

the deadliest of all major forms of cancer. It's not easy to hear a woman talk about losing her husband, a sister talk about losing her brother, or even a father talk about losing his daughter.

It's not easy to listen to their stories, but it's important, and here's why: pancreatic cancer is the fourth leading cause of cancer deaths in this country; the 5-year survival rate is just 6 percent; and there are still no early detection tools or lifesaving treatments.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which requires the National Cancer Institute to develop a scientific framework for combating both pancreatic cancer and lung cancer. Unfortunately, the much-needed progress we stand to make is in serious jeopardy. Largely because of sequestration, the National Cancer Institute's budget has been drastically cut.

This is simply unacceptable, and it's yet another reason why I continue to call for a permanent fix to sequestration. The country deserves it; those constituents I met with deserve it; and everyone who has lost a loved one to pancreatic cancer deserves it.

#### The SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we use words like "SNAP," and people don't know what it means. SNAP means Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It's supplemental to what people receive. Nutrition, that's its main purpose, and it just gives assistance.

What we are proposing to vote on is a bill that would cut \$40 billion from SNAP. What it means—and this is something that's very important for us to recognize—is it means children will lose access to things like free school lunches. For some children, that's the best meal of the day that they have. We know hundreds of thousands will lose that.

Mr. Speaker, 1.7 million people, 850,000 households will be reduced by \$90 a month. Think about your own budgets and think about what \$90 will mean for a family that needs assistance. And in addition, this bill will ask disabled people to work 20 hours a week before they can even qualify for supplemental nutrition assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a mean-spirited measure, and Congress should not be defined by that.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 761, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 347

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 761,

the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. It provides one hour of general debate, equally divided between both sides. It provides for five amendments, four of which are Democrat amendments and one is a Republican amendment. So this rule is fair to a fault and it is totally generous, and it will provide a balanced and open debate as long as we, as Members, structure our remarks to the merits of this particular bill and don't go off on tangents.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand before the House and support this rule. It's a good rule.

I also support the underlying bill, H.R. 761, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), as sponsor of this particular piece of legislation, as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for his leadership in this particular effort.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is blessed with an abundance of resources, which has made us a leading world economy and industrial power, and we have only scratched the surface, literally, of what we can potentially develop.

We have energy potential such as coal, oil shale, and natural gas deposits, as well as various critical minerals that we, as a Nation, need and should be developing.

But unfortunately, much of this development of our domestic mineral resources has actually been stymied by a combination of special interest politics, as well as bureaucratic red tape, particularly under this administration. It is a pain we have all seen coming.

Twenty-five years ago, 20 percent of all money that was spent for development and production of critical minerals was spent here in the United States. Today that's down to only 8 percent, as other nations have replaced our efforts, unfortunately.

This has meant an increase in our trade imbalance, dollars going overseas, escalating prices here at home for both energy and commodities. It means job losses here in the United States. And ironically, these jobs that we are losing are some of the highest-paying middle class jobs that are available. Bureaucratic delays are causing this, and they are causing us to see a change, both for manufacturing and defense.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 30 minerals that we actually had to import to this Nation that were considered critical minerals. Today that number has gone from 30 to 61.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 16 minerals that we imported a great majority of. Today that number that has gone to 24.

It affects manufacturing, such as electronics and metal alloys, ceramics, glass, magnets, catalysts, everything. It affects our defense as well, as our Defense Logistics Agency tries to

stockpile these minerals so the demands are there when we actually need them.

Unfortunately, as we've illustrated, more and more of these are being purchased from overseas. They are critical to our weapons development system, including such things as night vision equipment, advanced lasers, avionics, fighter jet components, missile guidance systems, and it goes on and on.

Look, the Constitution tells us that our first responsibility is to provide for a common defense. This bill steps us into the right direction so we actually can provide for a common defense and do it intelligently and avoid unnecessary and frivolous delays.

There are some that will criticize us for the kinds of minerals that we are placing in this restriction area. There was a study in 2009 that was done called the Great California ShakeOut, which was a mock of what could happen if the big earthquake actually hit that area, and it found out that, in an effort to try and rebuild the infrastructure that would be necessary, there's a whole list of things we normally don't consider as critical that would, in that situation, be critical, including sand and gravel, that we simply would have a frightful deficiency of if we were trying to rebuild under those types of critical situations.

This bill anticipates that, and makes sure that we will not be found lacking, either in defense, or in manufacturing, or in critical civilian needs in case of disaster.

This bill doesn't predetermine anything. It simply says, make a decision, yes or no, on whether this project should go forward; simply make a decision, and do it in a timely fashion.

We still, today, average between 7 and 10 years in which those decisions are made. This bill says that that is unrealistic, and it simply says, you've got 30 months—2½ years—to make a decision, yes or no. If you have to have an extension, it provides for that on common agreement, which is only rational to do. But for heaven's sakes, finally make a decision.

It is based on not only what we are talking about here, but it's based on what we are doing in our transportation area. It's based on a Presidential concept; when the President established an Executive Order No. 13604, which talked about the importance of trying to streamline reform and reference our process.

This is the basis of what we are attempting to do in this particular bill as well. This implies that whenever there are agencies, multiple agencies involved in a project, that there must be a lead agency which must take the responsibility of actually getting the job done, so that any kind of environmental statement should be being done currently, not sequentially, that we can make sure that any kind of lawsuit does not stop the process of making a decision.

Once again, this is one of those things that simply is logical. Just

make a decision. You have plenty of time to do it. Make a decision. There is no reason we cannot make a decision on whether to go forward on a project in 2½ years, none, none whatsoever.

The fact that we are dragging our feet is simply done from bureaucratic excess that is illogical and irrational. We have done this in other areas. This is the time to do this in this area as well.

If, indeed, we could do this process, it would be very clear that this Nation would prosper. We could have good-paying jobs, and we could make the desert blossom.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I deem necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the House faces a number of pressing issues that everybody in America knows that we should be addressing. Instead, we are here today on H. Res. 347, a structured rule, and the underlying bill, H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013.

I get it that my friends from areas that have these minerals in public spaces would like for us to proceed apace to extract them. I understand their feelings. I come from yet another of the critical areas of our country that we have to protect much of the space of, and that would be the Everglades.

I don't understand why Congress is trying to provide even more breaks to the United States mining operations when we do have these urgent domestic issues that we are confronted with and, somehow or another, that we were unable to undertake.

We haven't done all of our appropriations. We are having difficulty getting a continuing resolution. We will soon be faced with lifting the debt ceiling. And somehow or another, we are dealing with something that, I might add, we have voted on before, that came out of the House of Representatives, that did not pass the Senate, and H.R. 761 is not going to pass the Senate either.

So H.R. 761 guts important environmental protections offered through the National Environmental Policy Act, referred to as NEPA. It fails to require adequate financial assurance, and I will have an amendment on the floor that will address that subject, and offers other benefits to mining companies.

Mining operations in the United States benefit already from multiple Federal tax breaks, exemptions to regulation under existing environmental laws, and no royalty payments to the United States for mining operations, even on U.S. land.

Mining companies limit their liability for environmental restoration and cleanup by operating with U.S. subsidiaries to foreign parent companies. This relationship shields the parent com-

pany from liability and has allowed parent companies to draw profits from United States mining operations.

So what happens when companies do not pay for environmental damage caused by their operations?

The people of the United States pay. They pay through a contaminated environment. They pay through sickness, including cancer. They pay through taxes, because taxpayer dollars are ultimately needed to clean up these sites.

It would seem that we should have learned from our mistakes with the 1872 General Mining Law. Mining companies should be held accountable so that their operations will not impose additional burdens on the American people.

H.R. 761 not only takes away valued natural resources for hiking, fishing, canoeing and other recreational activities, it shifts the burdens of mining cleanup and restoration to the American taxpayer.

Furthermore, H.R. 761 classifies domestic mining operations for strategic and critical minerals on Federal lands as infrastructure projects. Using a broad definition that encompasses virtually every type of mine, this legislation allows mines to take advantage of a Presidential order from 2012 which requires Federal agencies to streamline the permitting process for infrastructure projects.

However, building a mine is not the same as building roads and highways that are much needed in this country, or replacing rotted sewerage that is much needed in this country, which is, in fact, the country's infrastructure.

Bills like this are why, in my opinion, the American people are so frustrated with us here in the United States Congress. We have a number of issues that we could—no, not that we could, that we should be working on—and, yet, we are rehashing a bill that went nowhere last Congress, ain't gonna go nowhere this Congress and, most importantly, is bad for the Nation.

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

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

I just want to make a couple of comments before we go on with the discussion of this particular rule, which, once again, is a fair rule and is a good rule.

This bill is one of those bills that has no significant cost to the budget. At no time does this stop any of the NEPA requirements. All it says is, do your job and do it on time. Nothing big about that, simply what those regulations are.

And it is obviously one of those things that takes place that we desperately need, both for the manufacturing sector, as well as for defense.

Look, I'm old. I still use legal pads. I trust those. They never crash on me. But if you have an iPhone or an iPad or any of that other kind of new stuff that my kids like to have, you're going to

have these critical minerals. And if we are not proposing and developing them here in the United States, we are paying more to develop them out of country, and we're putting ourselves, manufacturing-wise, in a significant deficit situation. And obviously, with the defense, what is happening is even more critical.

This is simply taking the executive order and saying, yeah, it's good for infrastructure; it's also good for our critical mineral development system, and saying, do the job. Do it well, do it quickly, get it done in a reasonable period of time, and don't drag this stuff out by sequencing the issues and the actions one after the other. You have a period of time. Do your job.

It's an amazing concept of asking the bureaucracy of this Nation to actually do their job, but it's important.

Yes, it was passed in the last session by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. It's a bipartisan bill. The fact that the Senate did not take it up is another indictment to Senate leadership, admittedly, an oxymoron, but it's another indictment for the Senate leadership for ignoring the significant issues that we have to face in this Nation. It's another indictment that they should actually do their job.

Just because the Senate leadership decides to sit on these type of issues does not mean we have to sit on them as well. This is something we have to have, and it needs to go over to the Senate. If it has to go over every week to the Senate until the Senate finally decides to actually do something, then that is our responsibility, and we should do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper characterizations of leadership of the other body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Oregon, (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Great name. We're really good at messaging around here, particularly on the Republican side. It's got a great name: National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013.

Now we've heard just earlier that this is about things that are in critical short supply, vital for our national security and for emergencies.

□ 1245

None of those things are true. They could be a miniscule part of this.

But what this bill does is say that any mining project anywhere on any public lands in the United States of America does not constitute a significant Federal action. No matter how large, no matter how sensitive the area, no matter how proximate to the Grand Canyon and national treasures or how proximate to Yellowstone or

how proximate to some critical watershed, that's not a major Federal action. So it's exempt from NEPA. That's one very big problem with this legislation. I think there's a lot of members of the public even living in very conservative areas of the country who would find that a little bit of overreach.

And then, again, these critical minerals are not critical. Sand and gravel are now critical. Anything is critical that you can find on public land. Any dirt of any sort, you are going to get an expedited process. That's a little bit of overreach.

We're going to have a great amendment by Mr. LOWENTHAL, who will use an actual definition from the National Research Council for strategic and critical minerals. So if this is on the up-and-up, the other side will accept that amendment and we will have these expedited processes, which still cause us some anxiety; but they will only be for truly strategic and critical materials, not everything and anything on any public land.

Secondly, most Americans would be appalled—those who don't already know—to learn that we give away all of the minerals on our public lands: gold, uranium, platinum. No matter what it is, we give it away. We do not charge. Unlike many western States, unlike Native American tribal lands, unlike private lands, unlike most foreign countries, we don't charge a royalty for extracting minerals from our lands, no matter how valuable, no matter how many billions of dollars that that load might be worth of platinum or gold or uranium. No charge. Give it away.

Twice this body has passed, on a bipartisan basis, historically, a modest royalty on the extraction of depletable valuable minerals from Federal lands. I've been very involved in that in the past. In the summer, I went to the Rules Committee when this bill was first going to come up.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. They admit there are no parliamentary issues, no scoring issues. In fact, with my amendment, an 8 percent royalty would raise hundreds of millions of dollars. And those hundreds of millions of dollars would be used to remediate hundreds of thousands of mines in the West that are polluting the environment, polluting our rivers.

I have a foreign company in my district that, yeah, they put up their million-dollar bond. Unfortunately, they left the country, and it's a \$14 million cleanup. The public is going to get stuck with that. It's polluting the river, killing fish, and the taxpayers are going to have to pay for it.

My amendment would have raised the resources necessary to deal with hundreds of thousands of abandoned mines in the western United States

that need remediation and mitigation, but the Republicans were afraid to vote on that amendment.

Some in the West know it's a problem. They didn't want to vote against fixing the problem. Others just say you should run the government like a business, except when it comes to valuable minerals. We want to give them away. We don't really care about the deficit.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. If we defeat the previous question, I'm going to offer an amendment to this rule that will allow the House to hold a vote on the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill will help to boost the economy by encouraging businesses to bring more jobs to America and discourage companies from shipping jobs overseas.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), my good friend.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. HASTINGS.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill before us today, H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013. I just think it goes too far.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and take up this legislation, which we've worked on for a full year now, the Bring Jobs Home Act, a bill which, for the first time, makes sure we promote insourcing of jobs and stop the corporate welfare business for outsourcing jobs.

The underlying legislation would set a dangerous precedent by waiving mining projects from environmental reviews and eliminating public access to the justice system itself. Pushing mining projects through the permitting process is sure to continue to degrade our environment and create workplace situations which are definitely unsafe. But it won't solve the employment problem.

Since that's been injected into the discussion, the legislation will simply allow our Nation's resources to be used to pad the pockets of the same international corporations who ship jobs overseas; and, by the way, that process of shipping jobs overseas is subsidized by the Federal Government. We have for years helped corporations send jobs overseas. What we should be doing is helping them get jobs back to America, particularly since we see an upgrading of the past 16 months in the manufacturing sector of our economy.

With this bill we're going to end the tax breaks that encourage companies to ship their jobs overseas and use that to pay for tax credits for patriotic companies that want to bring jobs back home. Do you want to have real job improvement? This is the way to do it.

Over the last decade we've lost 5.5 million manufacturing jobs—more than during the entire Great Depression. Our trade deficit increased by \$300 billion. During the recession, the manufacturing workforce plummeted to a near 60-year low.

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. More troubling, Mr. Speaker, is that recent studies estimate that one-quarter of American jobs are at risk of being outsourced in the coming years. We're not talking about chump change here. This is a lot of jobs.

So let's defeat this motion so we can actually debate a bill that will end corporate welfare that allows companies to continue to engage in outsourcing and then get a tax cut for doing so. Instead, let's provide incentives that will grow good-paying manufacturing jobs in the USA.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend if he's prepared to close. I have no further speakers at this time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Obviously, I am prepared to close. It depends on how long your closing goes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I can make it go as long as you want it to go.

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

Picking up where Mr. PASCRELL left off, which I wasn't intending to do until my good friend from Utah mentioned the timeframe. Tomorrow, we are going to vote on whether or not to cut \$40 billion from the supplemental nutrition program for people this country. One of the measures included in that is going to be that people can only qualify for 3 months during a specified period of time if they are able-bodied people.

Well, if you vote for the previous question that Mr. PASCRELL offered, there may be some jobs for those people. Otherwise, what we're getting ready to do is put more people in a position of needing the food stamps. And we continue to talk about jobs, but we haven't done anything on the infrastructure.

I predict even if this measure before us today were to become law, which it is not, but if it did by chance become law, we would be lucky if in the course of time we had the kind of jobs and the number of jobs that are desperately needed in this country.

What is wrong with this institution? Don't we understand that we have college kids that are graduating and they can't find a job? We hire kids up here at lower than the minimum wage because they can't find jobs in the private sector. This is crazy.

We can't continue doing nothing when in fact the people are suffering in this great country of ours. We have not only the natural resources that my friends would have us extract from even public lands without paying royalties, but we have the resources as a people to do the things creatively to assist us in bringing jobs here rather than sending them all over the world and causing a diminution of jobs here at home.

Again, for the life of me I don't understand why we are considering this bill today. We're considering virtually every mine on public land, including uranium and coal mines, to operate without adherence to Federal environmental laws, which protect public safety. Our priorities are truly in the wrong place.

As I asked before, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the opportunity we have of presenting this particular rule to the body. I've always appreciated the opportunity of sharing this time with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is a good friend and a very colorful orator. And I always like to hear his orations here on the floor.

You'll forgive me if I want to try and refocus on the matter that it is hand, for, indeed, I recognize the statements that have been made by the last two speakers that deal with the significance of jobs. What we simply have to have is a policy in this country that promotes private sector jobs, not just government sector jobs.

By promoting private sector jobs, we actually expand the economy and build upon that concept. That is one of the reasons why this particular bill is here. But all of a sudden you go from 30 minerals that we had to import from other areas to 61 minerals that we now have to import from abroad. That means there are a bunch of minerals that we used to be producing in good, high-paying jobs that no longer are there.

So this is one of the areas that we can move our country in the proper direction and not just simply say, Okay, let's create some kind of make-work program that actually adds particular jobs. It needs to be the right kind of jobs to move our country forward.

One person once told me the people sitting here is the entire universe with which we talk. We will not make ourselves rich by paying each other to take vacations. At some time, someone has to add real wealth into the equation. That's what this bill is trying to do. We have critical mineral wealth in this country. It needs to be added to the equation so that we can create those good-paying mining jobs that will spin off into good-paying manufacturing jobs in the private sector. That's everything we are attempting to do.

I would like to take one issue and try to put it to rest as to the idea that these companies who would be receiving benefit from this are somehow getting off and not paying taxes or royalties. They are not paying Federal taxes, but sometimes we forget that we're not the only equation out there. Every one of these pays significant royalties and severance taxes to State and local governments.

□ 1300

The Federal tax that is proposed by some of the amendments to this bill would be on top of that. It would be a form of double taxation. Its goal would be to raise money, which is a nice goal, but simply because you found a potential effort for the Federal Government to try and raise more money doesn't mean you need to rush into that, especially when it has a negative aspect somewhere else. It would have a negative aspect on State and local governments. It would also have a negative aspect on those companies that some people don't want to have any empathy for the situation they're in.

If you actually put an additional Federal royalty on top of the State and local royalty which they are paying and the severance tax that you are paying, in a traditional company you could pass that tax burden on to the consumer. In a world market, you cannot. That just doesn't happen. It has to come out from the company itself.

The companies who are involved in here have clearly said that they are not opposed if we could put some kind of net proceeds up. But these kinds of proposals that we will be hearing in the debate today are not net proceeds tax; they are an unparalleled, unprecedented gross tax. Nothing has ever gone to that level in which the amendments would try to put on this program.

So once again, what we're trying to ask you to do is look at this in the overall view of what we are trying to do to develop real and good private sector jobs.

The underlying element still goes back to the fact that, look, what we need is to go through the permitting process but to do it in a way that is legitimate. It should not have to wait 7 to 10 years to actually permit something. That is just unrealistic.

I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I am an old schoolteacher. As a schoolteacher, we had 9 months to do something. If you couldn't get it done in 9 months, you didn't get it done. There was no idea of just postponing it to a future date. If a principal came to me and said we're going to have to have our testing done on Tuesday for the standardized test, I couldn't say no, I can't do that; let's wait for 2 weeks and maybe—maybe—I will be ready to help you with the testing data. In any education system, when the time is up, the time is up. You have to do the work, and you back-schedule to make sure that you actually do the work. That happens in

almost every element of society except for here in government.

When I was in the State legislature, we had a constitutional end of that State legislative date. We had 45 days to make a decision. Often those decisions are not easy and you make the better of the bad choices that you have, but we had to make a decision.

I contrast that with what is happening here in the United States Government in which the Forest Service was asked to do a study on a potential bridge that we could transfer from Federal ownership over to State ownership. They said yes, in about 4 years we would be able to do that study. Four years to do a simple study? We give ourselves these unreasonable and inexcusable time references, and we do it all the time.

I had a bill that we passed a couple of years ago and which mandated that a certain agency of government had to give a piece of property over to the local entity of government. Congress passed it. They mandated it. Now here, 2½ years later, the agency still has not transferred that land. They are going through their surveys. They are taking their time. Even the local government had to pay for all these time-consuming surveys. What Congress mandated, 2 years later, still has not happened. That is unrealistic. In the private sector, no one would tolerate that. In our State government, no one would actually tolerate that. In the education community, no one would tolerate that. Yet we look at that as the norm, 7 to 10 years, as an average, to actually permit these things?

That is why what this bill is trying to do is say, look, go through the process, use the NEPA process, but do it in a fair and rational way and make a decision. You don't drag things out just for the fun of dragging things out. If the decision is yes, fine; if the decision is no, fine; but for heaven's sake, make a decision.

Some elements of government, whom I will not make caricatures about even if it's true, some elements seem to like to drag out decisions. This is an area that should not be. So this simply says, if you're going to deal with this area, you've got 30 months to make a decision. You can do that in 2½ years. There is no reason why it cannot be.

We are doing this in other areas of the government. The President, in his executive order, said this has to be the way we move forward. This bill moves us forward.

This bill does a good thing. It was right that it passed in the last session by a huge bipartisan vote because it's the right thing to do. It's the right message. It's the right program. It moves us forward. It's the right thing to do this year. And we will continue to push this until at some point we have succeeded in making sure that we are moving forward with hard deadlines so that decisions are made and we're not just piddling and piddling and waiting and delaying time after time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill. It was a good bill last time we passed it. It's still a good bill. We need to pass this bill again. It's also a very good rule. It's a fair rule. It's a rule for which we can be proud.

I would urge my colleagues to make sure that we vote for this rule so we can move forward on a bill that should have been passed by both bodies a long time ago. But we need to, once again, start this process and continue going forward because it is the right thing to do. It will provide us with resources; it will provide us with jobs; it will provide us, more importantly, with decisions. Finally, we can actually have an agency that makes a decision in a timely manner.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 347 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 851) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 851 as specified in section 2 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT  
REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 347, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 301.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

YEAS—229

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

NAYS—192

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

Edwards Lee (CA) Rahall  
 Ellison Levin Richmond  
 Engel Lewis Roybal-Allard  
 Enyart Lipinski Ruiz  
 Eshoo Loebsock Ruppertsberger  
 Esty Lofgren Ryan (OH)  
 Farr Lowenthal Sánchez, Linda  
 Fattah Lowey T.  
 Foster Lujan Grisham Sanchez, Loretta  
 Frankel (FL) (NM) Sarbanes  
 Fudge Luján, Ben Ray Schakowsky  
 Gabbard (NM) Schiff  
 Gallego Lynch Schneider  
 Garamendi Maffei Schrader  
 García Maloney, Carolyn Schwartz  
 Grayson Green, Al Scott (VA)  
 Green, Al Matheson Scott, David  
 Green, Gene Serrano Serrano  
 Grijalva Matsui Sewell (AL)  
 Gutiérrez McCollum Shea-Porter  
 Hahn McDermott Sherman  
 Hanabusa McGovern Sinema  
 Hastings (FL) McIntyre Sires  
 Heck (WA) McNeerney Slaughter  
 Higgins Meeks Smith (WA)  
 Himes Meng Speier  
 Hinojosa Michaud Swallow (CA)  
 Holt Miller, George Takano  
 Honda Moore Moran  
 Horsford Hoyer Murphy (FL)  
 Hoyer Hufman Napolitano  
 Huffman Israel Neal  
 Israel Jackson Lee Negrete McLeod  
 Jackson Lee Jeffries Nolan  
 Johnson (GA) O'Rourke  
 Johnson, E. B. Owens  
 Kaptur Pallone Veasey  
 Keating Pascrell Vela  
 Kelly (IL) Pastor (AZ)  
 Kennedy Payne  
 Kildee Pelosi  
 Kilmer Peters (CA)  
 Kind Peters (MI)  
 Kirkpatrick Peterson  
 Kuster Pingree (ME)  
 Langevin Pocan  
 Larsen (WA) Price (NC)  
 Larson (CT) Quigley

NOT VOTING—11

Courtney Miller, Gary  
 Diaz-Balart Nader  
 Herrera Beutler Perlmutter  
 McCarthy (NY) Polis

□ 1338

Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BARBER, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. VEASEY, CUELLAR, and Ms. LOFGREN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 231, noes 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—231

Aderholt Benishek Brooks (AL)  
 Alexander Bentivolio Brooks (IN)  
 Amash Bilirakis Broun (GA)  
 Amodei Bishop (UT) Buchanan  
 Bachmann Black Buschon  
 Bachus Blackburn Burgess  
 Barletta Boustany Calvert  
 Barr Brady (TX) Camp  
 Barton Bridenstine Campbell

Cantor Hurt Renacci  
 Capito Issa Ribble  
 Carter Rice (SC) Jenkens  
 Chabot Johnson (OH) Rigell  
 Chaffetz Johnson, Sam Roby  
 Coble Jones Roe (TN)  
 Coffman Jordan Rogers (AL)  
 Cole Joyce Rogers (KY)  
 Collins (GA) Kelly (PA) Rogers (MI)  
 Collins (NY) King (IA) Rohrabacher  
 Conaway King (NY) Kingston  
 Cook Kingston Rokita  
 Cotton Kinzinger (IL) Rooney  
 Cramer Kline Ros-Lehtinen  
 Crawford Labrador Roskam  
 Crenshaw LaMalfa Ross  
 Culberson Lamborn Rothfus  
 Daines Lance Royce  
 Davis, Rodney Lankford Runyan  
 Denham Latham Ryan (WI)  
 Dent Latta Salmon  
 DeSantis LoBiondo Sanford  
 DesJarlais Long Scalise  
 Duffy Lucas Schock  
 Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer Schweikert  
 Duncan (TN) Lummis Scott, Austin  
 Ellmers Marchant Sensenbrenner  
 Farenthold Marino Sessions  
 Fincher Fincher Shimkus  
 Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick Shuster  
 Fleischmann Fleischmann Simpson  
 Fleming Fleming Smith (MO)  
 Flores Flores Smith (NE)  
 Forbes Forbes Smith (NJ)  
 Fortenberry Fortenberry Smith (TX)  
 Foxx Foyx Southerland  
 Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ) Stewart  
 Frelinghuysen Rodgers Stivers  
 Gardner Meadows Stockman  
 Garrett Meehan Stutzman  
 Gerlach Gerlach Terry  
 Gibbs Mica Thompson (PA)  
 Gibson Miller (FL) Tiberi  
 Gingrey (GA) Miller (MI) Thornberry  
 Gohmert Mullin Tipton  
 Goodlatte Mulvaney Turner  
 Gosar Murphy (PA) Upton  
 Gowdy Neugebauer Valadao  
 Granger Noem Wagner  
 Graves (GA) Nolan Walberg  
 Graves (MO) Nugent Walden  
 Griffin (AR) Nunes Walorski  
 Griffith (VA) Nunnelee Weber (TX)  
 Grimm Olson Webster (FL)  
 Guthrie Owens Westrup  
 Hall Palazzo Whitfield  
 Hanna Paulsen Pearce  
 Harper Harper Perry  
 Harris Hartzler Petri  
 Hartzler Hastings (WA) Pittenger  
 Heck (NV) Heck (NV) Pitts  
 Hensarling Hensarling Poe (TX)  
 Holding Holding Pompeo  
 Hudson Hudson Posey  
 Huelskamp Huelskamp Price (GA)  
 Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI) Radel  
 Hultgren Hultgren Reed  
 Hunter Hunter Reichert

NOES—190

Andrews Cleaver Esty  
 Barber Clyburn Farr  
 Barrow (GA) Cohen Fattah  
 Bass Connolly Foster  
 Beatty Conyers Frankel (FL)  
 Becerra Cooper Fudge  
 Bera (CA) Costa Gabbard  
 Bishop (GA) Courtney Gallego  
 Bishop (NY) Bishop (NY) Garamendi  
 Blumenauer Cuellar Garcia  
 Bonamici Cummings Grayson  
 Brady (PA) Brady (PA) Green, Al  
 Braley (IA) Braley (IA) Green, Gene  
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL) Grijalva  
 Brownley (CA) Brownley (CA) DeFazio  
 Bustos Bustos DeGette  
 Butterfield Butterfield Delaney  
 Capps Capuano DeLauro  
 Capuano DelBene Hanabusa  
 Carney DeFazio Hastings (FL)  
 Carson (IN) Carson (IN) Heck (WA)  
 Cartwright Cartwright Deutch  
 Castor (FL) Castor (TX) Dingell  
 Castro (TX) Chu Doggett  
 Chu Doyle  
 Cicilline Cicilline Duckworth  
 Clarke Enyart Edwards  
 Clay Eshoo Ellison Hoyer  
 Engle Engle Huffman  
 Enyart Enyart Israel  
 Eshoo Eshoo Jackson Lee

Jeffries	McNerney	Schiff	Cantor	Grayson	McGovern	Serrano	Terry	Walorski
Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Schneider	Capito	Green, Al	McHenry	Sessions	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Johnson, E. B.	Meng	Schrader	Capps	Green, Gene	McIntyre	Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Kaptur	Michaud	Schwartz	Capuano	Griffin (AR)	McKeon	Shea-Porter	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
Keating	Miller, George	Scott (VA)	Cárdenas	Griffith (VA)	McKinley	Sherman	Thornberry	Waters
Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott, David	Carney	Grijalva	McMorris	Shimkus	Tiberi	Watt
Kennedy	Moran	Serrano	Carson (IN)	Grimm	Rodgers	Shuster	Tierney	Waxman
Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)	Carter	Guthrie	McNerney	Simpson	Tipton	Weber (TX)
Kilmer	Nadler	Shea-Porter	Cartwright	Gutiérrez	Meadows	Sinema	Titus	Webster (FL)
Kind	Napolitano	Sherman	Castor (FL)	Hahn	Meehan	Sires	Tonko	Welch
Kirkpatrick	Neal	Sinema	Castro (TX)	Hall	Meeks	Slaughter	Tsongas	Wenstrup
Kuster	Negrete McLeod	Sires	Chabot	Hanabusa	Meng	Smith (MO)	Turner	Whitfield
Langevin	O'Rourke	Slaughter	Chaffetz	Hanna	Messer	Smith (NE)	Upton	Williams
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Chu	Harper	Mica	Smith (NJ)	Valadao	Wilson (FL)
Larsen (CT)	Pascarell	Speier	Cicilline	Harris	Michaud	Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Wilson (SC)
Lee (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Swalwell (CA)	Clarke	Hartzler	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)	Vargas	Wittman
Levin	Payne	Takano	Clay	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Southerland	Veasey	Wolf
Lewis	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	Cleaver	Hastings (WA)	Moore	Speier	Vela	Womack
Lipinski	Peters (CA)	Thompson (MS)	Clyburn	Heck (NV)	Moran	Stewart	Velázquez	Yarmuth
Loeb sack	Peters (MI)	Tierney	Coble	Heck (WA)	Mulvaney	Stivers	Visclosky	Yoder
Lofgren	Peterson	Titus	Coffman	Hensarling	Murphy (FL)	Stockman	Wagner	Young (AK)
Lowenthal	Pingree (ME)	Tonko	Cohen	Higgins	Murphy (PA)	Swalwell (CA)	Walberg	Young (FL)
Lowey	Pocan	Tsongas	Cole	Himes	Nadler	Takano	Walden	Young (IN)
Luján Grisham	Price (NC)	Van Hollen	Collins (NY)	Hinojosa	Napolitano			
(NM)	Quigley	Vargas	Conaway	Holdings	Neal			
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rahall	Veasey	Connolly	Holt	Negrete McLeod			
(NM)	Rangel	Vela	Conyers	Honda	Noem			
Lynch	Richmond	Velázquez	Cook	Horsford	Nolan			
Maffei	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky	Cooper	Hoyer	Nugent			
Maloney,	Ruiz	Walz	Costa	Huelskamp	Nunes			
Carolyn	Ruppersberger	Wasserman	Cotton	Huffman	Nunnelee			
Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Schultz	Courtney	Huizenga (MI)	Olson			
Matheson	Sánchez, Linda	Watt	Cramer	Hultgren	Owens			
Matsui	T.	Waxman	Crawford	Hunter	Palazzo			
McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch	Crenshaw	Hurt	Pallone			
McDermott	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)	Crowley	Israel	Pascarell			
McGovern	Schakowsky	Yarmuth	Cuellar	Issa	Pastor (AZ)			
			Culberson	Jackson Lee	Paulsen			
			Cummings	Jeffries	Payne			
			Daines	Jenkins	Pearce			
			Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi			
			Davis, Danny	Johnson (OH)	Perry			
			Davis, Rodney	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)			
			DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Peters (MI)			
			DeGette	Jordan	Peterson			
			Delaney	Joyce	Petri			
			DeLauro	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)			
			DelBene	Keating	Pittenger			
			Denham	Kelly (IL)	Pitts			
			Dent	Kelly (PA)	Pocan			
			DeSantis	Kennedy	Poe (TX)			
			DesJarlais	Kildee	Pompeo			
			Deutch	Kilmer	Price (GA)			
			Dingell	Kind	Price (NC)			
			Doggett	King (NY)	Quigley			
			Doyle	Kingston	Radel			
			Duckworth	Kinzinger (IL)	Rahall			
			Duffy	Kirkpatrick	Rangel			
			Duncan (SC)	Kline	Reed			
			Duncan (TN)	Kuster	Reichert			
			Edwards	Labrador	Renacci			
			Ellison	LaMalfa	Richmond			
			Ellmers	Lamborn	Rigell			
			Engel	Lance	Roby			
			Enyart	Langevin	Roe (TN)			
			Eshoo	Lankford	Rogers (AL)			
			Esty	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)			
			Farenthold	Larson (CT)	Rogers (MI)			
			Farr	Latham	Rohrabacher			
			Fattah	Latta	Rokita			
			Fincher	Lee (CA)	Rooney			
			Fitzpatrick	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Fleischmann	Lewis	Roskam			
			Fleming	Lipinski	Ross			
			Flores	LoBiondo	Rothfus			
			Forbes	Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard			
			Fortenberry	Lofgren	Royce			
			Foster	Long	Ruiz			
			Fox	Lowenthal	Runyan			
			Frankel (FL)	Lowe	Ruppersberger			
			Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Ryan (OH)			
			Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)			
			Fudge	Lujan Grisham	Salmon			
			Gabbard	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda			
			Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray	T.			
			Garamendi	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta			
			Garcia	Lynch	Sarbanes			
			Gardner	Maffei	Scalise			
			Garrett	Maloney	Schakowsky			
			Gerlach	Carolin	Schiff			
			Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Schneider			
			Gibson	Marchant	Schock			
			Gingrey (GA)	Marino	Schrader			
			Gohmert	Matheson	Schwartz			
			Goodlatte	Matsui	Schweikert			
			Gosar	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (VA)			
			Govdy	McCaul	Scott, Austin			
			Granger	McCollum	Scott, David			
			Graves (MO)	McDermott	Sensenbrenner			

## NOT VOTING—11

Cárdenas Himes Polis  
Cassidy McCarthy (NY) Rush  
Diaz-Balart Miller, Gary Waters  
Herrera Beutler Perlmutter

## □ 1345

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL ENVOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 301) to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 22, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—402

Aderholt	Benishek	Braleigh (IA)
Alexander	Bentivolio	Bridenstine
Amodel	Bera (CA)	Brooks (AL)
Andrews	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Brownley (CA)
Barber	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Barletta	Black	Bucshon
Barr	Blackburn	Burgess
Barrow (GA)	Blumenauer	Bustos
Barton	Bonamici	Butterfield
Bass	Boustany	Calvert
Beatty	Brady (PA)	Camp
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Campbell

## NAYS—22

Amash	Massie	Rice (SC)
Broun (GA)	McClintock	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Hudson	Neugebauer	Woodall
Jones	O'Rourke	Yoho
King (IA)	Posey	
Lummis	Ribble	

## NOT VOTING—8

Cassidy	McCarthy (NY)	Polis
Diaz-Balart	Miller, Gary	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter	

## □ 1353

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

## 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. 761.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 347 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 761.

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

## □ 1355

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, with Mr. FORTENBERRY in the chair.