that is subject to section 01 may be reviewed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The D.C. Circuit shall resolve any such appeal as expeditiously as possible and, in any event, not more than 180 days after such interlocutory or final judgment, decree, or order of the district court was issued.

#### SEC. 04. LIMITATION ON SCOPE OF REVIEW AND RELIEF.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.—In any judicial review of any Federal action under this title, any administrative findings and conclusions relating to the challenged Federal action shall be presumed to be correct unless shown otherwise by clear and convincing evidence contained in the administrative record.

(b) LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.—In any judicial review of any action, or failure to act, under this title, 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 Federal law requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation concerned.

#### SEC. 05. LEGAL FEES.

Any person filing a petition seeking judicial review of any action, or failure to act, under this title who is not a prevailing party shall pay to the prevailing parties (including intervening parties), other than the United States, fees and other expenses incurred by that party in connection with the judicial review, unless the Court finds that the position of the person was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust.

#### SEC. 06. EXCLUSION.

This title shall not apply with respect to disputes between the parties to a lease issued pursuant to an authorizing leasing statute regarding the obligations of such lease or the alleged breach thereof.

#### SEC. 07. DEFINITIONS.

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) COVERED ENERGY DECISION.—The term “covered energy decision” means any action or decision by a Federal official regarding the issuance of a covered energy lease.

(2) COVERED ENERGY LEASE.—The term “covered energy lease” means any lease under this Act or under an oil and gas leasing program under this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today has great potential to create jobs, to boost our economy, and provide our country with new, much-needed sources of energy. But as written, it also has the potential to invite frivolous, duplicative lawsuits filed by outside entities with no real tie to the individual contracts stemming from this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen it happen time and time again: situations in which the community, the developer, and the Federal Government are all on

the same page, but plans are ultimately ground to a halt by activist environmental groups that file lawsuit after lawsuit in order to stop the development in its tracks.

My amendment would stop this cycle as it relates to projects begun under this bill. It would allow individuals and groups not party to a lease under this bill to file a suit once—only once—within 60 days of an official action under the bill. Should a suing entity lose, it would be allowed an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and final resolution would have to be reached within 180 days.

Finally, my amendment would also include a “loser pays” standard, meant to protect taxpayers and discourage the filing of a suit without true legal merit.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill would do much to move our country ahead, but I fear that we will not reach our full potential unless this important language is included.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just simply want to say that I think the amendment adds to this legislation, and I support the legislation.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I urge support of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

To begin with, this amendment creates a major obstacle for parties such as States, municipalities, local entities, and nonprofit organizations from challenging unsound licensing decisions in the courts.

It does this by requiring the losing side in these disputes to pay the legal costs, not just of the prevailing party, but for every intervening party as well. Just imagine what this would mean.

How could a local beach community risk bringing an action knowing that it may have to pay for its own legal costs, let alone the legal costs of all of the parties in the case, which could include some of the Nation's largest oil and gas producers. Without question, this draconian cost-shifting regime will have a chilling effect on the right of individuals, municipalities, and nonprofit organizations to challenge licensing decisions that could have devastating effects on their communities.

Sure, the provision allows the losing party to argue that its position was substantially justified or that special circumstances make such an award unjust, but even meeting that standard could require extensive litigation.

This savings provision offers the tiniest of fig leaves. It is clear that the real intent of this provision is to ensure that only the wealthiest members of society will be able to litigate these issues.

Second, this amendment is not necessary. Current law already authorizes a Federal court to sanction a party for filing frivolous actions or for engaging in wrongful conduct. Federal rule of Civil Procedure 11 deems every pleading, motion, and any other paper filed by a party in a Federal proceeding to be a certification by such party: that it is not being presented for an improper purpose; that the claims and legal contentions asserted in the pleadings are warranted by existing law; and that the factual contentions made in the pleading have evidentiary support.

And should the court find that any of those requirements have been violated, the court may impose an appropriate sanction, including requiring the offending party to pay all of the prevailing party's reasonable attorneys' fees and other expenses arising from the violation.

In addition, the court, under certain circumstances, may also impose monetary sanctions against a party who violates rule 11. So, in sum, this amendment is simply not necessary.

Third, this amendment is not only an affront to the independence of the Federal judiciary, but it could seriously disrupt the ability of the courts to meet its obligations to litigants in other pending matters. The amendment does this by setting hard-and-fast deadlines that ignore the complexities of the individual case or the court's schedule. And it requires the court to prioritize these actions over all other pending matters before the court.

Not surprisingly, the Judicial Conference of the U.S. has long opposed legislative efforts to impose specific deadlines and mandate that certain actions be prioritized over others for some very important reasons. By imposing rigid deadlines, measures such as this amendment undermine the effective civil case management and unduly hamper the court's discretion in managing and prioritizing its case docket. Each case should be considered on its own merits without the imposition of artificial deadlines.

Worse yet, this amendment specifically provides that if the district court fails to meet this deadline, the case must be dismissed with prejudice and terminates all rights relating to cause or claim. Just imagine how a defendant could use this provision to its advantage by running the clock through delaying tactics such as employing a multiplicity of procedures and time-consuming discovery demands. This amendment is anti-justice. It must be opposed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm not advocating for “loser pays” in all civil cases. My amendment relates only to these specific cases, in

which an extremist environmental group files suit after suit simply to stop the development of natural resources and energy resources on American soil. Under my amendment, parties to a lease aren't subject to this standard.

Furthermore, my amendment does not undo the ability for members of the community who are concerned about a particular lease to petition the government—State or Federal—during the NEPA process.

Finally, while I understand the concern that “loser pays” harms complainants with the least amount of disposable income, I would simply say that near-record gas prices are harming them and are hurting the most vulnerable in our society, poor people and senior citizens on limited income. In fact, my colleague from Georgia, my good friend, was saying it's unnecessary. But if it's unnecessary, he shouldn't be afraid of this amendment. This is a commonsense amendment, and I urge its support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 0940

AMENDMENT NO. 10, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY  
MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 113-131, as modified by the order of the House on June 27, 2013.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

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

Add at the end the following:

**TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**  
**SEC. —. STATE RIGHTS AND AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED.**

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple savings clause amendment of the kind that we include typically, frequently, in almost every bill that's a major bill that passes this House. It says as follows:

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

The simple purpose of this is to avoid any implication by this statute that it is taking away any rights of any State, including my State of Florida, where drilling rights are a matter of extreme controversy.

Now, why do we do this? Because of the Constitution, because the supremacy clause in the Constitution says the Federal law is the highest law of the land. And whenever we're dealing with any area, any area at all of the law, where there are states' rights and there are Federal rights, it's incumbent upon us to explain that we are preserving those State rights, not just in this bill but in every bill.

In fact, we are shoring up the provision that exists already in 43 U.S.C. 1311, entitled “Rights of States.”

And why do we need to do that?

Because this is a comprehensive scheme to regulate offshore drilling in this country, and when you establish any comprehensive scheme, you run the risk that a court will determine that you have obliterated, you have annihilated, you have eliminated states' rights. That is what happens when you pass a law that is a comprehensive Federal scheme.

Now, yesterday, we had a similar amendment come up. In that case the vote was a very exciting 213-213 tie vote. And the arguments that were made against the amendment yesterday today simply do not apply.

Yesterday, if you may recall, Mr. Chairman, a map was provided by the opposition to that amendment. The map pointed out that the drilling in that area was limited to offshore drilling on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Well, today, we're dealing with drilling from sea to shining sea, dealing with all of our shores. So that limitation that was promoted yesterday doesn't apply.

Yesterday, there was an argument made at the last minute that, somehow or other, the definition of States in this amendment applied to Mexican states, which was absurd and ridiculous, and yet, it was made against that amendment. All you had to do is look at the definition, not just in the title, but in the chapter and the subchapter of the word “States,” and you would see that the word “States” is defined as limited to the United States of America.

Now, today's bill provides a much greater threat to Federal preemption of State law than yesterday's bill did. In fact, this bill explicitly entangles Federal and State law together in this area under section 1344(a)(2)(F) of this bill. This actually establishes a consultation regarding the States which could be construed as being in lieu of and extinguishing states' rights.

It's a clear error in the drafting of this bill, and my amendment is nec-

essary to protect it. My amendment is necessary to prevent a preemption, through this bill, of states' rights.

This bill clearly, as drafted, conflates Federal and states' rights and would lead to a disastrous preemption of states' rights based upon section 1344(a)(2)(F) alone.

Now, today we have new arguments that have been made against this simple savings provision, and neither one of those arguments carries any weight. One argument that we've already heard is that this bill couldn't possibly preempt states' rights.

Well, in fact, it could possibly preempt states' rights. I've explained to you how that could happen. Any Federal court could look at this bill, reach the conclusion, particularly with regard to the presence of 1344(a)(2)(F), that this is a comprehensive Federal scheme, and it preempts states' rights.

We've never heard any explanation from anyone opposing this amendment as to how it could not preempt states' rights.

Secondly, we've heard an argument which, respectfully, verges on the specious, that this amendment somehow would negate individual rights, and that is completely false, completely without any merit.

In fact, I would venture to say that there has never been a case where a statute or an amendment or a bill that contains the phrase “Nothing in this Act affects the right and power of each State”—I don't know how that could ever be construed as somehow negating individual rights.

Clearly, on its own terms, explicitly, this amendment simply preserves states' rights.

We are in a fundamentally different situation today than we were yesterday because of the presence of section 1344(a)(2)(F) in this bill. There is a far greater need today than there was yesterday with the tie vote to have this amendment here as a savings clause.

I would call, respectfully, upon the chairman of the committee to agree to this amendment today and let us move on.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again with unnecessary amendments designed to delay the work of Congress in enacting important legislation that would expand U.S. offshore energy production in order to create, once again, millions of new American jobs, to lower energy prices, to grow our economy, and strengthen our national security.

H.R. 2231 is similar to legislation passed last Congress and fully upholds existing states' rights within their boundaries and offshore areas. Nothing

in this bill changes the fundamental 60-year-old relationship between States and the Federal Government enshrined in the Submerged Lands Act or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

This bill is focused on activity in Federal waters and respects States' abilities to control and govern their waters. States' authority is in no way limited or affected by this bill. Existing Federal law protects states' rights over their waters, and boundaries are not changed or amended in this bill. I've now repeated that three times.

The gentleman's amendment is asserted as a simple restatement of these states' rights, though its sponsor admits the principle is not a restatement of existing law, but of the principle—big difference in that, Mr. Chairman, which is where the amendment then raises several serious questions that leads me to oppose its adoption in the form that it is written.

As drafted, the amendment purportedly reflects current law with regards to management of natural resources, but it could effectively usurp the individual private property rights of individuals in favor of State control.

The amendment reads that it is the right and power of each State to prohibit management, leasing, developing the natural resources within such lands within its boundaries.

States have the right to regulate natural resources, but not outright prohibit development of private property. That's the point here, Mr. Chairman.

In the United States, unlike much of the remainder of the world, natural resources are owned both by the government and private individuals. The right to private property is one of the foundations of our Constitution. Natural resources property rights include the right to own minerals, timber rights, water rights, and those are just a few examples.

Congress should not be endorsing a policy that gives the States sole power to prohibit the development of these rights, and that's what this amendment could do. Such an action, like that embodied in this amendment, could be construed as a massive taking, in violation of the Constitution.

The government can't take property without compensation. The courts have held, including this week, in the gentleman's State of Florida, a Florida case at the Supreme Court that the State taking property or impinging on its fair use requires fair compensation.

Even if a State may not be inclined to fully exercise such authority granted by this amendment, should it become law, simple passage could open the door to lawsuits challenging private property rights. It's for these reasons that I urge a "no" vote on the Grayson amendment.

And Mr. Chairman, at a time when our Nation's economy continues to struggle, we should avoid erecting new barriers to economic activity and private freedoms.

Again, this amendment is unnecessary, as H.R. 2231 fully upholds and it

does not change or diminish or impinge existing states' rights.

How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I'd like to yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the full committee, Representative HASTINGS. And I'll just reinforce the last point he was making.

And I don't believe that the gentleman from Florida intended his language to do this. But it says it is the right and power of each State to prohibit management, leasing, developing of the natural resources within such lands within its boundaries.

I don't believe it was intended, but this could have the dangerous consequence of trampling on private property rights.

□ 0950

It's been tried in the Fifth Amendment, and that is a vital core principle in our Bill of Rights. And I know that you didn't intend that, but this language could lead to that. For that reason alone, we should reject this amendment. This could have dangerous consequences.

So I agree with the full chairman, the gentleman from Washington. Let's reject this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I just want to make this point in the 15 seconds I have left.

The gentleman from Florida referenced 1334(a)(2)(f). That is not amended or referenced in this bill. So the gentleman's argument that that could somehow play a part in that is simply not true because it's not referenced; it is not amended.

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

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

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

Mr. GRAYSON. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 113-131.

Mrs. CAPPS. 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:

Add at the end the following:

**TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**  
**SEC. . PROVISIONS NOT EFFECTIVE.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 203 and title III shall have no force or effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward amendment that is overwhelmingly supported by my constituents, and I hope we can all agree to it. The amendment strikes a harmful and unnecessary provision in the bill that actually mandates new drilling in the sensitive waters off Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties in my district. Whatever the reasons behind this provision, the fact remains that the people most affected—my constituents—don't want new drilling.

My colleagues have heard me before invoke Santa Barbara's devastating 1969 oil spill, and that's because it galvanized central coast residents and actually the entire State of California against more offshore drilling. We were outraged by the damage to the environment, wildlife, and our economy.

We understood the havoc that similar blowouts could wreak on our economy, especially our tourism and our fishing industries. That's why California permanently banned new oil and gas leasing in State waters in 1994. It's why some 24 city and county governments, including both Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, have passed measures banning or requiring voter approval before any new onshore facilities to support offshore drilling can be built. And it's why in 2008, then-Republican Governor Schwarzenegger told President Bush and Congress to oppose new drilling off the west coast. Even the Pentagon has expressed concerns with new drilling in the area.

Mr. Chair, Californians have spoken loud and clear. We do not want more drilling off our shores. I urge my colleagues to join us in striking these harmful and unnecessary provisions from the bill and support the Capps-Brownley-Lowenthal amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, when Juan Cabrillo first sailed up the Santa Barbara Channel in 1542, he noted a massive natural oil slick. That's how vast California's petroleum resources are.

Today, we hear much about the Bakken shale oil formation that has

produced unparalleled prosperity for North Dakota. Yet California's Monterey oil deposit is nearly five times the size of the Bakken field in North Dakota. California also has 1.6 billion barrels of untapped offshore oil in unleased acreage right now that can be reached with slant drilling from onshore. But California's resources are placed off limits by the ideological extremism that is now on full display courtesy of the amendment offered by my colleagues from California. They have had their way in California for a full generation, and I've watched their folly take what once could boast of being America's Golden State and turn it into an economic basket case and a national laughingstock.

California's unemployment rate is the second highest in the Nation at 8.6 percent. North Dakota's is the lowest at 3.2 percent. Yesterday, the average price per gallon of gas in California was \$4.03. In North Dakota, it was \$3.69. Since 2000, California's reliance on foreign oil imports has literally doubled as a percentage and tripled as a volume. They're not helping the environment.

When I grew up in Ventura County 50 years ago, everyone on the coast kept pans of turpentine in their garages to wash off the globs of natural tar that you couldn't avoid as you walked on the beach. The offshore oil development of that era relieved the natural pressure that had polluted the waters of Santa Barbara Channel for centuries, and over several decades the tar disappeared and the beaches have never been cleaner.

Those were also the days when California literally led our Nation's economy. People had high-paying jobs, low energy bills, and families from across America seeking a better future for their children flocked to California. Now those same families flee from California.

Mr. Chairman, if I sound a little bitter, it's because I am. I have watched their policies destroy the promise and prosperity of my Golden State for my children. For God's sake, don't let them destroy our country.

Mrs. CAPPS. I'll just make the quick comment that the suggestion that oil seeps are good for the environment or that more oil drilling would reduce oil seeps is simply bad science. Even the authors of the one study that suggested this might be possible have repudiated its use before Congress.

I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from coastal California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentlewoman from California, who has been an outstanding champion of ocean protection.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It would not only honor the wishes of the Governor of California, but also the vast majority of the Federal and State representatives, especially all those that are closest to where this misguided bill would

not only authorize, but would force the sale of offshore oil and gas leases. These are the people who would bear the greatest risk of any oil spill, which, as we all know, has already occurred in the past in these waters.

As I just said, the underlying bill we are considering today not only just authorizes, but it mandates lease sales in vast portions of the Outer Continental Shelf, including southern California, forcing the Interior Department and the States to accept leases in their backyards, regardless of the opposition from potential impacts. And it not only does that, it bars citizens from properly participating in the process.

What do I mean? This bill lacks meaningful environmental review and a chance for Americans to voice their informed consent by not allowing any consideration of any nonleasing alternative in the NEPA process.

Instead, what does the bill do? It dictates to the public, it dictates to the States, it dictates to the Interior Department, without any of their input, where oil and gas leases will be held. This would occur regardless of whether the public has legitimate concerns or not. Too bad. They're going to drill in our backyard.

Mr. Chair, instead of focusing on dead-end legislation, this body should be preparing for our energy future, which I believe the public will demand more and more.

I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, this amendment simply ensures that the express will of my constituents and the people of California is respected. I find it ironic that some of the same people in this body who decry the overarching Federal Government seem to have no qualms about forcing new drilling upon a local population directly against its wishes.

□ 1000

The American people are tired of these political games, especially those that put our coasts, our communities, and our way of life at risk. Instead of expanding oil and gas drilling, we should be working together on a responsible, sustainable energy policy for the future.

We can't end our dependence on oil overnight, but we can certainly do more to encourage innovation and clean energy technologies like solar, wind, and biofuels. We can enact better efficiency standards to make the resources we do have last longer, and we can end the billions of dollars in giveaways for Big Oil and finally level the playing field for all types of energy technology.

A clean energy future is good for jobs, it's good for our environment, and

it's good for the American people. This bill is just another recycled bad idea designed to go nowhere.

Doubling down on oil drilling may be good policy for oil companies, but it's terrible policy for the American people. This amendment would help stop these games and stop the reckless expansion of oil drilling off the southern California coast.

I urge my colleagues to respect the will of California's voters and support this amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this point. The fundamental reason for H.R. 2231 is to expand energy production in American waters. This amendment would put another moratorium; it goes the opposite direction. Furthermore, this amendment would eliminate revenue sharing, which has worked so well in the gulf coast.

But here's the point I want to make specifically about California that was not made by my two colleagues on the other side of the aisle from California. This legislation directs that any offshore drilling should come from existing rigs onshore. That is possible to do, Mr. Chairman, because of the new technologies—horizontal drilling—that the oil industry has done for several years. It works. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the Governor of the State of California, Jerry Brown, has proposed precisely that for State waters.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle from California didn't mention that—I don't know why they didn't mention it, because their Governor is in favor of that process. What this bill does is simply mirror that by saying we'll do that in Federal waters.

I think my colleague from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) put it in a very good way: California, like the United States, needs a jump-start in the economy. The best way to do that is through energy production, providing a certainty of energy for a growing economy in the future.

With that, I urge rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. 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 gentlewoman from California 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 B of House Report 113-131 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 11 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 235, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—183

Andrews	Eshoo	Lynch
Bachmann	Esty	Maffei
Barber	Farr	Maloney
Beatty	Fattah	Carolyn
Becerra	Foster	Markay
Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	McCollum
Blumenauer	Gabbard	McDermott
Bonomici	Garamendi	McGovern
Brady (PA)	Garcia	McNerney
Braley (IA)	Grayson	Meeks
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Meng
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Michaud
Bustos	Gutiérrez	Miller, George
Butterfield	Hahn	Moore
Capps	Hanabusa	Moran
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Nadler
Carney	Herrera Beutler	Napolitano
Carlson (IN)	Higgins	Neal
Cartwright	Himes	Negrete McLeod
Castor (FL)	Holt	Nolan
Castro (TX)	Honda	O'Rourke
Chu	Horsford	Pallone
Cicilline	Hoyer	Pascarell
Clarke	Huffman	Pastor (AZ)
Clay	Israel	Payne
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jeffries	Peters (CA)
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Peters (MI)
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree (ME)
Conyers	Keating	Pocan
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Courtney	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kildee	Quigley
Cummings	Kilmer	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Kind	Rangel
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Reichert
DeFazio	Kuster	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Rush
DelBene	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lewis	Sánchez, Linda
Dingell	Loeb	T. Sanchez, Loretta
Doggett	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Doyle	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Duckworth	Lowey	Schiff
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Schneider
Ellison	(NM)	Schrader
Engel	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schwartz
Enyart	(NM)	

Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Fleishchmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallego  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene

Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez

NOES—235

Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Hinojosa  
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  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson

NOT VOTING—16

Bass  
Bishop (UT)  
Campbell  
Coble

Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte

Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Titus  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

McMorris  
Rodgers

Nunes  
Perlmutter

Smith (WA)  
Young (FL)

□ 1035

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 299, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 202, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

AYES—217

Aderholt	Duffy	Kelly (PA)
Alexander	Duncan (SC)	King (IA)
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Kingston
Bachmann	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Bachus	Farenthold	Kline
Barletta	Fleischmann	Labrador
Barr	Fleming	LaMalfa
Barton	Flores	Lamborn
Benishek	Forbes	Lance
Bentivolio	Fortenberry	Lankford
Billirakis	Foxx	Latham
Black	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Long
Bonner	Garamendi	Lucas
Boustany	Gardner	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Lummis
Bridenstine	Gerlach	Marchant
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Marino
Brooks (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Massie
Broun (GA)	Gohmert	Matheson
Buchanan	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Bucshon	Gowdy	McCaul
Burgess	Granger	McClintock
Calvert	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Camp	Graves (MO)	McKeon
Cantor	Griffin (AR)	McKinley
Capito	Guthrie	Meadows
Carter	Hall	Meehan
Cassidy	Hanna	Messer
Chabot	Harper	Mica
Chaffetz	Harris	Miller (FL)
Coffman	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Collins (GA)	Heck (NV)	Mullin
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Mulvaney
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Cook	Holding	Neugebauer
Cotton	Hudson	Noem
Cramer	Huelskamp	Nugent
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Olson
Culberson	Hunter	Palazzo
Daines	Hurt	Paulsen
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Pearce
Denham	Jenkins	Perry
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Peterson
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Petri
DesJarlais	Jordan	Pittenger
Diaz-Balart	Joyce	Pitts

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

## NOES—202

Amash  
Andrews  
Barber  
Barrow (GA)  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Ciilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garcia  
Gibson  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene

## NOT VOTING—15

Bass  
Bishop (UT)

Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Southerland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton

Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Speier  
Swailwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Farr  
Fincher

Fitzpatrick  
Goodlatte  
Kaptur  
McCarthy (NY)

McMorris  
Rodgers  
Nunes  
Perlmutter

Smith (WA)  
Young (FL)

Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Radel  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rice (SC)

Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)

## NOES—210

Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huiwenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce

Speier  
Swailwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Yoho

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

□ 1040

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I regret that I was detained at the beginning of the vote series on June 28, 2013 during votes on amendments to H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. Had I been present, my intention was to vote “no” on the DeFazio Amendment and “yes” on the Broun amendment. Again, I regret that I was detained.

AMENDMENT NO. 10, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY  
MR. GRAYSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 210, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

## AYES—209

Andrews  
Barber  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Ciilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette

Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Huffman  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries

Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, George

Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)



## NOT VOTING—15

Bass	Fitzpatrick	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Coble	McMorris	Young (FL)
Farr	Rodgers	
Fincher	Napolitano	

□ 1046

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 300—Brown (GA) Amendment 301—Grayson (FL) Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 300 on Brown; “yes” rollcall No. 301 on Grayson.

## AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 241, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

## AYES—176

Andrews	Doggett	Kirkpatrick
Barber	Doyle	Kuster
Beatty	Duckworth	Langevin
Becerra	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Bera (CA)	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Lee (CA)
Blumenauer	Enyart	Lewis
Bonamici	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Esty	Loeb sack
Braley (IA)	Farr	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lowey
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Butterfield	Fudge	(NM)
Capps	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray
Capuano	Garamendi	(NM)
Cárdenas	Garcia	Lynch
Carney	Grayson	Maffei
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	Maloney,
Cartwright	Gutiérrez	Carolyn
Castor (FL)	Hahn	Markey
Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	Matsui
Chu	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Ciilline	Heck (WA)	McDermott
Clarke	Higgins	McGovern
Clay	Himes	McNerney
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Meeks
Clyburn	Holt	Meng
Cohen	Honda	Miller, George
Connolly	Horsford	Moore
Conyers	Hoyer	Moran
Courtney	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Crowley	Israel	Nadler
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Neal
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Negrete McLeod
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Nolan
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
DeGette	Keating	Pallone
Delaney	Kelly (IL)	Pascarell
DeLauro	Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)
DelBene	Kildee	Payne
Deutch	Kilmer	Pelosi
Dingell	Kind	Peters (CA)

Peters (MI)	Schiff	Titus
Pingree (ME)	Schneider	Tonko
Pocan	Schrader	Tsongas
Polis	Schwartz	Van Hollen
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Quigley	Scott, David	Veasey
Rahall	Serrano	Velázquez
Rangel	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky
Roybal-Allard	Shea-Porter	Walz
Ruiz	Sinema	Wasserman
Ruppersberger	Sires	Schultz
Rush	Slaughter	Watt
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Waxman
Sánchez, Linda	Swalwell (CA)	Welch
T.	Takano	Wilson (FL)
Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	
Schakowsky	Tierney	

## NOES—241

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

## NOT VOTING—17

Bachus	Fitzpatrick	Napolitano
Bass	Kaptur	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Levin	Perlmutter
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Coble	McMorris	Smith (WA)
Fincher	Rodgers	Young (FL)

□ 1050

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 302 Capps Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably absent earlier today during rollcall vote 302. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 302, the Capps amendment to H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 274, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end the following:

**TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS****SEC. 01. PROHIBITION ON DRILLING FOR OIL OR GAS UNDERNEATH THE GREAT LAKES.**

Nothing in Act and the amendments made by this Act affects the prohibition on issuance of oil and gas leases for new oil and gas slant, directional, or offshore drilling in or under one or more of the Great Lakes established by section 386 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58; 42 U.S.C. 13368 note).

**SEC. 02. BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT AND PROHIBITION ON OUTSOURCING OF AMERICAN JOBS.**

Each oil and gas leasing program issued pursuant to this Act, and each lease issued pursuant to this Act or such a program, shall encourage each major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that obtains such a lease—

(1) to use only materials made in the United States in drilling operations; and

(2) to avoid outsourcing American jobs.

Mr. FLORES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

I rise to offer this motion to recommend to ensure, first, that one of our Nation's most important natural resources, our Great Lakes basin, is protected from untenable energy exploitation risk; and, second, that as we explore additional ways to boost domestic energy production, we do so with an appropriate emphasis on creating jobs here in America.

Our Great Lakes are truly unique. Within these lakes sit 95 percent of the United States' surface water and 20 percent of the world's surface water. Straddling the United States and Canada, the Great Lakes—Superior, Michigan, Huron, Ontario and Erie—have more than 10,000 miles of coastline, touching eight States: Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York.

Not only a critical source of drinking water, the lakes are integral to the country for transportation, power generation, and recreational opportunity. Over 30 million Americans in cities, towns, and rural communities depend on the Great Lakes for their lives and livelihoods.

In fact, according to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Action Plan, taken as a whole, the Great Lakes region economy would be the second largest economy in the world, second only to that of the United States.

The Great Lakes support an incredible biodiversity, including almost 200 species of native fish and scores of species found nowhere else in the world. In

short, as one of our Nation's greatest treasures, we cannot put the Great Lakes at risk from oil and gas drilling of any kind.

My amendment is quite simple and straightforward. With it, I only seek to ensure that the Great Lakes will remain protected and off-limits from unjustifiable environmental risk. It safeguards Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake Superior, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario from potentially detrimental and irreversible harm and provides necessary protections against potentially irresponsible exploitation of our natural resources.

In my own State, the Great Lakes annually contribute over \$200 billion in economic activity for Illinois. Lake Michigan alone provides drinking water for 7 million Illinois residents. It brings 20 million visitors annually to Illinois, supports 33,000 jobs, and generates \$3.2 billion in economic activity.

As we explore ways for the United States to become more energy independent, we cannot lose sight of the importance of protecting our environment and establishing commonsense rules of where and how we can effectively, safely utilize our natural resources.

Preserving the prohibition on drilling the Great Lakes provides economic security to thousands of businesses, large and small, that depend on the lakes every day for trade, recreation, and tourism. It also protects the health of our communities and the health of our wildlife.

Let me be clear: the underlying legislation, while focusing on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, has other provisions that relate to domestic energy production and may, when implemented, have implications for the Great Lakes.

The bill specifically restricts oil and gas leasing in the eastern Gulf of Mexico and should also include a restriction on new oil and gas leasing in the Great Lakes basin. This clarifying amendment is, therefore, necessary to ensure that our energy policy does not compromise our Great Lakes ecosystem, does not threaten our single greatest fresh water supply, and does not unduly put our Great Lakes basin economy at unwarranted risk.

In addition to protecting the Great Lakes, the amendment I am proposing today would also encourage companies seeking leases to drill for oil and gas found in America to use materials and products made in America.

□ 1100

This additional provision will ensure that U.S. oil and gas resources will benefit American workers, as well as provide new business opportunities for American manufacturers. As we pursue a diversified energy portfolio, we must continue to ensure that America's natural resources benefit the American people and are not unfairly diverted to the benefit of foreign suppliers and foreign workers.

Mr. Speaker, the essential provisions of this amendment will only improve the underlying bill, while protecting Americans' jobs and our environment. I strongly urge my colleagues to support these commonsense changes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FLORES. I rise in strong opposition to this motion. This motion epitomizes what's wrong with Washington Democrats' energy and economic plan.

Let's start with the obvious: the Great Lakes are not part of the Outer Continental Shelf. The second thing is current law already provides for offshore drilling to be done, using America's goods and service wherever practical. So their empty argument doesn't make any sense at all.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, this week offers a true contrast between two visions for how to fuel our economy and to build manufacturing jobs. One vision was laid out by the President earlier this week. While we are currently in the midst of a transformation in the way we produce American energy cleanly, affordably, abundantly, and responsibly through the use of new and improving technology, how does the administration respond? By declaring a war on coal and picking winners and losers in energy production, both of which have been an assault on job creators, especially for American manufacturing.

Even as we've been debating this bill, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have responded by attempting to drown offshore production with more regulations and declarations that make it more difficult to achieve energy independence by 2020, thus, killing tens of thousands of American jobs that could be created.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another vision of how we can energize America through the responsible production of our resources and create American jobs. That vision does not include ill-advised regulations that ignore the effects on the pocketbooks of hardworking American families. It does not include programs where political appointees and bureaucrats can decide who can and cannot produce energy at the expense of hardworking taxpayer dollars. And, most importantly, it does not include administrative attempts to implement a backdoor cap-and-trade regime to fulfill the President's original goal, where "electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket."

This new vision, our vision, builds off what the private sector has done in revolutionizing how oil and can be produced. It takes stock of what laws this Congress has passed and the regulations this administration has promulgated, and then we ask ourselves? What can we do to make America truly energy independent? What can we do to make it easier for the job creators to

actually create jobs that grow healthy American families?

This House is working to achieve this vision now, offering solutions to take advantage of the innovative, job-creating, and cost-reducing energy resurgence that is going on across America to fuel the next generation of American manufacturing. We have passed hydropower bills out of this house. We passed the popular Keystone XL pipeline bill. Today, we will pass a bill for responsible offshore energy production. And this is just the beginning. This House, through the leadership of my good friend from Washington, Chairman DOC HASTINGS, will continue to bring bills through committee and to the House floor that will embrace American resources and that will get the government out of the way of producing them.

By producing American energy, we are just starting. We must harness these same technological advances to achieve even greater economic opportunity and job creation through the distribution of this energy and, most importantly, creating an environment where we can start making things in America again.

We know that the cost of energy is one of the most important factors that determine where plants are built and if jobs are created. So we know that cheaper energy means higher-paying American jobs.

I often see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on this floor with a big sign that says, "Make It in America." We agree. So instead of standing next to a slogan or getting behind the same rhetoric as the President, I urge my colleagues to work toward a vision, a vision of jobs and energy security and a greater standard of living that all Americans are desperately seeking. This is how we really take action for our kids, as compared to the empty rhetoric of the White House.

The American people want us to create results-oriented solutions of what America can do, not the tired liberal rhetoric of what America can't do. We will not sit idly by as the President lays down his vision of new regulations, producing uncertainty for American energy workers and American families that could stamp back our Nation's energy and economic revolution.

Remember the results of the President's last energy plan:

Number one, greatly reduced access to offshore areas and public lands;

Number two, programs like Solyndra, where he "invested" \$26 billion of money from hardworking taxpayers to produce only 2,300 jobs, at a cost of \$11.5 million per job;

Number three, the shutdown of 20 percent of our coal-fired electricity generation and the loss of paychecks for thousands of American families.

His latest energy plan is more of the same types of action that he wants to do to destroy the futures of our kids and grandkids.

Mr. Speaker, we will work toward energy security, and I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit and a "yes" vote on the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 225, answered "present" 1, not voting 13, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 303]

#### AYES—195

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

Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas

Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz

Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

#### NOES—225

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

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Benishak

#### NOT VOTING—13

Bass	Fitzpatrick	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Coble	McMorris	Young (FL)
Fincher	Rodgers	

□ 1114

Mr. PETERSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 186, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

#### AYES—235

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

Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield

Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall

#### NOES—186

Andrews  
Barber  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownlie (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Grayson  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez

Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Markay  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod

Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Levin  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

#### NOT VOTING—13

Bass  
Bishop (UT)  
Campbell  
Coble  
Fincher

Fitzpatrick  
Kaptur  
McCarthy (NY)  
McMorris  
Rodgers

Nunes  
Perlmutter  
Smith (WA)  
Young (FL)

□ 1120

So the bill was passed.

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. 299 on H.R. 2231, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon Amendment No. 8, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 300 on H.R. 2231, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. Broun of Georgia Amendment No. 9, 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. 301 on H.R. 2231, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. Grayson of Florida Amendment No. 10, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 302 on H.R. 2231, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Ms. Capps of California Amendment No. 11, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 303 on H.R. 2231, on Motion to Recommit with Instructions, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 304 on H.R. 2231, on Passage, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALMON). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2231, the clerk is authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 324. An act to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

H.R. 1151. An act to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2383. An act to designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri, and southwestern Illinois as the "Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge".