



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 2014

No. 100

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 25, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER PRIDE MONTH

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today in celebration of LGBT Pride Month because this year my friends in the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community have more to celebrate than ever.

America was founded on the principle that we are all created equal, but for decades the struggle for LGBT equality seemed like a distant dream. Just 45 years ago, in June of 1969, a series of

police actions against the gay community sparked the stonewall riots, one of the most pivotal moments in the fight for LGBT equality.

What began as a moment is now a movement, bringing LGBT Americans together with allies to fight for the rights they deserve but are too often denied. Back then, the movement moved slowly but surely, making inroads neighborhood by neighborhood, city by city. Now I am proud to say the equality movement is moving State by State, picking up steam across the country with no signs of slowing down.

It seems like almost every other month a new State is reaffirming the rights of its gay and lesbian citizens to marry whom they love, regardless of gender. In fact, last November, my home State of Illinois became the 16th State to legalize same-sex marriage. I have to smile when I think that, just 2 months prior, I was officiating symbolic marriages at a festival in Chicago to draw awareness to the cause. What a difference a few months can make.

Currently, gay and lesbian Americans have achieved marriage equality in 18 States and the District of Columbia, and America is stronger for it. Even the Supreme Court has recognized the march toward equality is inevitable, striking down the antiquated Defense of Marriage Act last year.

For too long, DOMA denied same-sex couples the Federal benefits they earned and deserved. Thankfully, the Supreme Court saw this discriminatory law for what it was and tossed it into the ash heap of history. Now LGBT couples are able to file taxes jointly and take advantage of tax breaks that were once limited to heterosexual couples. Now the brave men and women who serve in our Armed Forces can use the veterans benefits they have earned for their same-sex partners. Now binational couples who once lived every day under a cloud of uncertainty are able to sponsor their partners for green

cards and are treated equally under the immigration laws.

What once was one a dream is now our reality. As I said, Madam Speaker, there is more to celebrate this Pride Month than ever before. This weekend, thousands will celebrate how far we have come at the 45th annual Chicago Pride Parade. I will be proud to join the celebration, as I have every year since 1982, and recommit to the work that lies ahead to reach full LGBT equality.

I look forward to one day soon when the Supreme Court extends marriage rights to all citizens once and for all so that no American is denied equality because of the State they live in, a day in which Congress passes the employment nondiscrimination act here in the House so that no American can be fired simply because of whom they love, a day in which LGBT Americans are allowed to visit their loved ones in the hospital and have access to every Federal benefit that is available to all other Americans, a day in which we ensure LGBT youth are protected from harassment and bullying, and a day in which healthy gay and bisexual men are no longer barred from donating lifesaving blood to patients in need.

It is a day that is coming soon; there is no doubt about that. Until then, we must find the courage to keep marching, fighting, and believing that one day America will be a Nation that fulfills its promise of liberty and justice for all.

NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, yesterday the United States Fish and Wildlife Service announced it will extend the deadline on its decision whether to list the northern long-eared bat as endangered under

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H5727

the Endangered Species Act in order to further review public comments on the proposal. The announcement comes in response to a letter initiated by members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation outlining the lack of sufficient data used to support the designation and cautioning that moving forward with the listing would constitute a fundamentally ineffective approach to species restoration while severely harming the economy.

The Service initially cited the effects of the white-nose syndrome as the lone basis for its proposed endangered listing. Although the disease is impacting the long-eared bat in areas of 38 States, the Service has acknowledged that the economic activities that would be most affected by the proposed listing have little impact on the population numbers or the decline of the species.

Madam Speaker, this extension will allow for a fresh look at the sufficiency and the accuracy of the data and, with any hope, will allow the Service to consider a better alternative or more effective approach to combat the white-nose syndrome.

CRAFT AN IMMIGRATION POLICY

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, I came to the floor on April 2 to tell my Republican colleagues that they had 3 months to craft an immigration policy before the July Fourth recess. At the time, there was still hope that sensible Republicans would see that their existence as a national party depended on getting the immigration issue resolved. I came back to this well almost every week to remind my Republican colleagues that time was running out. With the Nation gripped by World Cup fever, let me give you a visual representation of my message for the last 3 months.

I gave Republicans a yellow card to put them on warning if they failed to act on immigration. If they failed to act, they would be out of the game. Having met with the President in March, I knew he was prepared to give Republicans time to craft an immigration reform bill, but if they failed to take action, I knew the President intended to use his pen and pad to save families at risk of being deported.

Let's review where we stand 3 months after I gave you the first warning.

A year ago this Friday marks the 1-year anniversary of passage of the bipartisan Senate immigration reform bill that passed with 68 votes in the Senate. We had our own group of 8 here in the House crafting a tough but fair immigration compromise, but politics slowed us down and the effort collapsed. Some leaders in the Republican Party, knowing that immigration reform is the only way to achieve border security and workplace verification like E-Verify, legal immigration to feed our economy, and compassion and

justice for how we treat our immigrant neighbors and friends, some in the Republican Party kept trying, and I thank them.

On my side of the aisle, we kept an open mind. When the Speaker of the House said no to the Senate bill, I said, okay, let's find a way to craft a House bill. When Republicans said no to a conference, I said we will find a way to make it work if that is what needs to be done.

Piecemeal bills they said, not a comprehensive bill. I said we will work with you. No direct path to citizenship for most immigrants, well, we didn't like it, but we kept talking. No one tried harder than I did to keep the two parties talking about how to move forward on immigration.

There are Members of the House Republican Conference who need immigration reform politically, others who want it because it restores law and order, and others for reasons deeply grounded in their conservative philosophy. Still others in the Republican Conference are fighting for reform out of a sense of compassion and doing the right thing, as my friend Mr. DIAZ-BALART from Florida has.

But months passed and Republicans turned their backs on their own members, turned their backs on the American people, turned their backs on the business community, on Latino and Asian voters, and on those trying to save the Republican Party from itself.

You know, Madam Speaker, I kept hoping the better angels in the Republican Party would tamp down the irrational and angry angels blocking reform the American people want and deserve.

And then the last straw. As violence and poverty and gangs drive families out of Central America, I see Republican Members of Congress and their allies in talk radio and TV taking advantage of a humanitarian crisis to score cheap political points. In a few hours, the Judiciary Committee, which has done nothing to help move the Republican Party and the Congress forward on immigration, will hold a hearing on what it calls "Administration-Made Disaster at U.S.-Mexico Border."

I gave you the warning 3 months ago and now I have no other choice. You are done. You are done. Leave the field. Too many flagrant offenses and unfair attacks and too little action. You are out. Hit the showers. It is the red card.

First of all, your chance to play a role in how immigration and deportation policies are carried out this year is over. Having been given ample time and space to craft legislation, you failed. The President now has no other choice but to act within existing law to ensure that our deportation policies are humane, that due process rights are protected, that detention conditions are as they should be, and, most importantly, that the people who we are deporting are detriments to our communities, not assets to our families, economy, and society.

I think we all know that you are out when it comes to the White House. By taking no action, even after repeated warnings, you have decided it is up to the Democrats to pick the Supreme Court Justices, conduct foreign policy, and carry out all the functions of the executive branch for a generation, for the next 30 years. The Republican Presidential nominee, whoever he or she may be, will enter the race with an electoral college deficit they cannot make up.

Republicans in the House simply have no answer when it comes to immigration reform, and Republicans have failed America and failed themselves. Madam Speaker, it is now time for the President to act.

A CALL TO ACTION AGAINST BULLYING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIMM. Madam Speaker, I rise, unfortunately, today to call attention to a growing epidemic that is plaguing families across our country, and particularly in my district in Staten Island and Brooklyn.

This week the New York Post and the Staten Island Advance mentioned a story of an 11-year-old student, Cyon Williams. Cyon's struggle is with unaddressed bullying, which drove him to contemplate violence and suicide. Think about that, an 11-year-old boy contemplating violence and suicide.

Just a few weeks ago, I met with this bright and very impressive young man along with his mother at their home. I have to tell you it was an absolutely heartbreaking story to see this very mild-mannered, very nice, polite, respectful young man tell me a heartbreaking story of how he is terrified to go to school every day, but yet he is yearning to read and to learn.

□ 1015

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, Cyon is far from alone. There is an example of a tragic suicide of a 15-year-old Tottenville student back in 2012, and that suicide proves all too well that this epidemic is continuing.

In her memory and the memory of countless innocent children victimized by bullying, it is time that we all say enough is enough. We must demand accountability from those charged with addressing bullying in our schools, especially in New York City, where one in five public school students are victimized by abusive peers.

I am calling on all of my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1199, the Safe Schools Improvement Act. This would require all public schools to establish policies to combat bullying.

We owe it to all of our young adults to demand safe learning environments, where they can grow and develop in a peaceful environment.

VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, how do we all get here? How do we get to be one of 435 people in the United States Congress, a great honor that it is to serve in this Congress?

Madam Speaker, we all get here because people vote for us, the American public votes. It is the essence of a democracy. That is what makes this country great. That is why we have sent soldiers to Iraq and other places, to try to give other people democracy and have people vote.

Forty-nine years ago, this Congress passed the Voting Rights Act. JOHN LEWIS, a Member of this Congress now, marched in Selma, Alabama, and was beaten by troopers to get the right to vote.

Even before that, students went to Mississippi and throughout the South—which was called the Mississippi Freedom Summer—to register people to vote and had to fight to give African Americans the opportunity to vote.

Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman were killed in Mississippi. They were Mississippi Freedom Summer fighters. I met with Andy Goodman's—who was murdered down there—brother yesterday because a year ago, almost to the day, if not to the day, the Supreme Court, in *Shelby v. Holder*, ruled part of the Voting Rights Act unconstitutional. Our Chief Justice said it is no longer needed.

Well, he was wrong. It is needed. Everyone should be entitled to vote. There are issues about States, right now, denying people the right to vote—voter ID, Madam Speaker, long lines, ending early voting, different problems being placed before people to stop them from voting, that is anti-American, yet it is occurring in this country right now.

There is a Voting Rights Amendment Act proposed, right now bipartisan, but limited bipartisan. Mr. SENSENBRENNER and a few other Republicans—I can count them on both my hands—are cosponsors, along with Democrats, to pass a law that would require preclearance in States that have shown by actions—indeed, discriminatory practices—that would inhibit the right to vote and stop it before it becomes discrimination, but we have got just a paucity of Republican support.

I haven't been a sponsor of that act because the decision was we wanted to be bipartisan, and for a Democrat to be a sponsor, they had to bring a Republican along.

I went over here, Madam Speaker, and I talked to at least 15 different Republicans and asked them to be a cosponsor because I thought they should have been a cosponsor because I wanted to be a cosponsor, and I had to bring somebody with me.

It would have been easier to go to the South Pacific and find that airplane in the ocean than to find another cospon-

sor over here, so today, it is being opened up for Democrats to show that they want to be for voting rights. I will be added as a cosponsor today, and many, many, many other Democrats will be too. Madam Speaker, every Republican should join as well.

This is American as apple pie, to have a Voting Rights Act that gives the courts—the Justice Department—the right to go and have preclearance and stop discrimination before it occurs.

The Voting Rights Act amendment would create a new coverage formula to identify those States and localities with a recent history of discriminatory voting laws and practices that are still at high risk for continuing voting discrimination.

It would enhance the authority of courts to order a preclearance remedy, require greater transparency regarding voting changes, and clarifies the Attorney General's authority to send Federal observers to monitor elections in jurisdictions subject to preclearance requirements.

Those changes that the Voting Rights Amendment Act would make to current law would help prevent voting practices that are likely to be discriminatory before they have a chance to cause harm.

The House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and particularly the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, of which I am the ranking member, should have hearings immediately and pass this act now.

Forty-nine years ago, this Chamber historically passed voting rights, and now, we can't pass an amendment. In 2006, the House voted to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act by a vote of 390–33, which meant, on both sides of the aisle, great majorities were for it, but now that the Supreme Court has struck it down and said we need to modernize it by finding States in localities that are currently exercising discriminatory practices, we can't come up with a formula because, politically, it would harm, theoretically, one side more than the other.

Just as Mr. GUTIÉRREZ spoke earlier about immigration and how that is going to affect the Republican Party in the future elections, voting rights will affect them too, and it won't affect them positively because, if the party becomes a party that is against people of color and giving them the American right to vote, as well as opportunities for sound and logical immigration practices, which this country needs for labor, it will be a minority party forever.

I am not here to lecture the Republicans about what they can do to help themselves politically. I am saying what they can do to make America more America. Pass the voting rights amendment.

LINSLEY SCHOOL 200TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 200th anniversary of the Linsly School in Wheeling.

Established in 1814, Linsly is a preparatory school committed to academic excellence and character development. The Linsly School was the first of its kind west of the Allegheny Mountains.

The school's founder, Noah Linsly, was born in Connecticut in 1772. With a law degree from Yale, he began his career at his alma mater. However, recognizing opportunity in this frontier town of Wheeling, Noah Linsly moved there in 1799 and, valuing the need for education, established a school for children.

At the time of Linsly's founding, Napoleon Bonaparte was still causing havoc in Europe. James Madison, the fourth President of the United States, was President; and the British troops had captured and burned Washington, D.C.

200 years ago, there were no phones, no cars, no buses, no trains, just a lawyer with a vision who moved to a small town on the frontier and donated all his belongings to help children get an education.

Reno DiOrio, Linsly's current president for external affairs, said it best when he said:

When one considers everything that has happened to our country and to our local community in the time period of 200 years—the Civil War, two world wars, the Great Depression, major floods in the valley, the civil rights movement—we are proud that Linsly has been able to adapt with the times, to persevere and overcome challenges, and to remain committed to its founding principles.

Linsly's motto—"Forward and no retreat"—has been reflected in their emphasis that the greatest accomplishment is not in ever failing, but in rising again after you fall. With this motto, Linsly has continued to believe that children should be challenged and pressed without the possibility that they will quit.

From the fourth President to the 44th President of the United States, Linsly not only has survived, but has thrived. Among its graduates are Federal judges, business leaders, professional athletes, authors, Congressmen, and college presidents, among others.

This little school in Wheeling—this little school in Wheeling, not Boston or Philadelphia—is the 25th oldest boarding school in the United States of America, and its reputation is spread internationally. Now in its 200th year, Linsly is welcoming students from 15 States and 12 foreign nations.

As one of Linsly's greatest benefactors once stated:

Linsly will, in years to come, influence the lives of hundreds of young people who will go forward to serve their fellow men.

After 200 years, Linsly has already influenced the lives of hundreds of young people, and now, it is ready for another 200.

Madam Speaker, I ask that we honor this momentous and heartfelt anniversary for a program at Linsly. Happy 200th birthday, Linsly School.

IRAQ CANNOT BE LOST OR WON

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, over 60 years ago, the United States President sent advisers to a nation in Asia. He did so because a regime that was perceived as friendly to U.S. interests, but which was, in fact, deeply corrupt and rotten, was threatened.

He promised that those advisers would not engage in combat, that they were there to protect American military equipment. Years later, with 60,000 dead Americans and billions and billions of dollars expended, the helicopters lifted off from Saigon, and the Vietnamese regime fell.

Today, another U.S. President is sending advisers to a nation in Asia and contemplating air strikes in a three-way civil war in Iraq. This President is doing it purportedly to preserve a nation which was the creation, as Secretary Albright says, of British and French diplomats lying to each other almost a hundred years ago.

It is a Nation which, while we have paid gravely in blood and treasure to preserve, may not have the support of its own people.

As usual, politics are intruding. The architects of the Iraq war under George W. Bush see the possibility of redemption for their mistakes, so unbelievably, they are accusing this President of losing Iraq.

Let's be very clear: Iraq cannot be lost or won. A brutal dictator or the United States military can sit on top of conflicts between Sunni and Shiite and Saxon tribes that have roiled that society for centuries, but remove that dictator or remove the U.S. military, and those conflicts will reemerge.

At the end of the day, it is Iraqis and Iraqis alone who have to decide whether their Nation will be preserved, whether there will be multiple countries reflecting multiple fates, or whether there will be one pluralistic nation. Whether they will live in the 21st century, the 7th century, a caliphate, what kind of nation they will have is up for them to determine.

There is an argument, of course, that ISIS—the terrorists who have made such astounding gains in regions of Iraq—are bad and brutal people. This is true. I sit on the Intelligence Committee and see, every day, the outrages that they perpetrate.

They have made two mistakes: one, their brutality will ultimately be their undoing with their own people; and, second, they are now occupying territory—this means that they have addresses.

Just as there are terrorists in Nigeria, in Somalia, in Libya, in Lebanon, in Syria, in Iraq, in Iran, in Egypt, and Morocco—the list goes on—there are terrorists in the Sunni areas of Iraq, but the answer cannot be that the United States military will be there to prevent them from doing what they would wish to do.

Our interests—let's be clear about what our interests are—it must first and foremost be up to the citizens of those nations that I just listed to determine what sort of society they will live in. We cannot do it for them, and when we try, it does not end well.

We must say to these nations that: if you work to craft an inclusive society respecting your minorities, respecting the rights of the individual and of women in particular, if you abide by international norms, we will be at your side. We did this 240 years ago, and we know a little something about how one might do it, and if not, we will not be at your side.

Number two, our interest is to say to them that: if, in the birthing pains of your new societies, you nurture or support or in any way assist those terrorists that would target us or that would target our ally Israel or would target other civilized nations, we will find them, we will fix them, and we will take them off the battlefield, as we are doing around the world today.

□ 1030

Those are our national interests. Those goals are worth our time, our treasure, and our talent. Coaching a team in a three-way civil war is not.

Colleagues, let us not expend one more dollar or one more life on military activity that is not in the clear service of our essential national interests.

VIOLENCE AGAINST MUSLIMS IN SRI LANKA

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

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to condemn in the strongest terms the ongoing violence against the minority Muslim population in Sri Lanka.

Last week, Buddhist mobs rampaged their way through three towns, attacking Muslim homes and businesses, burning many to the ground. As one victim said:

The house I own was burned down. My family has nowhere to go.

Another victim describes every night following another attack as being a “nightmare,” with her family cowering in fear of the next attack.

The Sri Lankan government has not done enough to deal with the threat of the so-called Buddhist Power Force, the group responsible for this violence. When the Sri Lankan police were called in to stop the violence, reportedly, many just stood on the sidelines doing nothing.

Madam Speaker, the Sri Lankan government must take a stronger stance against this violence and protect its minority Muslim population. While promises have been made to rebuild houses and shops, it is unacceptable that this minority continues to live in fear.

REMEMBERING SUE KINT

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, today, we pay our respects to Sue Kint, a longtime friend of many in the community of Buena Park, California, who recently passed away after battling what began as lung cancer.

Sue Kint's remarkable story has humble beginnings. Born to Korean parents in Japan, Sue later moved to South Korea as a young girl, where she attended Ewha Womans University in Seoul, Korea. She later moved to the United States to complete her bachelor's degree at California State University of Los Angeles, majoring in finance and law.

Ms. Kint was the founder and CEO of Kint & Associates, a successful international consulting and trading company. Through her exceptional work and dedication, she was recognized as one of 2,000 notable American women.

Among her other notable accomplishments, Sue served on the Chapman University board of governors and was recently awarded an honorary doctor of the university degree. She also served on the Orange County chapter of the National Unification Advisory Council as an appointee of former South Korean President Lee Myung-bak and current President Park Geun-hye. She was a valuable asset on my Asia Pacific Community Advisory Council, and was known as an exemplary woman who cared deeply about excellence in education and what could be done in education and opportunities for the next generation.

In her fight with cancer, she maintained a spirit of courage, dignity, and grace. Her strong will and desire to live a fulfilling life has encouraged others to do the same. She will be truly missed by her brother, Kevin, all of her friends, and all the lives she has touched. She will be remembered as her spirit lives on.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

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

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, one of the greatest legislative achievements in the history of our country.

There were so many men and women who were a part of the civil rights movement, but I would like to take this time to highlight one of them who has been especially important in my life, and that is my father, who was a civil rights lawyer and who wrote much of the enforcement language behind the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was one of the greatest achievements

in human rights in our Nation's history.

Like me, my father was trained as a scientist. During World War II, he designed fire-control computers for the Navy. Most of the way through the war, he started getting reports about how many people had been killed this week by his team's equipment. Despite his understanding of the justice of that war, he became deeply unhappy with the idea of his technical skills being used to hurt other human beings.

So when he came back from the war, he thought about it for a while and decided that he wanted to spend part of his life in service to his fellow man. This was the late 1940s and 1950s and the birth of the civil rights movement.

My father grew up in the South, where he saw firsthand the struggles for equality and basic human rights. He saw civil rights as the great cause of his generation. So he left behind his career in science and became a civil rights lawyer.

My father, among other things, wrote the Federal regulations for implementing school desegregation under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

There were 10 years between the famous Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, which established the right of children to attend integrated schools, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. During those 10 years, only the Federal courts attempted to desegregate the public school systems. My father spent much of those 10 years traveling around the South, interviewing and offering advice to school districts that were struggling with the implications of *Brown v. Board of Education*.

My father served as sort of an informal advance man for the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. He would send back memos saying, for example, that in one southern county there was one guy who runs the place, that understands the tide of history, and if you could get Burke Marshall or Robert Kennedy or whoever was running the Justice Department to give him a call, then everything would be okay; but in another county, it was a lost cause, and you should just plan on bringing in troops and filing suit.

It was while actually reading my father's papers after he passed away that I first started thinking about stepping away from my career in science and spending part of my life in service to my fellow man.

It was as a result of this work that when the Civil Rights Act was passed, my father, who had become somewhat of an expert on the nuts and bolts of desegregating schools, was called upon to write what were referred to as the Federal guidelines for implementing title VI of the Civil Rights Act. These were the detailed rules that called out what Southern school systems had to do each year to desegregate their schools in order to qualify for Federal funds.

With the carrot of Federal education funding and the stick provided by the

Federal guidelines for title VI of the Civil Rights Act, more school desegregation was achieved in the year following the Civil Rights Act than had been achieved in the previous 10 years following *Brown v. Board of Education*.

My father had the chance to work with some of the leaders of the civil rights movement. He described having dinner at the kitchen table of Myrlie and Medgar Evers and holding their infant child in his hands only weeks before Medgar was shot down in his driveway.

My father was not an activist or a protester, but he saw a great injustice and he quietly devoted himself to changing it.

Martin Luther King, Jr., famously said:

The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.

But the arc does not bend on its own.

On July 2, 1964, when President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act into law, the arc was bent towards justice, but only because of the tireless efforts of so many who fought so long to bend it in the right direction. I am proud to say that my father was among them.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor all of those who played a part in advancing civil rights and making our country and our universe more just.

RECOGNIZING DR. JO ANNE MCFARLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, today, I am honored to rise to recognize a pillar of the higher education community in Wyoming. Dr. Jo Anne McFarland is retiring as the president of Central Wyoming College after 40 years of service, and 25 years after she was named Wyoming's first woman college president.

Active nationally with the American Association of Community Colleges and with the Higher Learning Commission, Dr. McFarland has made great contributions to the development of community colleges nationwide.

Dr. McFarland started as an adjunct faculty member in 1970, shortly after the college was founded in Riverton. Under her leadership, Central Wyoming College has expanded its academic offerings and instituted distance learning programs. It has opened facilities in Jackson, Lander, Thermopolis, and on the Wind River Indian Reservation.

Notably, Dr. McFarland has created an atmosphere of courtesy, manners, and respect at Central Wyoming College unlike any I have seen on any college campus. The leader sets the tone for such a positive, respectful atmosphere. Jo Anne McFarland is in every way imaginable leadership personified.

Madam Speaker, the mascot of Central Wyoming College is the cattle rustler. As a cattle rancher, I have a bit of a dislike for rustlers, but this is one rustler I will be very sorry to see hang

up her spurs. She earned those spurs, Madam Speaker.

23 IN 1—SAN ELIZARIO, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, today, as we continue our journey through the 23rd District of Texas, I would like to talk about the newest city in the 23rd District and one of the newest cities in Texas, which is the city of San Elizario, with a population of about 12,000 people.

Located south of El Paso, it is a small community that incorporated on November 5, 2013, after its residents voted to make it a city. Recently, on May 10, the people of the city of San Elizario elected their first mayor, Maya Sanchez, and the voters of San Elizario also elected council members Leticia Hurtado-Miranda, David Cantu, Miguel Najera, Jr., Rebecca Martinez-Juarez, and George Almanzar.

While it is a new city, the San Elizario community has been around a very long time.

In 1598, Don Juan de Onate, who was a Spanish conquistador and nobleman who was born in Zacatecas, led a group of more than 530 colonists and about 7,000 head of livestock from southern Chihuahua to settle the province of New Mexico.

The group traveled a northeasterly route for weeks and crossed the desert until reaching the banks of the Rio Grande in present day—you guessed it—San Elizario.

On April 30, 1598, the travelers, who were very thirsty, drank the cool water of the river and then celebrated with a thanksgiving mass and enjoyed a feast. They ate fish, fowl, and deer. That is actually considered the very first Thanksgiving ever celebrated in the present-day United States of America.

Mr. Onate performed a ceremony known as "La Toma," or "the take," declaring the land a new province of Spain, to be ruled by King Phillip II.

San Elizario was established around 1760 as a civilian settlement of Hacienda de los Tiburcios. In 1789, the Spaniards established a fort there called Presidio de San Elizario. The town grew around the fort and took the name of San Elizario.

The word San Elizario actually comes from the Spanish word "San Eliceario," known as the Roman Catholic patron saint of soldiers.

The chapel there at the mission of San Elizario, or La Capilla, is one of three missions in El Paso—Socorro and Ysleta being the other two—and is part of El Paso's historic Mission Trail.

During the 20th century, it served as the center of missionary work throughout the Mission Valley. The chapel was moved to its present site in 1789 to protect travelers and settlers along the Camino Real, or Royal Highway, which ran from Mexico through Ciudad Juarez, which was then called Paso del

Norte, and on to Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Upon Mexico's independence, the presidio fell into ruins. Rebuilding efforts didn't begin until 1853, with a small church. The present structure was completed in 1882, and little has changed since then.

I invite everyone to visit the city of San Elizario and the historic Mission Valley of El Paso to learn more about the cultures and traditions of the 23rd District of Texas.

I congratulate the new city.

□ 1045

SUPPORT THE PROTECT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LUMMIS). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, today, I am rising in support of H.R. 4836, the Providing Rigorous Oversight to Terminate Extreme Criminal Transfers, or PROTECT, Act.

The PROTECT Act is a piece of legislation I have introduced with Congressman WOLF of Virginia. It will ensure that Guantanamo Bay detainees do not ever end up on American soil. The PROTECT Act will prevent the transfer to the United States of Gitmo detainees or any other unprivileged enemy belligerents captured overseas. Current transfer prohibitions are tied to annual funding bills. The PROTECT Act is a long-term solution to the detainee issue and punishes unlawful transfers by up to 5 years in prison. It is supported by the 9/11 Families for a Safe and Strong America.

We do need the PROTECT Act. Why do we need it? Because of lawlessness. This administration has demonstrated a pattern of lawless behavior that is creating a constitutional crisis in our Nation. The most recent example of this was the President's failure to notify Congress about the release of the Taliban Five.

Make no mistake. The administration fully intends to bring Gitmo detainees to American soil, read them their Miranda rights, and give them access to our civilian courts. Gitmo detainees do not belong here. Their presence would endanger our local communities. We need a solution that will deter this administration from looking for ways around the law. It is important to consider the administration's actions regarding this detainee issue.

First, President Obama signed Executive Order No. 13492 on January 22, 2009, to close the Guantanamo Bay detention center.

Second, in November 2009, the administration announced 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed would be tried in New York. It later abandoned the idea.

Third, on December 15, 2009, a letter signed by Hillary Clinton and several other administration officials was sent to Illinois Governor Pat Quinn, stating

the administration's intent to bring Gitmo detainees to the Thomson Correctional Center in Illinois.

These actions triggered an avalanche of opposition and forced the President to temporarily abandon his plan to bring these Gitmo detainees to the U.S.

However, in this year's State of the Union address, the President renewed his pledge to close Gitmo by stating:

And, with the Afghan war ending, this needs to be the year Congress lifts the remaining restrictions on detainee transfers and we close the prison at Guantanamo Bay.

Cliff Sloan, an administration special envoy for the closure of Guantanamo Bay, recently told ABC that the administration would have to work with Congress on changing the law so that detainees could be brought here.

He stated:

For detention and trial and prosecution, we think people should be allowed to be brought to the United States. Our supermax facilities are very secure, and we have hundreds of people convicted of terrorist offenses in our supermax prisons.

The President may not like having three branches of government, and he may not like checks and balances, but this system of checks and balances has served our Nation well. His lawless actions are creating a constitutional crisis, and it must stop. Gitmo detainees are coming to American soil unless we pass the PROTECT Act. Its criminal penalties will ensure that the President respects the law.

I encourage my colleagues to join me on the PROTECT Act, which includes a transfer prohibition, provides a long-term solution, enacts criminal penalties, and provides an exception for American citizens.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Israel Zoberman, Congregation Beth Chaverim, Virginia Beach, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Our one God of life's blessings who brings us together to be one family, gloriously diverse and gratefully united through the divine commandments of loving kindness.

In this House of Representatives' august Chamber of the most flourishing democracy, we give thanks to the awesome author of an endangered universe for the essential twin gifts of freedom

and responsibility. May You in Your infinite goodness ever guide our elected and appreciated lawmakers who are entrusted with the American people's agenda and the safeguarding of our precious liberties.

Mindful of living in our uncertain and unsettling world, let us reaffirm that the Creator's divinity and human dignity are inseparable, that he who upholds but one human life upholds a unique, irreplaceable universe of purpose and meaning.

May blemishes turn into blessings, hatred into love, violence into vision, and pain into promise in a global village at Shalom's peace at last.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SONIA GARRO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of Sonia Garro, a member of the pro-democracy group, Ladies in White, las Damas de Blanco, who, after being in prison for more than 2 years in one of Castro's gulags, will face a kangaroo trial on Monday. She faces the likelihood of 10 to 12 years in jail because she is brave enough to speak out, demanding respect for human rights and democratic change.

Cases like those of Sonia—and there are so many others—show us the true nature and brutality of the Castro regime. There have been efforts by Castro apologists aimed at changing our policy toward Cuba, but it is the Castro regime that must change its oppressive policies against the people of Cuba.

While Castro's thugs continue to flagrantly violate the fundamental liberties and the dignity of the Cuban people, the U.S. will stay on the side of

the Cuban people who call for freedom like Sonia Garro.

TIM RUSSERT EXHIBIT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, since 2008, the "Inside Tim Russert's Office" exhibit has been on display at the Newseum here in Washington, D.C. This week the exhibit is in the process of relocating to the Buffalo History Museum in western New York.

This unique mix of personal and professional pieces of Tim's life will represent a homecoming, as he was born, raised, and began his career in Buffalo, New York. Even after moving to Washington, D.C., he never forgot his hometown and his dedication to his beloved Buffalo Bills. Whether working in politics or in journalism, Tim Russert made western New York proud as he exemplified the values that he learned right in our own community: love of family, faith, community, and country.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor to work with the Russert family, the Buffalo History Museum, and the Newseum in making this homecoming a reality. We eagerly await the debut of this expanded exhibit in the fall, including additional pieces that reflect Tim's south Buffalo roots and the story of Buffalo, the city he never forgot.

GET OUR ECONOMY BACK ON TRACK

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today the first quarter GDP numbers were revised downward, again, and now show the economy contracted by 2.9 percent in the opening months of 2014. The administration's spin machine cited cold weather as the root cause of this, but as critics noted, Canada's GDP grew by 1.8 percent in the first quarter. Was it warmer in Canada?

It is clear that this President is out of ideas about how to get our economy back on track. It now seems we have exhausted even his supply of excuses as well.

Being out of excuses is a positive development. Since this administration seems prone to believing their own spin, perhaps they will now, at long last, work with House Republicans on legislation that will put Americans back to work.

There are 40 House-passed bills awaiting action in the Senate. These bills will help. Will the President and his party act on them?

TRIA AND THE THREAT TO NEW YORK

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the terrorist who is at this moment leading insurgent attacks against Iraq and cities in Iraq reportedly once said to U.S. soldiers, "I will see you guys in New York."

When he said it, he didn't mean he wanted to go to a Broadway show like "Jersey Boys" or "Beautiful." New York has been and continues to be a target for terrorists to attack. It is a towering symbol of all that makes America so exceptional. That is why it is so important for Congress to get the changes that were being made to the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act absolutely correct.

The TRIA bill that was recently reported out of the Financial Services Committee, as it now stands, would drive small- and medium-sized insurers out of the market and actually reduce the amount of insurance available. That is just the wrong way to go.

At a time like this, Congress should acknowledge that a very real threat still exists and pass the strongest TRIA bill possible. It is important to the American economy, and it is important for American jobs.

IRS INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on the Department of Justice to appoint a special prosecutor to examine political targeting at the IRS. Abuse of the Tax Code for political purposes by the most feared and powerful agency in the Federal Government is simply unacceptable.

Despite promises of full cooperation, we have yet to receive all of the documents we have requested from the agency. The IRS tells us it cannot locate nearly 2 years of emails from Lois Lerner, a central figure in the investigation. We know the IRS has been aware of this concern for months and chose not to notify Congress in a timely manner.

We must work to restore confidence that Americans won't be targeted for their political beliefs. The House of Representatives has already voted on a bipartisan basis to urge the Department of Justice to appoint a special prosecutor, and I hope that the Department of Justice will work to assure the American people that the scales of justice also apply to the IRS.

RHODE ISLAND HOUSING

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rhode Island Housing, a public agency that works to ensure that all people who live or work in Rhode Island can afford a healthy, safe home that meets their needs.

Rhode Island Housing has made a real impact on the lives of thousands of Rhode Islanders helping over 60,000 families buy homes; and its success is due in large part to its dedicated and talented staff, led by executive director, Richard Godfrey.

Last week, Rhode Island Housing was awarded over \$856,000 in Federal funds to continue its important work to end homelessness in Rhode Island.

A good home provides a foundation upon which individuals and families thrive, children learn and grow, and communities prosper; but finding affordable, healthy housing has become a real concern for middle class working Americans. According to the Providence Journal, in 2012 a Rhode Island household earning the State's median income could afford a median-priced house in just 11 of our 39 cities and towns.

For more than 40 years, Rhode Island Housing has been providing valuable assistance to middle class Rhode Islanders to help them become homeowners and overcome the many challenges they face. I am delighted that these funds will support their efforts to end homelessness in Rhode Island, and I am proud to support their outstanding work to strengthen our communities.

POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell my colleagues about H. Res. 631, which supports the goals and ideas of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month. PTSD is a condition affecting more than 5.2 million Americans.

Our heroic servicemen and -women face daily atrocities and dangers on the battlefield. When they return home, adjusting to everyday life can be a brutal challenge, and living with PTSD can become a waking nightmare. Without treatment, PTSD can lead to alcohol and drug abuse, flashbacks, depression, and suicide. Sadly, because of the stigma surrounding mental health in our country, less than 40 percent of returning military personnel seek help.

My first job out of medical school was at a VA hospital. I witnessed firsthand the toll PTSD takes on our soldiers and their loved ones.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 631. Show our brave men and women in uniform that we have their backs like they have ours.

Thank you to Bob Mims of Tennessee's Fourth District for his continued efforts on this critical issue.

PASS COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the urgent need to fix our Nation's broken immigration system. We cannot continue to wait. The time is now to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the bill H.R. 15 would reduce the deficit by \$900 billion over the next two decades. There are 200 bipartisan cosponsors supporting H.R. 15, and the Senate overwhelmingly passed an immigration reform bill, almost to the day, last year.

We know that comprehensive immigration reform will grow our economy, so what are we waiting for?

Americans across the country want us to do something on this issue, and they want us to act now. I urge a vote on H.R. 15, the comprehensive immigration reform bill introduced by my Hispanic Caucus colleague Congressman JOE GARCIA from Florida. Now is the time.

IRS HARD DRIVE CRASH

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are not buying what the IRS is selling re these lost emails.

They want us to believe that within 10 days of DAVE CAMP requesting emails from the IRS, Lois Lerner's hard drive just happened to crash; her emails are gone and unrecoverable.

Now, what are the odds that the IRS is telling the truth? My friend, colleague, and MIT grad THOMAS MASSIE provided me the following calculations:

Using the IRS's own figures, the chance that a hard drive would crash on any given day is 0.01 percent. So, over a 10-day period, the odds are basically 1 in 1,000 that your hard drive would crash. But here's the thing: only 10 percent of hard drive crashes result in having data and emails that are completely unrecoverable. So if you multiply those probabilities out, the odds that the IRS is telling the truth is one one-hundredth of 1 percent.

Now, if you, as a taxpayer, provided the IRS with an explanation that was that improbable, how long do you think it would take them to laugh in your face and hold you accountable? So the question we have, Mr. Speaker, is: Why should we accept such an improbable explanation from the IRS?

□ 1215

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in April, nearly 300 Nigerian schoolgirls were kidnapped by the terrorist group Boko Haram. As late as yesterday, there are reports of more abductions.

I listened in horror as the Nigerian Government announced it has com-

pleted its inquiry in the April abduction and has little progress to report. This means these girls remain in the hands of Boko Haram. Boko Haram has emerged as a well-armed insurrection, with a growing thirst for blood, and the government has no plan to take action. This is unconscionable.

The government's failure to rescue the girls and protect them has sparked international outrage and launched the Bring Back Our Girls movement dedicated to the support and rescue of the girls.

We must keep pressure on the Nigerian Government until the girls are safely returned to their families.

Please join our Tweet war every day, 9 a.m. to noon, #bringbackourgirls and #joinrepwilson. Tweet, tweet, tweet "Bring Back Our Girls."

CALLING FOR A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR TO BE APPOINTED TO INVESTIGATE THE LOIS LERNER EMAILS

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, after months of requesting all of Lois Lerner's emails, the agency now tells Congress that it has lost 2 years' worth of her emails. The IRS knew about these problems for months. They even told the White House about the lost emails, but withheld this information from Congress.

This stonewalling by the IRS must end. The complete lack of faith of my constituents in the IRS compels me to demand a special prosecutor to independently investigate the lost emails of Lois Lerner.

There needs to be an independent investigation that leaves no stone unturned. This should also include a forensic audit of their IT systems. Only then will the American people know the truth. This will send the message to the IRS that the American people will not tolerate further abuses.

EXTEND FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am calling, again, on the House to introduce a dose of democracy into this body.

For months, since December 28, millions of Americans have lost their extended unemployment benefits. We were elected to represent the will of the people, to chart a course for this country, and to deal with the exigent needs of those Americans who are struggling.

A majority of this House is ready to do that. A majority of this House would vote to extend Federal unemployment benefits to prevent people who have worked hard for their entire lives from losing everything that they have worked for because this body fails to act.

A majority is for it—a majority of the people and a majority of this House. The Senate will pass unemployment extension. They did once already. The President will sign it.

It is incumbent upon us to do the will of the people. If we do not do this, we bear responsibility for the fact that, for generations, poverty could be inflicted upon people who have worked hard their entire lives and stand a chance of losing everything simply because we won't act.

CONGRATULATING ANDREW ARSHT AND ANDREW MARKOFF

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year, Georgetown University seniors, Andrew Arsht—who happens to be a Utahan in my district—and Andrew Markoff won the 68th National Debate Tournament for the second time in 3 years.

As sophomores and seniors, they were the national citizenship team. As juniors, they were in the final four, which means they are the only team in the history to accomplish these standards each year.

There have been 286 colleges who have competed at this tournament since 1947. Only eight of those colleges have actually won more championships than these two guys by themselves.

They are the only team to have won two national championships and the Copeland Award for the best yearlong performance. Arsht was also named as the top individual speaker at the tournament.

I congratulate these two debaters, as well as congratulations to Jonathan Paul, who is the director of debate at Georgetown University.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOU GEHRIG'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this Fourth of July will mark the 75th anniversary of Lou Gehrig's historic farewell address at Yankee Stadium, where he brought national attention to the disease that bears his name today. Sadly, so many decades later, we are still struggling to understand the cause of ALS, and there is still no known cure.

On June 13, I was proud to join the Rhode Island ALS chapter to reaffirm our commitment to the families affected by this disease. Hearing their stories emboldened me to fight harder than ever for additional research funding that will lead to more effective treatments and, ultimately, a cure.

Lou Gehrig famously said in his farewell speech:

I might have been given a bad break, but I've got an awful lot to live for.

So, too, do the millions of people in the fight against ALS—I recognize them and the caregivers that take care of them. They are unsung heroes as well. Together, I know this is a fight that we can win.

POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Posttraumatic Stress Awareness Day on Friday, June 27.

Approximately one in five veterans that served in Iraq and Afghanistan has been diagnosed with PTS, with many also affected by other mental illnesses and physical disabilities. All our veterans deserve treatment, Mr. Speaker.

There is almost one veteran suicide an hour. This is inexcusable. It is vital that we recognize the invisible wounds that are just as serious as the physical ones.

The one-size-fits-all doesn't always work. That is why I am introducing the creating options for veterans expedited recovery act tomorrow that will pave the way towards alternative treatments for those suffering from PTS.

All options should be on the table to treat our true American heroes, Mr. Speaker.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation, and let's get our veterans covered.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the House to action.

On Friday, we will mark 1 year since the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform with broad bipartisan support. We also mark 1 year of inaction in this House, where we have not even had one vote on immigration reform.

This is despite the fact that we have had a House bill with 200 bipartisan cosponsors. This is despite the fact that we have a House bill that 80 percent of Americans support, and this is despite the fact that hundreds of businesses, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and a variety of religious organizations, are all calling for the same thing: comprehensive immigration reform.

It is not just a moral thing to do, it is the right thing to do for our economy, for public safety, and to reduce our deficit.

The time is now.

I am asking House leadership today: bring this bipartisan effort to the floor for a vote.

HONORING ANNETTE LAMBERT

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Vice Chairwoman Annette Lambert of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation, who recently passed away.

Serving her people was Ms. Lambert's calling in life. Prior to her election to the tribal executive board, she was a businesswoman who helped provide services and jobs on the reservation.

She inspired the young men and women to pursue higher education as a volunteer member of the tribe's higher education board of directors and one of the founders of Fort Peck Community College, a tribal college in Poplar, Montana.

Ms. Lambert will be greatly missed by many. Her commitment to service and leadership should not only serve as an inspiration for her fellow tribal members, but for all Montanans.

VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to celebrate two very different anniversaries. Fifty years ago, we enjoyed the Freedom Summer and the signing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that paved the way for voting rights in this country.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, 49 years later—and 1 year ago today—the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act, saying that it was outdated and unjustified.

Since this decision, we have seen that the Voting Rights Act is needed more than ever now before. From 2000 to 2013, there were a recorded 148 violations in 29 States, meaning 29 States have actively tried to pass laws, such as requiring a photo ID or cutting out early voting, which limits access to the ballot.

It is time we pass the Voting Rights Amendment Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor, and keep fighting until voting rights are reinstated in this country.

PROTECT STUDENTS FROM FAILING INSTITUTIONS ACT

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, over the last decade, we have seen too many for-profit colleges deceive their students and mismanage their finances, all while reaping millions of dollars in Federal funding.

It is critical that we hold institutions accountable for delivering quality education, but we must also protect the students who fall victim to these schools and ensure that they don't have to live with the mistakes of the college, should they close.

That is why I have introduced the Protecting Students from Failing In-

stitutions Act, which ensures every student who was enrolled at a school that closed the campus has the assurance that their Federal loans will be forgiven and their Pell grants restored.

Career Colleges of America, a for-profit college with a campus in my district in South Gate, abruptly closed earlier this year, abandoning hundreds of students, with tens of thousands of dollars in student loan debt and no degree to show for it. That is inexcusable, and our students deserve better.

There have been instances of other for-profit schools that have closed across this country.

I am going to continue—and I hope you do too—to work to protect hard-working students in my district across the country from these shameful predatory practices.

ASK VETERANS ACT

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, from the day that I was sworn into office, I have heard from the veterans that I have the honor of representing that while—when they can get into the VA to seek care—the care is great and the providers are wonderful, it is too hard to get an appointment, and that appointment, once given, is often canceled.

The VA, on the other hand, was telling me something far different, that there were no problems with wait times.

To resolve the differences, we surveyed the veterans themselves. What they told us was that more than 36 percent of the veterans that I represent cannot get in to receive a mental health care appointment. This is at a time when we have 22 veteran suicides every day in this country.

That is why I join my colleague from across the State and across the aisle, Mr. FLORES, to introduce the ask veterans act, so that we do this in every community and VHA district in this country, so that veterans help us lead the VA out of the crisis that we are currently in.

We cannot trust the VA to tell us how the VA is doing, but we can certainly trust veterans to do just that.

CONGRATULATIONS TO TIM DUNCAN OF THE SAN ANTONIO SPURS

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my hometown stars, Tim Duncan of the San Antonio Spurs.

Tim is a five-time champion, a 14-time all star, a two-time MVP, and a three-time finals MVP. He grew up on my home island of St. Croix, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and he graduated from St. Dunstan's Episcopal School

with my eldest daughter. That is where a tall, thin, and shy Timmy began playing basketball, and let me just say: they were not the winningest team.

From his time at Wake Forest, where I attended his last game, we, in the Virgin Islands, have followed his career with pride. Beyond the games, we appreciate the way he stayed in touch with his classmates and friends these 22 years, the way he has given back to us, to North Carolina, and to San Antonio through his foundation—the character program in our schools—and his support of youth sports and health awareness and research.

Tim Duncan is a champion in basketball and in the lives of the communities that he continues to give back to.

On behalf of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands: Thank you, Timmy, for making us proud and for being the role model that you have been for our young men and for young men everywhere.

□ 1230

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, the American people want and favor comprehensive immigration reform. An overwhelming majority believe in a pathway to citizenship for the undocumented because we are a compassionate country.

But you have not brought it to the floor.

You have said you favor the ENLIST Act, but wouldn't put it as part of the National Defense Authorization Act.

What is wrong with serving our country and earning a pathway to citizenship? What is wrong with going to school and being a good member of our society and earning a pathway to citizenship?

These are DREAMers—dreamers of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with reuniting families, keeping the promises to people like the Filipino World War II veterans, who believed in what General MacArthur said to them? There is nothing wrong with that.

Bring the comprehensive immigration reform bill to the floor and let us all vote. Vote for the DREAMers who truly believe in this country.

PRE-K FOR USA

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for generations in America, we have seen that education is the surest path to success. That is why today I am introducing the Pre-K for USA Act.

The Pre-K for USA Act allows local education agencies and governments to

apply directly to the Federal Government for grants to develop and expand high-quality pre-K programs. Cities and school districts need to have the ability to step up to the plate and pick up the slack where their State governments are failing.

Unfortunately, in my home State of Texas, as is the case in other States, legislatures have curtailed their investment in education. Instead, they have picked up the troubling practice of pretending to balance budgets by slashing early childhood education funds.

I call on my colleagues to support the Pre-K for USA Act and get our country one step closer to ensuring that all American children have the opportunity to get ahead in life, achieve their dreams, and boost our Nation's prosperity.

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO PASS A FAIR PLAN FOR COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Americans want Congress to act on comprehensive immigration reform, and the Senate already has. In fact, it has been exactly 1 year this week since the Senate passed bipartisan legislation to offer a pathway to citizenship for millions living in the United States. But 365 days later, there has still been no action in this House.

The Democrats have a plan that will decrease the Nation's deficit by nearly \$1 trillion, secure our borders, unite families, and provide an earned pathway to citizenship. But the GOP has other ideas. Republicans have made it clear that they have no intention of acting on a plan for comprehensive immigration reform.

Last October, we introduced H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, based on bipartisan principles and bipartisan solutions to fix our country's broken immigration system. The bill has strong bipartisan support and has the votes to pass in the House if it comes for a vote. The legislation already has 200 cosponsors, including three Republican cosponsors.

The United States, Mr. Speaker, has rightfully earned its reputation as the land of opportunity. We need to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4899, LOWERING GASOLINE PRICES TO FUEL AN AMERICA THAT WORKS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4923, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 641 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 641

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-50. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be

debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from June 27, 2014, through July 7, 2014—

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

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

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

SEC. 6. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 3, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). 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 unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel An America That Works Act of 2014. It makes 10 amendments in order—four Republican and six Democrat—and the rule provides 1 hour of general debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 4923, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act of 2015, under a modified open rule and provides for other technical and clerical purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act is a bipartisan measure that provides for the essential funding of several Federal agencies during the next fiscal year, including the Department of Energy, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

This measure would also fund important Federal science research in the fields of energy, high-performance computing systems, and next-generation energy sources. It is appropriate that this measure providing for the Nation's energy needs also be included with this rule.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today and speak in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014.

American families, Mr. Speaker, are hurting. Every time you pull up to the gas pump, you have to wonder whether there will ever be any relief to the family budget for these ever-increasing gasoline prices.

It means simply—whether you support or like the guy or not—that before President Obama took office in 2009, the average national price for a gallon of unleaded regular gas was under \$2 a gallon. Today, it has nearly doubled to around \$4 a gallon. And the prices keep rising almost every day.

This administration touts its growth in energy production, not recognizing that that production increase has all come on private and State-owned property. If we are to have sustained growth of our economy, if we are not having peaks and valleys, if we are not having boom and bust, it is important that the resources that we have in great abundance that are on Federal lands also be included so there can be a sustained growth to our economy.

Unfortunately, since President Obama took office, total Federal oil production has dropped 6 percent, total Federal national gas production has dropped an astounding 28 percent, and, at the same time, offshore oil production is down 15 percent and offshore gas production is down 47 percent.

Unfortunately, 87 percent of all the area that is allowed offshore of acreage of potential development is currently off limits to oil and natural gas production.

We have policies that are really harming our progress forward, and they need to be changed. This act that will be put before us, if we pass this rule, does indeed do that.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join my good friends on the Energy and Water Committee, Representatives LOWEY and KAPTUR, in applauding the chairman's concerted effort to compose H.R. 4923 in an inclusive manner.

□ 1245

I appreciate the bipartisan nature of the bill and am supportive of many of the provisions contained within it. However, I am not without my concerns. All of these phrases that my friends on the other side of the aisle bandy about—"increase over this," "funding above last year's levels"—sound great, but as always, we need to see what is lurking in the shadows.

For example, H.R. 4923 is completely uninspired when it comes to renewable energy. Its approach, in my view, is a myopic one—one that, if we follow it too far, leaves us trying to play catch-up with our competitors, like the Chinese and many other countries, that have turned their attention to renewable energy. As China continues its now decade-long trend of increasing investment in its renewable energy sector—a footnote here: it invested \$56 billion just last year—we take the truly uninspired step of cutting funding for renewable energy by 6.4 percent.

I am aware of the studies that conclude that our Nation will be able to meet 97 percent of its energy needs through domestic production by 2035, and I consider that to be great. This Nation has spent \$2.3 trillion on importing foreign oil since 2003. This is a serious national security vulnerability, and I think we can all agree that lessening this dependence is a desirable goal.

I also know that, for many in this day of Twitter and Facebook and Instagram, 2035 seems like a long way off. Those of us in this Chamber do not have the luxury of thinking that way. We have a responsibility to look past 2035, and we have a responsibility to leave our children and grandchildren with an energy portfolio that will keep them in good stead for the years after 2035. We abdicate this responsibility when we underfund research and development in the renewable energy sector. We abdicate this responsibility when we skew applied energy programs at the Department of Energy too heavily toward nuclear energy and fossil fuels. An increased investment in renewable energy makes good economic sense; it makes good environmental sense; and it makes good national security sense. The time to make this investment is now.

We need to be careful even where we see funding increases. Though these funding increases may seem impressive and prudent, we need to be reminded that all that glitters is not gold. They merely mask a continuation of the status quo for my friends from across the

aisle. They would have you believe they are increasing funding for environmental protection while reducing spending on defense, but alas, in my view, this is an illusion. In reality, this bill represents business as usual for the Republican Party—slashing funding for research in renewable resources while doling out more handouts to dirty energy and environmental polluters. It seems like every other week we are voting to drill off our shores, in our parks, or on Federal lands.

To that end, H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014—we are the greatest naming people in the world here in Congress—is just a greatest hits record, rehashing two measures the House has already voted on, one of which itself was already cobbled together from a number of separate bills. Like all greatest hits albums, it, too, is stuck in the past. Those past attempts rightly died in the Senate, and there is no reason to expect a different result this time around. Yet here we are again, tossing legislation into the void while our country's very real problems fester.

My friends across the aisle have no ideas, evidently, for energy independence and security beyond more drilling. They would rather score political points than propose real solutions. I am sure they will go home to their districts next week for one of the biggest driving weekends of the year. Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I commented that the oil industry manipulates us. Every year in the summer, prices go up on gasoline, and I just don't think that is coincidental when gas prices historically tend to be high. Yet they are going to point to these votes as evidence that they tried to lower gasoline prices. While it may make for a good feel-good story, that is all it is. Putting more oil out there won't move prices. Domestic production is already at a 25-year high in this country, up 60 percent since 2008. Imports are at 29-year lows.

Despite my friend's claims, onshore oil production from Federal lands has gone up 30 percent since 2008. I can never pass up an opportunity to say that I will continue to resist offshore drilling off the coast of Florida beyond the accommodations that have already been made by this body. Yet gas prices remain unchanged. The U.S. holds only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. Even tripling current offshore drilling capabilities by the year 2030 would lower gasoline prices only 5 cents per gallon more than if we would continue at the rate we are going; or if we would increase oil production all the way to 50 percent—which is more than drilling in the Arctic, increasing public lands and offshore drilling, and the pipelines would provide—prices would decrease by only 10 percent at most.

Oil is priced on the global market, which is far more complicated than my friends let on. RECORD demand for fossil fuels in this country and in places

like India and China and Singapore and Japan have far more impact on the price of gasoline than anything my friends here hope to do. The liquid natural gas export bill the House passed yesterday shows they understand the nature of the market. They just choose to ignore it whenever it is convenient.

My friends across the aisle have no plans for addressing the demand for the kinds of policies that actually could help reduce energy costs, like increasing our energy efficiency, improving the fuel mileage of our cars, and developing renewable energy resources. I was visited by one of our college presidents, John Kelly, who is new at Florida Atlantic University. He visited with me today, and that university has a new grant dealing with currents, which may very well at some point add to our understanding with reference to renewable energy resources. So it won't be the American people who benefit from more drilling. It will be the bottom lines of the companies that own the wells. Hardworking Americans will be left to bear the risk.

This "drill everywhere, all the time" plan isn't a serious energy strategy; it is a cash grab by the fossil fuel industry. It is not a path to energy independence and security; it is a road to environmental and economic collapse. This isn't a game. The threat is real, Mr. Speaker. We haven't enacted any safety or environmental reforms in response to the BP Deepwater Horizon spill. Let me repeat that. We haven't enacted any safety or environmental reforms in response to the BP Deepwater Horizon spill. A footnote here: BP has not paid for all of the damage that they did in that area, and I defy anybody to show me how it is that they did. I ask anybody who is getting ready to eat seafood that comes out of that bay to look at the damage that was done and at the continuing sediment that continues to rise from that area that was polluted.

What happens to all of those Floridians whose livelihoods depend upon our oceans and beaches?

If you want to know, ask the oyster people what happens. Ask the shrimpers who go out into the gulf what their product looks like nowadays, including the deformed product that they are seeing from this awful disaster.

Florida's GDP from its living resources, which includes fishing, hatcheries, aquaculture, seafood processing, and seafood markets, is worth nearly \$300 million. Additionally, the State's GDP from ocean-based tourism and recreation is nearly \$16.5 billion. On top of that, Florida generates millions of dollars in commercial fishing, including shrimp, mackerel, blue crab, swordfish, and stone crabs, which we are finding are diminishing in numbers. We have 350,000 jobs in tourism and recreation and nearly 120,000 direct jobs in recreational and commercial fishing.

But you can't eat contaminated fish, and who wants to spend one's hard-

earned dollars and vacation time lounging on a beach that is covered in tar balls?

When I lifted up on Monday in the US Air plane and looked down at the shore of Florida, I saw what amounts to about a mile-long oil slick. I saw people walking, and I knew that, in a matter of time, they would be walking on tar balls.

How bad does the next spill have to be?

Climate change is not even pending anymore. It is here, and its effects are conspicuous. Downtown Miami, for example, floods whenever it rains, and so does Hollywood, Florida, and areas that I live around. People can't get to work, businesses can't open, and historic droughts have now ravaged the West, and my friends say that there is nothing to concern ourselves about as it pertains to climate change.

The Risky Business report just released by President George W. Bush's former Treasury Secretary—Henry Paulson—and Mayor Bloomberg and Tom Steyer and other former Cabinet officers, lawmakers, corporate leaders, and scientists says climate change could cost the country billions of dollars over the next two decades.

This bill fully ignores the reality of the world we live in, but I do want to say one thing.

In yesterday's Rules Committee, my friend who is managing this rule, Mr. BISHOP from Utah, did make to me a compelling argument regarding education in the State of Utah and the fact that, on some of the Federal lands in Utah, if they had an opportunity to do further oil exploration, it could have an impact on Utah's economy. I think that, in many respects, a lot of that is reasonable. I am hopeful that at some point some of his views in that regard will prevail, but I hope, for the most part, that his overall views do not prevail.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

H.R. 4899 is yet another example of the majority's backward energy policy that doubles down on dirty fossil fuels instead of investing in a clean energy future. The bill also specifically targets my congressional district, requiring new oil drilling leases off the central coast of California.

□ 1300

This is the fourth time in as many years that the House leadership has tried to override the will of my constituents and California voters who overwhelmingly oppose new offshore drilling.

Even if drilling in these waters could start tomorrow, it would certainly have no impact on gas prices.

Why is that? Because the low-quality oil off the central coast of California can't be used to make gasoline. It is used to make asphalt.

While I certainly support investing more in our Nation's roads and bridges, this is certainly not the way to do it, so I find it incredibly disingenuous for my colleagues to pretend that this bill would lower gas prices for consumers when, in reality, it is just another big giveaway to Big Oil.

I also oppose this rule because it blocks consideration of two important amendments that I had filed. One of those amendments simply required a study on the environmental impacts of offshore fracking.

We depend on our oceans for such varied needs and values that the least we can do is understand how they are impacted by these offshore activities. Our constituents sent us here to get things done, not to stifle debate, but this rule won't even allow us to discuss this important issue.

The rule also blocks a vote on my amendment to protect the central coast from additional offshore drilling.

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

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

Mrs. CAPPS. This amendment is identical to one which was made in order to be considered on the floor last year, when the House last considered this redundant legislation.

Perhaps the majority believes it is a waste of time to consider something that has already been voted upon. I only wish they would apply this logic to bills that they bring to the floor because, if they did, we wouldn't be here wasting our time with a bill the House already voted on last year.

Stapling two old bills together doesn't make it a new idea. H.R. 4899 is still a bad idea, and it is still a waste of time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1426, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act of 2013, Representative TIM BISHOP's bill, to end the billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies given to the largest, most profitable oil companies each year.

To discuss our proposal, I am pleased, at this time, to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), my good friend.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise to urge defeat of the previous question to allow consideration of my legislation, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act, which would finally end middle class subsidies to big oil companies.

For too long, this Congress has perpetuated corporate welfare, saying job

creators need incentives to continue growing this country, but last year, the largest oil companies reported a bottom-line profit of \$93 billion—let me say that again, \$93 billion—and yet, this Republican-led Congress continues to lavish subsidies and tax breaks on these highly-profitable companies.

We can not overlook that cuts to good programs continue during this second year of sequestration and, as we face the ever-present imperative to cut the deficit, Congress should rethink preferential treatment for Big Oil that burdens millions of hardworking Americans and small businesses which foot the bill for these subsidies.

For instance, we can save \$9.2 billion over 10 years by repealing the outdated section 199 tax break, which designates oil production as a manufacturing activity, and gives Big Oil a 6 percent deduction from their income. This could be much better spent on real efforts to create jobs, increase revenue, and support local economies.

We could direct that funding towards infrastructure construction or education or keep it in the energy sector, to further incentivize renewable energy technology development, rather than perpetuate our reliance on fossil fuels.

These are real job creation efforts that Congress has supported in the past and are still needed to ignite economic growth; or we could use the savings from the bill to help fill the immediate need to pay for the shortfall in the highway trust fund, which will run out of money only weeks from now.

This means the House could leave this week without a solution to this impending crisis threatening to freeze construction projects and lay off workers, further imperiling our Nation's economic recovery.

There is no shortage of solutions Congress needs to reach this year, and many of them have steep price tags. By supporting the previous question, my colleagues can use a source of funds that oil companies won't miss to offset our to-do list.

With no signs from the majority about whether the House will ever move to consider tax reform, it remains unclear, when—if ever—the opportunity will arise again to reform the Tax Code, so that it reflects the needs and aspirations of working families and small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in better prioritizing taxpayers' funds by defeating the previous question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise at this time and ask if you would learn from my colleague if he is ready to close. I have no further speakers, and I am prepared at this time to close.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The gentleman has only from me yet to hear.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that these bills just leave us spinning our wheels, while we could be making actual progress in helping hardworking Americans all across this Nation.

It is outrageous that 3 million Americans have lost their emergency unemployment insurance since it expired in December 2013. I might add that we learned yesterday that 300,000 of that 3 million are American veterans.

We have also had, along with the expiration of tax extender provisions that help individuals that have expired, they help families and small businesses invest.

Republicans and Democrats should be working together to move our Nation forward on comprehensive immigration reform, and I might add that I agree with everybody that says that the border needs to be secure, and one good way to do that is to do comprehensive immigration reform and tax reform.

We need to raise the minimum wage in this country, and we need to protect voting rights and secure equal pay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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, before I will urge my colleagues to vote "no," I just want to make it very clear that the measures that we are considering today have already been voted on by the House and did not go further to become law. The likelihood of this measure reaching that same fate is very strong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

Vote "no" on the underlying bill, 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 am an old history teacher, and one of the things I have always claimed for my students is you should actually try to look to the past, to see how you can plan for the future.

When Ronald Reagan became President of the United States, this country was faced with the crisis of double-digit inflation, double-digit unemployment, and double-digit interest rates; and as President, after so many years of a Congress that tried to have the policy of spending ourselves into economic growth that failed, his issue was: Which of those do you attack first?

I think it is interesting to realize—to grab hold of each of those issues, his first action was to increase the supply of affordable energy. That became the basis of growing an economy in which he could then attack each of those problems of unemployment and inflation and interest rates which were plaguing this country.

We have to realize now that a strong foundation of affordable energy is extremely significant, from whatever source, but especially from what will be workable now.

High gasoline prices—and the price that is increasing in every form of energy we have today—hurts the middle class, and it especially hurts the working poor, many of whom have to decide, every time they go to the pump, whether they are going to put food on the table or fill up the minivan.

We have to deal with something. Now, in my area of the west where we live and the part of the country where the distances between communities are extremely large, as opposed to back here in the east, where everything is so lumped closely together, the increase in fuel costs hits home with a real inflicting pain.

I am sorry. The policies of the past that we had that made the desert bloom are being reversed by the policies of the present. Whether you are at the pump realizing the pain that is inflicted or whether your concern is what kind of energy cost it will take when you go into the room and flip on the light or you decide to cook food, we have to realize these are real problems facing middle America, as well as the working poor of America.

We can either come up with policies that move us forward, or we can implement policies that allow us to freeze in the dark, and so far, we have done a good job on the latter and not the first.

Republicans in the House of Representatives have passed several bills over the past few years—and this year as well—aimed at increasing U.S. domestic fuel production, only to have those bills sidelined in the deliberative body on the other side of this building.

It reminds me of a great quote, when Thomas Brackett Reed, the old Speaker of the House, went over to the Senate to watch them in debate and came back and announced to the body:

Thank heavens we are not a deliberative body.

There are problems that we have that can be solved. We have those places, too, and I appreciate the fact the gentleman from Florida did mention that China and others are putting money into alternative energy programs.

They are also going around the world and gobbling up whatever kinds of oil and coal resources they can get their hands on, to support and sustain a growing economy over there, while our administration is taking the United States in the opposite direction by self-inflicted artificial limits, policies that have actually hurt our economy, killed high-paying jobs, and increased the cost of consumer goods for all, including the middle class.

There are reasons why, Mr. Speaker, in the last 6 years, our economy is simply limping along, and we should learn the lessons of the past to recognize what we can do from that. Our economic malaise can be attributed to a lack of attention to a commonsense energy program on Federal lands.

So what would this bill, H.R. 4899, actually do? It would establish and demand a new 5-year plan for the leases of those areas, with the concept of

going after where the resources actually are. We can talk about all the lands that are leased, but it is totally unimportant if there are no resources there.

Have a plan that focuses on where the resources are. Produce a revenue-sharing plan with the coastal States. Come up with three distinct agencies which would replace the new structure that has been put upon since the oil spill and make them actually functioning. That is the problem.

I agree with some of the things you have said. We haven't done much in reform, but we have done a whole lot in regulatory reform on the administrative level, and I agree with you, that that hasn't worked as well.

To establish a policy that the NPR-A is for the purpose of providing oil as a resource to the United States and to establish some kind of Internet-based auctions for these programs—look, we are not talking about taking over everything and drilling everywhere.

This Federal Government owns somewhere around 400 to 450 million acres of land. Of that, 350, roughly, are already in a conservation status that can never be touched.

There are 50 million acres, at the most, that have development potential, and those are the areas in which policies of this administration are strangling the ability to move them forward.

I will—because I hadn't planned on it, so I don't have my wonderful charts here. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida talking about education because I want to finish off with that in just one second.

I appreciate his sentiment that, some day, my position can prevail, but unless we change the overall Federal position, I can't get that moving forward, and that is why it becomes extremely important.

We are not just talking about gas at the pump and the cost of electricity and the cost of cooking your food. There are also those tradeoff effects which specifically deal with education.

If one looks at a map of the States, there is overwhelming control by the Federal Government of ownership of the land, the public land States of the Midwest and the west coast, and you look at the States which have the hardest time increasing their funding for public education.

It is an amazing correlation between the two, which means that, over the past 20 years, those who do not live in public land States, those areas east of Denver, which average about 4 percent of their States being controlled by the Federal Government, have grown their educational funding by 68 percent.

□ 1315

Those of us who average over 50 percent of our land controlled by the Federal Government in these public lands States have grown our education budget by 35 percent.

It is simply a matter that my State cannot improve its education funding

alone unless we are allowed to develop some of the resources we have in huge abundance but are tied up in the policies of the Federal Government.

So, yes, it is true. We are growing petroleum activities in this country. We are growing our exploration. We are growing what we are developing, what we are exporting. But it is all coming from private lands and State lands that are not part of the West. And if you want to keep that growth on a continuous basis and not have spikes, then you have to go after the resources that we have on the public lands.

And if you were allowed to do that, not only would we get royalties coming back in from those resources, but it would spin off all sorts of jobs that would then generate the income tax we need and the sales tax revenue and the royalties to replace the fact that we are not getting property tax from lands that are controlled by the Federal Government and were promised to us a long time ago when we became States.

This bill provides a plan on how to do this. This bill is something that is desperately needed if we are going to move forward. If enacted into law, it would encourage greater oil and gas development on Federal onshore and offshore lands with a plan of how you actually accomplish it and how you do it. And it may actually give my kids a chance at a fairer shot for an education, because they desperately need it, and the status quo is not providing it. And that has to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I would only urge Members to support this rule. It is a fair rule. It is a good rule. And then I would hope, afterwards, they would support the underlying bills which provide for our Nation's critical energy needs and would help promote jobs at the same time, as well as funding for my schools in Utah.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 641 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 7. 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. 1426) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities with respect to oil and gas activities of major integrated oil companies. 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. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1426.

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 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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

DOMESTIC PROSPERITY AND GLOBAL FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 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. 6.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1318

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. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 24, 2014, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-48. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 6

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act".

SEC. 2. ACTION ON APPLICATIONS.

(a) **DECISION DEADLINE.**—*The Department of Energy shall issue a decision on any application*

for authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) not later than 90 days after the later of—

(1) *the end of the comment period for such decision as set forth in the applicable notice published in the Federal Register; or*

(2) *the date of enactment of this Act.*

(b) **JUDICIAL ACTION.**—(1) *The United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the export facility will be located pursuant to an application described in subsection (a) shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of—*

(A) *an order issued by the Department of Energy with respect to such application; or*

(B) *the Department of Energy's failure to issue a decision on such application.*

(2) *If the Court in a civil action described in paragraph (1) finds that the Department of Energy has failed to issue a decision on the application as required under subsection (a), the Court shall order the Department of Energy to issue such decision not later than 30 days after the Court's order.*

(3) *The Court shall set any civil action brought under this subsection for expedited consideration and shall set the matter on the docket as soon as practical after the filing date of the initial pleading.*

SEC. 3. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF EXPORT DESTINATIONS.

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LNG EXPORT DESTINATIONS.—As a condition for approval of any authorization to export LNG, the Secretary of Energy shall require the applicant to publicly disclose the specific destination or destinations of any such authorized LNG exports."

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113-492. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113-492.

Mr. GARDNER. 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:

Redesignate subsection (b) of section 2 as subsection (c).

Strike subsection (a) of section 2 and insert the following:

(a) **DECISION DEADLINE.**—For proposals that must also obtain authorization from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or the United States Maritime Administration to site, construct, expand, or operate LNG export facilities, the Department of Energy shall issue a final decision on any application for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) not later than 30 days after the later of—

(1) the conclusion of the review to site, construct, expand, or operate the LNG facilities required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(2) the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONCLUSION OF REVIEW.—For purposes of subsection (a), review required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall be considered concluded—

(1) for a project requiring an Environmental Impact Statement, 30 days after publication of a Final Environmental Impact Statement;

(2) for a project for which an Environmental Assessment has been prepared, 30 days after publication by the Department of Energy of a Finding of No Significant Impact; and

(3) upon a determination by the lead agency that an application is eligible for a categorical exclusion pursuant National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 implementing regulations.

In subsection (c) of section 2, as so redesignated, by inserting “final” before “decision” each place it appears.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 636, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank you again for the opportunity to debate H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. It is something that, in this Congress, we don't do that often, a bill to address both job creation here at home and also to provide our trading partners and our allies with energy security abroad.

The amendment before the desk right now is a manager's amendment, brought to this Chamber in a bipartisan fashion with the gentleman from Texas, Representative GENE GREEN, who has been gracious and patient in this effort to work through this process to make sure that we have as broad-based support as possible for this legislation.

It recognizes that, despite some of the concerns our side has with the recent DOE changes to their process, including the expanding scope of DOE's public interest analysis to include elements unrelated to DOE's primary authorities, it is still vitally important to send as strong a message as possible to our allies that the U.S. is prepared to answer their call and enter the market as a major exporting nation.

It is equally important that we send a message that we are bringing certainty to the applicants and the jobs currently waiting in limbo at DOE, and that DOE will, indeed, be held accountable to do its job once FERC finishes their facility review and the NEPA process.

Again, this legislation has the potential to lift 45,000 people off of the unemployment rolls. Daniel Yergin testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that we could move from 1.7 million jobs in this country to 3 million jobs in this country in energy by 2020. And H.R. 6 and this amendment help advance that job creation.

But because DOE's recent changes did not put a final deadline for the Department to act on applications, this amendment requires that the Department must issue a decision on pending

applications within 30 days after FERC completes the NEPA review for the project. We are doing this because some of these applications have been languishing for more than 2 years, and it is time to insert accountability back into the process, especially when DOE's own analysis concludes: Increasing natural gas exports are net positive to our economy.

This issue is too important to domestic job creation and to increasing the United States' role in international energy diplomacy to continue to squander and delay our opportunities.

This amendment also addresses many of the concerns that those on the other side have voiced with previous versions of this legislation, including completing full environmental reviews and maintaining DOE's role in the public interest test. I hope this will help H.R. 6 garner even broader support.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) and, again, thank him for his support.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague and fellow committee member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the manager's amendment. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their hard work. The amendment we offer today is the result of hard, bipartisan work.

The original text of H.R. 6 worked to fix a problem at the Department of Energy. The problem was delay. The Department of Energy is responsible for permitting exports to non-free trade agreement countries.

Since 2011, the Department has received approximately 35 permit applications to export liquefied natural gas. Since 2011, only one project has received final approval.

EIA estimates that by 2035, the United States will produce 5 trillion cubic feet more than we can consume of natural gas. But in order to export the gas, rather than flare it and harm the environment, projects need permits.

The process is not working well. Why has only one project received final approval after 3 years? Why did DOE, just this month, propose changing the process? It is because the process is not working.

The manager's amendment that I co-authored with my colleague from Colorado acknowledges that DOE's proposed changes are a step in the right direction.

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

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Unfortunately, after 3 years of delay, we need to ensure DOE issues timely decisions. The manager's amendment places a 30-day timeframe on DOE after the completion of the environmental review process.

This amendment is an example of the cooperation and bipartisanship from our committee. And, again, I urge Members to adopt the manager's amendment.

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, Chris Smith, told a Senate panel last week that he is “confident that whatever the law requires, the department will be able to accomplish.”

DOE will issue public interest determinations 12-to-18 months after they receive the application.

I am confident that: after 3 years of delay, 12-to-18 months of environmental review, a 30 day public comment period; and an additional 30 days to review the application that DOE can issue a sound public interest determination.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the gentleman from Colorado, Congressman GARDNER, is proposing some changes in an effort to address some of the problems with his bill.

The base bill would require the Department of Energy to make final decisions on almost all of the pending energy export applications in 90 days, without the benefit of complete environmental reviews. Now they look at their bill, and they appear to understand that this would be bad policy.

The amendment would establish a different deadline. Now DOE must issue a final decision on an application within 30 days of completion of the NEPA environmental review. That is an improvement because it at least ensures that major LNG export projects are not approved without an environmental review. However, if this amendment is adopted, the bill will remain unnecessary and problematic.

The bill is unnecessary because DOE already is approving huge volumes of LNG exports without any legislative action. They have proposed to further streamline their review at DOE so that it prioritizes review of the projects that have completed environmental reviews. That is already happening without this bill.

So if we adopt this amendment, the bill will still be unnecessary because it truncates DOE's public interest review. We should give DOE the time it needs to weigh the pros and cons of granting an application. Instead, the bill sets a 30-day deadline that would rush that process. To me, that doesn't make sense, especially since rushing DOE isn't going to get LNG exported any faster. LNG can't be exported without a terminal, and nothing in this bill gets terminals permitted or built any faster.

I am not going to oppose this amendment because it is probably better than the base bill, but it doesn't solve all of the problems with the bill. It illustrates how this bill, which is being touted as bringing about domestic

prosperity and global freedom, is being worked on the go. I think it hasn't been thought through. This makes it a little better, but I don't see how the bill lives up to its title. I won't oppose the amendment, but I still think the bill is not worthy of passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank Ranking Member WAXMAN for his support of the amendment but would remind him that an Ambassador from Hungary, ambassador-at-large for energy security, said it is simply not true that lifting the natural gas export ban today would not have an immediate effect in Europe. It would immediately change the business calculus of infrastructure investment and send an extremely important message of strategic reassurance to the region, which currently feels more threatened than at any time since the cold war.

Passage of this bill would send an immediate signal to our allies and our enemies that the United States is serious about energy security and aiding our friends most in need of energy security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I know that the Ambassador from Hungary and other countries that are looking at the possible aggression of the Russians are concerned about not having to rely on Russia alone for their natural gas supplies, and they are desperate. And we need to help them as best we can.

But let's not fool anybody. Even if this bill were passed, it will probably not allow for us to get LNG to some of those countries until 2017, 2018. And if we allow the export of LNG, exporters here in the United States are going to send it primarily to those who will pay the highest prices. And they are not in Europe. They are in Asia.

□ 1330

I wouldn't want the people to be under any illusions that this will help them immediately. I think the statement by that Ambassador shows more desperation than anything else and hope that we send a signal that we are going to do the best we can to get LNG to them as soon as possible, maybe they can withstand a possible Russian action.

On the other hand, the Ambassador from Hungary knows that Hungary is part of NATO, and if Hungary is attacked by the Russians, we have an obligation to help them under our NATO agreement, so I think that is their base security, not this legislation.

They have high hopes, especially when they hear that this is a bill that will bring about domestic prosperity to the United States. They would presumably like for us to have prosperity, and so would I, and it is called not only Domestic Prosperity, but Global Freedom, and they certainly are hoping that we will do what we can for global freedom.

I certainly want to do everything we can for global freedom, and voting against this bill does not mean voting against global freedom.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I would be happy to yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado says that this would send a signal to European countries, and as my friend from California makes clear, it would not be a signal that help is on the way any time soon. The natural gas would not come soon, but the signal that would be heard loud and clear by manufacturers and homeowners is the price of gas would be going up.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that here is an article that states that: "Centrica buys U.S. LNG in 20-year deal as U.K. output wanes." Selling U.S. LNG to Europe, Italy is close to 20-year LNG deal with Cheniere; another article, "Cheniere and Endesa sign 20-year LNG sale and purchase agreement."

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment to H.R. 6.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113-492.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike "The Department" and insert "Except as provided in section 3(a)(2)(C) of the Natural Gas Act, as added by section 4 of this Act, the Department".

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS.

Section 3(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting before "After six months from the date on which" the following: "(1) AUTHORIZATION FOR THE IMPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS.—";

(2) by striking "export any natural gas from the United States to a foreign country or";

(3) by striking "exportation or"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(2) AUTHORIZATION FOR THE EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS.—

"(A) PROHIBITION.—No person may export any natural gas from the United States to a foreign country without first having secured an order of the Secretary of Energy authorizing such person to do so.

"(B) ISSUANCE OF ORDERS.—The Secretary of Energy may issue an order authorizing a person to export natural gas from the United States to a foreign country, upon application, if the Secretary determines that the proposed exportation will be consistent with the public interest, in accordance with the regulations issued under paragraph (3)(B). The Secretary may by order grant such application, in whole or in part, with such modification and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate.

"(C) TIMING.—No order may be issued by the Secretary of Energy under this paragraph prior to the date on which the Secretary issues final regulations under paragraph (3)(B).

"(3) PUBLIC INTEREST DETERMINATION.—

"(A) NEPA REVIEW.—The Secretary of Energy shall issue a detailed statement under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) of the environmental impact of the issuance of orders under paragraph (2), including by conducting an analysis of the impacts of extraction of exported natural gas on the environment in communities where the natural gas is extracted.

"(B) REGULATIONS.—

"(i) DEADLINE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of Energy shall issue final regulations, after notice and public comment, for determining whether an export of natural gas from the United States to a foreign country is in the public interest for purposes of issuing an order under paragraph (2).

"(ii) CONTENTS.—Regulations issued under this paragraph shall require the Secretary of Energy to determine, with respect to each application for export of natural gas from the United States to a foreign country, whether such export is in the public interest through—

"(I) use of the latest available data on current and projected United States natural gas demands, production, and price;

"(II) consideration of the effects of such natural gas exports on—

"(aa) household and business energy expenditures by electricity and natural gas consumers in the United States;

"(bb) the United States economy, jobs, and manufacturing, including such effects on wages, investment, and energy intensive and trade exposed industries, as determined by the Secretary;

"(cc) the energy security of the United States, including the ability of the United States to reduce its reliance on imported oil;

"(dd) the conservation of domestic natural gas supplies to meet the future energy needs of the United States;

"(ee) the potential for natural gas use in the transportation, industrial, and electricity sectors of the United States;

"(ff) the ability of the United States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions;

"(gg) the volume of natural gas produced on public lands in the United States, and where such natural gas is consumed;

"(hh) domestic natural gas supply and availability, including such effects on pipelines and other infrastructure;

"(ii) the balance of trade of the United States; and

"(jj) other issues determined relevant by the Secretary; and

"(III) consideration of the detailed statement issued under subparagraph (A).

"(4) EXEMPTIONS.—Paragraph (2) does not apply with respect to any order authorizing the exportation of natural gas if the natural gas that would be exported as a result of the order is exported solely to meet a requirement imposed pursuant to section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702), section 5(b) of the Trading with the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 5(b)), or part B of title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6271 et seq.). In such cases, the Secretary of Energy may issue such order upon application without modification or delay."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 636, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment that I am offering, along with Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

The effects of the natural gas boom have been felt throughout our economy, but before we hurry to ship our energy advantage overseas, we should ensure that we are not exporting our ability to create jobs, keep energy prices low, and to fuel a resurgence in American manufacturing that is so badly needed.

The Holt-Quigley amendment will ensure that the Department of Energy—before approving additional LNG exports—adheres to unambiguous congressional guidance in consideration of how such exports will affect our economy, our communities, and our environment.

H.R. 6 would essentially approve all pending LNG applications, in addition to those that have already been approved. All approved and pending export facilities add up to an ability to export 36 billion cubic feet of liquefied natural gas per day.

Thirty-six billion cubic feet per day is about 40 percent of U.S. peak daily consumption during this past winter—a winter, I should note, with volatility in the domestic natural gas market resulting in shortages in some areas—while, elsewhere, prices spiked, resulting in up to a 250 percent increase in natural gas prices from the previous year.

Now, we know that exporting more LNG will raise prices, but what we don't know is by how much. We know that higher prices will create problems for U.S. manufacturing and homeowner heating, but we don't know how badly.

We should take the time to consider what greater volumes of LNG exports will mean for energy prices, jobs, manufacturing, the environment, and the economy.

As with all the bills on the floor this week, H.R. 6 is about supporting oil and gas interest at the expense of American manufacturing, American families, and the environment.

Our amendment has the support of both America's Energy Advantage and the Industrial Energy Consumers of America.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Holt amendment is a virtual rewrite of the entire Natural Gas Act that has been drafted without the benefit of the full debate of this Chamber or committee in regular order of this process.

The amendment would reverse the rebuttable presumption that proposed exports are consistent with the public interest. The amendment would also require the Department of Energy to undertake a new rulemaking and issue new regulations to determine whether an export of natural gas from the U.S. to a foreign country is in the public interest.

The moratorium on processing applications resulting from the Holt amendment could last years. The DOE has already spent more than 3 years—3 years—establishing the process for reviewing the public interest.

The DOE's public interest analysis is already well informed by numerous economic and environmental studies; and in prior decisions, DOE has looked at a number of factors, including economic impacts, international considerations, U.S. energy security, and environmental considerations, already among other things.

To conduct its reviews, DOE looks to the record of evidence developed in the application proceeding. Applicants and intervenors are free to raise new issues or concerns relevant to the public interest that may not have been addressed in prior cases.

Even though the DOE has repeatedly rejected the same reoccurring arguments lodged by the same Washington, D.C.-based special interest groups, they are delaying decisions on new export applications.

The Department of Energy has continually stated that the public interest generally favors authorizing proposals to export natural gas that have been shown to lead to net benefits on the U.S. economy, and I believe the Holt amendment would disrupt the process that DOE has developed and result in even further delays.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the current amendment to H.R. 6.

The Holt-Quigley amendment requires the Secretary of Energy to consider how proposed natural gas exports will affect the domestic natural gas prices, jobs, and manufacturing when making a public interest determination.

I rise in opposition to the amendment because it codifies requirements that are already existing in the public interest determination. That is what the Department of Energy, under current law, is supposed to do, and we expect them to do their job.

When conducting a public interest determination, the Department of Energy considers economic, geopolitical, national security, and a variety of other issues. The public interest determination is a robust review of all the impacts associated with LNG exports. It would be redundant to require DOE to look at issues they are already considering.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment. I thank my colleague for the time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), a coproposer and coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the debate about our Nation's energy policy is happening here in Congress and around the country.

We are debating the merits of natural gas extraction, with many of us arguing for much stronger regulations to prevent the contamination of our drinking water and the pollution of our air.

We are debating the building of the Keystone pipeline, with many of us arguing that its approval would harm our environment and jeopardize the health and well-being of our communities. In each of these debates, the argument on each side may be contrary, but both sides are focused on one important question: Is this in the national interest?

It is essential that today's debate about the exportation of natural gas be framed in the same light. The amendment I am offering with my friend from New Jersey is based on a central premise. Before hurrying to export as much as 36 billion cubic feet of LNG per day, we should take time to consider what this will mean for energy prices, jobs, manufacturing, the environment, and our economy.

Current law simply assumes it is always in our natural interest to export natural gas, even though studies confirm that exporting our natural gas would increase the price domestically.

We are providing a rubberstamp review process that expedites LNG exports without considering its potential effects. Our amendment would simply flip this assumption and require, by law, that DOE take into consideration exports' impact on consumers, the economy, and energy security before making its decision.

By passing this amendment, we can ensure that true beneficiaries of the natural gas boom are our consumers and our economy, while protecting our environment at the same time.

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

I would just add that the National Association of Manufacturers, on April 9—which claims to be the largest manufacturing association in the United States, representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 States—supports H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

So the largest organization of manufacturers supports H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would also point out the risks if we do not have an outlet for American energy production.

The result of shut-in wells and less production, indeed, will lead to increased prices for consumers, but the fact is that DOE studies have already stated that exporting natural gas has been shown to lead to net benefits to

the U.S. economy, adding billions of dollars to our GDP, adding tens of thousands of jobs to our Nation's workforce, and removing people from the unemployment rolls.

This is something this Congress ought to adopt today, a way to move forward on energy security, and a way to move forward on jobs that are ready to put people to work. Let's pass this bill today.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment for the simple fact that it is unworkable and rewrites the law without adequate discussion and debate amongst this body.

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Groups representing a diverse group of businesses and manufacturers support this amendment—groups that believe we should proceed with caution when making decisions about vast quantities of domestic energy resources.

The Department of Energy has already approved LNG facilities that are capable of exporting 9.3 billion cubic feet per day, and before we irresponsibly and hurriedly expedite the approval of up to 36 billion cubic feet—nearly four times as much of LNG exports per day—I believe we should consider the effect this will have across our economy.

Mr. GARDNER says this amendment of ours might slow exports. Well, it might because the idea is not to do it as quickly as we can, but to do it as wisely as we can. Our responsibility is not just to look after the oil and gas interests. Our responsibility is also to look after American workers, American manufacturers, American consumers, and homeowners.

No one in this Chamber should want our domestic natural gas prices to increase on a par with those in Europe or Asia, and a vote in support of the Holt-Quigley amendment will ensure that that is not the case.

I urge support for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I represent an area that is a combination of both the customers of the natural gas boom that we have, but also the export opportunities in the States of Texas and Louisiana.

We are concerned about running up the price of natural gas because I want it to be used more for electricity production. I have a chemical industry that is in the eastern part of my district that I want to make sure we keep

adding those jobs like we are doing so much.

I also know that we need to keep those folks drilling in the field, and in south Texas, we are flaring natural gas right now. In North Dakota, we are flaring natural gas. It is not good for the environment, but we need to have consumers for that, and so that is why this legislation is needed, and we will be able to have customers for that.

I know, yesterday, I used it in the bill on pipelines. In Texas, we love Blue Bell ice cream. I know the Chairman does, too. Their ads are saying, "We eat all we can, and we sell the rest."

Let's use all our natural gas we can in our country at a reasonable price, but what we can't use, let's not waste it. Let's sell it to someone else, and I thank the colleague for the time.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113-492.

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:

Page 2, line 22, insert "and publically disclose the applicant's intention to use eminent domain for any construction necessary for such authorized LNG exports" after "authorized LNG exports".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 636, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

□ 1345

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

We just had a debate over the potential impact of export of LNG on domestic prices. There is no arguing that the low domestic prices for natural gas have been a boon for our country. Some manufacturers are actually moving operations back from overseas. Others here are being advantaged in the international markets, much to the concern of some of our competitors in Europe and elsewhere. So we can say that is good. We are not going to settle that issue in my amendment. I am going to bring up another issue.

But the reason natural gas companies want to export is to realize higher prices, and some of these terminals will require new pipelines to connect to domestic natural gas supplies, particularly some of the new supplies.

Here is the problem. In 2005, Congress passed the Bush-Cheney energy plan, which gave the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—a group of nameless, faceless, obscure bureaucrats—the

authority to grant eminent domain to pipeline companies. That means companies have eminent domain authority generally reserved for the greater public interest to build pipelines to export natural gas.

Now I had three amendments. This one simply requires disclosure. I just want to bring a bit more focus during the expedited—should this bill become law—application and approval process for persons in the area, whether or not there is a prospect that a natural gas pipeline will exert eminent domain over their property. Now, it is just disclosure, because, as I say, my other amendments weren't allowed, if eminent domain is going to be used to export natural gas to a pipeline terminal.

Now, earlier this year I voted with, as I have every year, every single Republican in favor of H.R. 1944. That is legislation to overturn the Supreme Court's decision in 2005, *Kelo v. City of New London*, where the city of New London was found to have the authority to use eminent domain on behalf of private development interests. The Republicans, as I mentioned earlier, brought up a bill to overturn that decision, the Private Property Rights Protection Act, which passed with every Republican vote and a number of Democrats on our side of the aisle.

The same principle applies here. I am not challenging—because that is not allowed—the issue of eminent domain for a private pipeline for the export of natural gas, but I am saying that at least persons who are in proximity to that, or actually in line with that proposed pipeline, should have the opportunity when the company applies to know that it may be used so they can address their point of view during the application process.

Now, there are some industry talking points saying wait a minute, wait a minute, this eminent domain isn't in section 3. They are right. I agree with them. They are absolutely right. However, section 7 regulates pipelines, and pipelines in some instances will be required and will be used to access these natural gas terminals, and I am simply saying that persons in those areas should know that eminent domain is intended to be used.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I have spent a great deal of my time, both here in this Chamber and actually working in the State legislature as well, to protect people's property rights, particularly private property rights. In the State legislature, I remember the decision coming down from the Supreme Court, making sure that we could do everything we could to prevent any abuse of eminent domain. But it is that State legislative experience that taught me that the

legal process of eminent domain is largely a State and local issue which should have no bearing on the Department of Energy's public interest determination—again, this is about the public interest determination—for the export of LNG to non-free trade countries.

By law, the Secretary of Energy plays no part in approving the construction of LNG export facilities or the pipelines connecting the gas to the facility. By law, the Secretary of Energy plays no part in the pipeline or construction of the facilities.

This bill only addresses the Department of Energy's process, and this amendment would expand the role of DOE into an area where the DOE is not currently involved and has no expertise.

The purpose of H.R. 6 is to expedite liquefied natural gas export applications which have been stuck in limbo awaiting a decision for far too long—in some cases, for more than 2 years. This amendment would unfairly put new requirements on these already pending applications, and I believe we should oppose the amendment because it is something, again, that is left to the States and local determination factors. With that, I would ask for a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, unfortunately, it isn't left to the States. The gentleman is wrong. The Bush-Cheney energy act preempted the States—preempted the State authority. It gives a faceless, nameless Federal bureaucracy, which on every other day is opposed by the other side of the aisle, the authority to grant eminent domain for a private company, for private profit, for the export of natural gas, which may well drive up the gas prices of the property owners adjacent to or who have been penetrated by that line.

This amendment doesn't delay anything. It doesn't give any significant new authority. It just requires the simple disclosure that if this terminal is built, a new pipeline is going to be required, and that pipeline, under section 3, with the faceless, nameless Federal bureaucrats behind it, is going to be granted eminent domain authority to take people's property. That is the bottom line. You can try and dance around it and say, well, I am against Kelo because that was another kind of development, but no, I am against this amendment because we wouldn't want people to know that they were going to lose their property rights to eminent domain because of faceless, nameless Federal bureaucrats.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me again.

That 2005 energy bill may have been called Bush-Cheney, but it came out of our Energy and Commerce Committee, and it had 77 Democratic votes when we passed that bill on the House floor.

Mr. DEFAZIO's amendment, with all due respect, requires an applicant to disclose any intention to use eminent domain on any construction necessary to support the LNG export project. I rise in opposition because it looks like an attempt to unnecessarily complicate LNG exports.

LNG facilities require pipelines. However, pipeline construction and operation is a whole separate issue. Yesterday in the House, we had a pipeline bill. Unfortunately, my colleague submitted LNG amendments to the pipeline bill yesterday. If H.R. 6 were a pipeline bill, then perhaps we could be honest about the debate. The fact of the matter is that we need more pipelines in our country. Right now in North Dakota and south Texas, we are flaring natural gas. But H.R. 6 is not a pipeline bill, and it is not the legislation to address the issue of eminent domain, which is predominantly under State law, and I am proud of our State law in Texas. I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I would just add again that there is no eminent domain authority for an LNG facility. That is what H.R. 6 is addressing, the export permits for LNG facilities. There is no eminent domain authority for an LNG facility. Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment.

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.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 4 will not be offered.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, 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. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 641, and adopting House Resolution 641, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4899, LOWERING GASOLINE PRICES TO FUEL AN AMERICA THAT WORKS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4923, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 641) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 180, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

YEAS—238

Aderholt	Boustany	Carter
Amash	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Amodei	Bridenstine	Chabot
Bachmann	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Bachus	Brooks (IN)	Coble
Barletta	Broun (GA)	Coffman
Barr	Buchanan	Cole
Barrow (GA)	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Barton	Burgess	Collins (NY)
Benishek	Byrne	Conaway
Bentivolio	Calvert	Cook
Bilirakis	Camp	Costa
Bishop (UT)	Campbell	Cotton
Black	Cantor	Cramer
Blackburn	Capito	Crawford

Crenshaw Jones
 Cuellar Jordan
 Culberson Joyce
 Daines Kelly (PA)
 Davis, Rodney King (IA)
 Denham King (NY)
 Dent Kingston
 DeSantis Kinzinger (IL)
 DesJarlais Kline
 Diaz-Balart Labrador
 Duffy LaMalfa
 Duncan (SC) Lamborn
 Duncan (TN) Lance
 Ellmers Latham
 Farenthold Latta
 Fincher LoBiondo
 Fitzpatrick Long
 Fleischmann Lucas
 Fleming Luetkemeyer
 Flores Lummis
 Forbes Marchant
 Fortenberry Marino
 Foxx Massie
 Franks (AZ) Matheson
 Frelinghuysen McAllister
 Gallego McCarthy (CA)
 Gardner McCaul
 Garrett McClintock
 Gerlach McHenry
 Gibbs McKeon
 Gibson McKinley
 Gohmert McMorris
 Goodlatte Rodgers
 Gosar Meadows
 Gowdy Meehan
 Granger Messer
 Graves (GA) Mica
 Graves (MO) Miller (FL)
 Green, Al Miller (MI)
 Green, Gene Miller, Gary
 Griffin (AR) Mullin
 Griffith (VA) Mulvaney
 Grimm Murphy (PA)
 Guthrie Neugebauer
 Hall Nugent
 Harper Nunes
 Harris Olson
 Hastings (WA) Palazzo
 Heck (NV) Paulsen
 Hensarling Pearce
 Herrera Beutler Perry
 Hinojosa Peterson
 Holding Petri
 Hudson Pittenger
 Huelskamp Pitts
 Huizenga (MI) Poe (TX)
 Hultgren Pompeo
 Hunter Posey
 Hurt Price (GA)
 Issa Reichert
 Jackson Lee Renacci
 Jenkins Ribble
 Johnson (OH) Rice (SC)
 Johnson, Sam Richmond
 Joly Rigell

NAYS—180

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

Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McDermott
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Veasey
 Vela
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13
 Gingrey (GA)
 Hanna
 Hartzler
 Kilmer
 Kirkpatrick
 Lankford
 Napolitano
 Noem
 Nunnelee
 Polis
 Rangel
 Reed
 Thompson (PA)

□ 1601

Messrs. JEFFRIES and CARNEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. GALLEGO, COLLINS of New York, PETERSON, CUELLAR, BARROW of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas and RICHMOND changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC, June 25, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Ms. Maria Matthews, Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State of Florida, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held June 24, 2014, the Honorable Curt Clawson was elected Representative to Congress for the Nineteenth Congressional District, State of Florida.

With best wishes, I am
 Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
 Clerk.

Enclosure.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
 DIVISION OF ELECTIONS,
 Tallahassee, Florida, June 25, 2014.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
 Clerk, House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. HAAS: This is to advise you that the preliminary results reported on the night

of June 24, 2014, for the special election for the Nineteenth Congressional District of Florida, reflected the following preliminary returns (which includes all early voting and Election Day results except write-in ballots, provisional ballots, and the overseas absentee ballots which could be received within 10 days after the election):

Curt Clawson, REP, 66,889, 66.95%.
 April Freeman, DEM, 29,294, 29.32%.
 Ray Netherwood, LPF, 3,724, 3.73%.
 Timothy Rissano, WRI, 0, 0%.

The first set of unofficial results are not due to be reported until noon, June 28, 2014. It is only when the first set of unofficial results are reported that we will know if a recount actually becomes necessary. Florida law requires a recount when a candidate is defeated by ½ of a percent or less of the votes cast. To the best of our knowledge, there is no contest to this election; however, a contest may be filed at any time within 10 days after the state's Election Canvassing Commission certifies the election, which is scheduled to occur on July 8, 2014.

As soon as the official results are certified by the state's Election Canvassing Commission, an official certificate of election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,
 MARIA I. MATTHEWS,
 Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE CURT CLAWSON, OF FLORIDA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable CURT CLAWSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Florida delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. CLAWSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 113th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE CURT CLAWSON TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Florida delegation, it is a great honor to welcome our newest Member of this proud body, Congressman CURT CLAWSON.

Like all of us here, the Congressman believes in a bright economic future for all of America, and I am sure that with his extensive background as a former CEO this will help us in our pursuit to make that future a reality.

CURT, from the basketball court to Capitol Hill, you have proven that no obstacle is too great and that with your dedication and your skills you will be able to accomplish whatever you set out to do.

Your journey to get to this point has been a long, storied, and successful one, gathering knowledge and understanding of our State and our Nation's needs and developing a clear vision along the way.

I am confident that together, along with the entire bipartisan Florida congressional delegation, you will be able to represent our great State to the highest degree and join us in a constructive, insightful debate to lead our Nation to domestic and international prosperity.

Last night was surely a joyous night for you, for your family, and for your community. It was a culmination of months, years, and a lifetime of hard work. We hope that you continue your efforts for the good of the people who shared your vision with you last night and for our entire State and country.

Before I yield to my distinguished colleague, I would like to once again welcome Congressman CLAWSON as our newest addition to the Florida delegation familia.

Congratulations, CURT, and welcome. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, it appears that there are too many point guards in this Hall.

I start by bowing in humility to my God, hoping for wisdom and inspiration on a responsibility so big on my shoulders that we all share of course.

My second point today is that I am committed to represent those in my district, and not only those that voted for me, but those that did not: the young and old, male and female, White, African American, or those that speak Spanish, too—los que hablan espanol, tambien. I am committed to representing all of my constituents in a fair way.

My grandfather was a gardener in his spare time, and he had a long, dark closet. At the end of that closet was a picture of a judge in long, flowing robes. At the bottom of that picture was written the following words: "We call him 'Your Honor' to remember our own."

I have always felt that my father and grandfather didn't need that reminder very often, but I come to you today hoping to bring just a small measure of honor to this Chamber and hoping that we can honor our constituents and

honor each other by the way we treat each other.

I am so humbled and grateful to be here and ask for your support. Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Florida, the whole number of the House is now 433.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4899, LOWERING GASOLINE PRICES TO FUEL AN AMERICA THAT WORKS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4923, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on adoption of House Resolution 641.

The question was taken; and the Speaker 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. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]
AYES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barietta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook

Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Fox
Frank (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo

Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

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

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richardmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am opposed to the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Garamendi moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 6, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, after line 22, insert the following new section:

SEC. 4. PROHIBITING HIGHER NATURAL GAS PRICES FOR UNITED STATES CONSUMERS AND PROTECTING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY.

In reviewing an application for authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b), the Department of Energy—

(1) shall deny such application if—

(A) the export would increase the price of natural gas, electricity, or home heating for American seniors on fixed incomes; or

(B) the natural gas would be exported to any nation that is a state sponsor of terrorism or otherwise threatens America's national security, or to any nation or corporation that steals America's military technology or intellectual property through cyber-attacks; and

(2) shall require, as a condition for approval of any such authorization, the applicant to ensure that United States-flagged ships and shipping containers are used to export the LNG.

OPEN WITH

CJG: I have a motion to recommit at the desk. . . .

Speaker Pro Temp: Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

CJG: I am opposed.

Speaker Pro Temp: The gentleman qualifies and the Clerk will read the amendment.

Clerk reads (Democratic Sponsor can ask UC to dispense with reading or if the Reccommit is short, just allow reading to be completed.)

CJG: 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.

This amendment would prohibit approval of applications export natural gas if:

The export increased the price of natural gas, electricity or home heating for American seniors on fixed incomes; OR

The natural gas were to be exported to a state sponsor of terrorism or a country that engaged in cyber-attacks against the U.S.;

This amendment would also require that before an application could be approved:

The applicant would have to ensure that U.S.-flagged ships and shipping containers would be used to export the LNG.

Mr. GARDNER (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 Colorado?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

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

My colleagues, America is blessed with many, many resources—all of you, for example. America is blessed with great natural resources, among them natural gas.

We have seen a terrific increase in the availability of natural gas, and it has provided this Nation with the opportunity to have the lowest price energy among the industrial nations, an incredible advantage that we have received as a result of God's gift of natural gas.

The question for all of us to ponder for a moment is: How will we use that natural gas and to whose benefit will it inure?

This bill will provide for the protection of Americans who have, from these number of years, enjoyed a reasonable price for their energy, but if this bill moves forward as presently written, we will be talking about seniors who will see higher prices in their natural gas and in their energy.

If this bill moves forward as it is currently written, we will be seeing our natural resource, this strategic asset, wind up in the hands of countries who support terrorists or countries who are engaged in industrial espionage through cyber attacks on our industry and on our government.

If this bill moves forward as it is presently written, we will not see American ships under our flag with our sailors taking this natural resource, this strategic asset, across the oceans.

However, ladies and gentlemen, if we approve this amendment, we will be protecting our seniors from higher energy prices because this bill says that, in determining the public interest, we will make sure our seniors are protected.

If we adopt this amendment, we will see that none of our natural resource—natural gas, a strategic asset—will wind up in the hands of countries who have supported terrorists.

□ 1630

We will find that no country that allows people in their country to engage in cyber attacks against our industries

or against our government will have our precious natural resource, and we will see American ships with American sailors and American flags on the ocean exporting this strategic national asset.

The question, therefore, for each and every one of us is this: With whom do you stand? The gas companies, who will have billions and billions of dollars of profits exporting? Or, do you stand with our seniors?

Who do you stand with? Countries that are engaged in cyberattacks against America, and who are supporting terrorists?

Who do you stand with? Do you stand with American sailors and shipbuilders?

That is the question. That is what this amendment is all about. It is about protecting America.

I ask for your "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, we recognize that motions to recommit are procedural motions that are not substantive legislative proposals. They are offered by the minority party, whether Republican or Democrat, with the goal of undermining or stopping the underlying legislation on the floor.

The Department of Energy's public interest consideration already looks at the concerns that you raise in this procedural motion. They already look at the factors that you talk about in this procedural motion.

No liquefied natural gas can go to countries which we have sanctions on or are otherwise restricted in law.

This administration has already said this will provide a net benefit to our economy. This administration has said U.S. natural gas prices will not rise to world prices. This administration has said that studies consistently demonstrate net economic benefits across all scenarios and export volumes. This administration has said the U.S. manufacturing renaissance is unlikely to be harmed by LNG exports.

If you stand for this bill you stand for jobs, you stand for economic opportunity, and you stand against delays. Let's pass this bill and defeat the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, let's oppose the motion to recommit and do what is right for America, creating jobs for us and our allies, answering the call for freedom at home.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 225, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

AYES—192

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

NOES—225

Aderholt	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Clawson (FL)
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Coble
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Coffman
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Cole
Barletta	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Barr	Burgess	Collins (NY)
Barton	Byrne	Conaway
Benishek	Calvert	Cook
Bentivolio	Camp	Costa
Bilirakis	Campbell	Cotton
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Cramer
Black	Capito	Crawford
Blackburn	Carter	Crenshaw
Boustany	Cassidy	Culberson
Brady (TX)	Chabot	Daines

Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Dent	Kline	Rohrabacher
DeSantis	Labrador	Rokita
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Rooney
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Duffy	Lance	Roskam
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Ross
Ellmers	Latta	Rothfus
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Royce
Fincher	Long	Runyan
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Ryan (OH)
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)
Fleming	Lummis	Salmon
Flores	Marchant	Sanford
Forbes	Marino	Scalise
Fortenberry	Massie	Schock
Fox	Matheson	Schweikert
Franks (AZ)	McAllister	Scott, Austin
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Gardner	McCaul	Sessions
Garrett	McClintock	Shimkus
Gerlach	McHenry	Shuster
Gibbs	McKeon	Simpson
Gibson	McKinley	Smith (MO)
Gohmert	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Gosar	Meadows	Smith (TX)
Gowdy	Meehan	Southerland
Granger	Messer	Stewart
Graves (GA)	Mica	Stivers
Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)	Stockman
Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary	Terry
Grimm	Mullin	Thornberry
Guthrie	Mulvaney	Tiberi
Hall	Murphy (PA)	Tipton
Harris	Neugebauer	Turner
Hastings (WA)	Nugent	Upton
Heck (NV)	Nunes	Valadao
Hensarling	Olson	Walberg
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Walden
Holding	Paulsen	Walorski
Hudson	Pearce	Weber (TX)
Huelskamp	Perry	Webster (FL)
Huizenga (MI)	Petri	Wenstrup
Hultgren	Pittenger	Westmoreland
Hunter	Pitts	Whitfield
Hurt	Poe (TX)	Williams
Pompeo	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Price (GA)	Wittman
Jenkins	Reichert	Wolf
Johnson (OH)	Renacci	Womack
Johnson, Sam	Ribble	Woodall
Jolly	Rice (SC)	Yoder
Jordan	Rigell	Yoho
Joyce	Roby	Young (AK)
Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)	Young (IN)
King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	
King (NY)	Rogers (KY)	
Kingston		

NOT VOTING—15

Davis, Rodney	Kilmer	Nunnelee
Gingrey (GA)	Kirkpatrick	Polis
Gutiérrez	Lankford	Rangel
Hanna	Napolitano	Reed
Hartzler	Noem	Thompson (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1639

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 25th, 2014, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 358 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 6—Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

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.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 150, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

YEAS—266

Aderholt	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Gowdy	Neugebauer
Amodei	Granger	Nugent
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Olson
Barber	Green, Al	Owens
Barletta	Green, Gene	Palazzo
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Barton	Griffith (VA)	Pearce
Benishek	Grimm	Perlmutter
Bera (CA)	Guthrie	Perry
Bilirakis	Hall	Peters (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Harper	Peterson
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Petri
Black	Hastings (WA)	Pittenger
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Pitts
Boustany	Heck (WA)	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bridenstine	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Brooks (IN)	Himes	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Hinojosa	Rahall
Buchanan	Holding	Reichert
Bucshon	Hoyer	Renacci
Burgess	Hudson	Ribble
Byrne	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Richmond
Camp	Hultgren	Rigell
Campbell	Hunter	Roby
Cantor	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Capito	Israel	Rogers (AL)
Cárdenas	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Cassidy	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Castro (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Chabot	Jolly	Rooney
Chaffetz	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Roskam
Coble	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Coffman	King (IA)	Rothfus
Cole	King (NY)	Royce
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Runyan
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ruppersberger
Conaway	Kline	Ryan (OH)
Connolly	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Cook	LaMalfa	Salmon
Cooper	Lamborn	Sanford
Costa	Lance	Scalise
Cotton	Larsen (WA)	Schraeder
Cramer	Latham	Schweikert
Crawford	Latta	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Sessions
Culberson	Long	Shimkus
Daines	Lucas	Shuster
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
DelBene	(NM)	Smith (MO)
Denham	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (NE)
Dent	(NM)	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	Lummis	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Maloney,	Southerland
Diaz-Balart	Carolyn	Stewart
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Stivers
Duffy	Marchant	Stockman
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Stutzman
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Terry
Ellmers	Matheson	Thornberry
Engel	McAllister	Tiberi
Enyart	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Farenthold	McCaul	Turner
Fincher	McClintock	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Valadao
Fleischmann	McIntyre	Veasey
Fleming	McKeon	Vela
Flores	McKinley	Visclosky
Forbes	McMorris	Wagner
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Walberg
Fox	Meadows	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Walorski
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Weber (TX)
Gallego	Mica	Webster (FL)
Garcia	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Garrett	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Gerlach	Moran	Williams
Gibbs	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Wittman
Goodlatte	Murphy (FL)	Wolf

Womack Yoder Young (AK)
Woodall Yoho Young (IN)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 355 on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 641, I am not recorded due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 356 on adoption of H. Res. 641, I am not recorded due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 357 on the DeFazio Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, I am not recorded due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 358 on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, offered by Mr. GARAMENDI of California, I am not recorded due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 359 on final passage of H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, I am not recorded due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Americans are all too familiar with the economic hardships caused by \$4 a gallon gasoline prices. I routinely hear from families in my central Washington district whose budgets are already being stretched thin and who can't afford the rising prices at the pump. Commuting to work, running the kids to after-school activities, and putting food on the table are all becoming increasingly difficult to afford. Yet the pain is not only being felt during trips to the gas station—high gasoline prices are a drain on our entire economy. That means that school districts juggle to operate bus routes, that cities grapple with the cost of sending police cars on patrol, and that businesses adjust budgets that can affect the hiring of new employees.

The good news is that \$4 gasoline does not have to be our reality. The U.S. is blessed with an abundance of oil and natural gas resources that can lower energy prices and grow our economy. H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act, is commonsense legislation to responsibly harness the American energy resources that we have right here at home.

Mr. Chairman, the Obama administration has spent the last 5½ years placing our energy resources on Federal lands and waters under tight lock and key. Offshore areas have been placed off limits. Scheduled exploration off Virginia was canceled, and over half of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, or NPR-A, has been closed to energy production. That is why it is no surprise that, since President Obama took office, total Federal oil production has dropped 6 percent and total natural gas production has dropped 28 percent. That is on Federal lands, Mr. Chairman. Meanwhile, gasoline prices have doubled during this Presidency. H.R. 4899 would reverse this trend and unlock our American energy.

The bill would implement a drill smart plan that would expand offshore energy production and safely open new areas that contain the most oil and natural gas resources, such as the mid-Atlantic, the southern Pacific, and the Arctic. It would require the Secretary to conduct specific oil and natural gas lease sales, including offshore Virginia, which was delayed and then canceled by the Obama administration. The bill would also establish fair and equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States and improve safety by reorganizing the Interior Department's offshore energy agencies.

NAYS—150

Barrow (GA)	Gibson	Pallone
Bass	Grayson	Pascrell
Beatty	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Hahn	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Pocan
Braley (IA)	Holt	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Honda	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Roybal-Allard
Bustos	Huffman	Ruiz
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rush
Capps	Jeffries	Sánchez, Linda T.
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Jones	Schakowsky
Cartwright	Kaptur	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Keating	Schneider
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Schwartz
Cicilline	Kennedy	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Serrano
Clay	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Cleaver	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Sires
Conyers	Levin	Slaughter
Courtney	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Loebsack	Speier
Cummings	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Maffei	Tierney
DeLauro	Matsui	Titus
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Dingell	McCollum	Tsongas
Doggett	McDermott	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McGovern	Vargas
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeke	Walz
Eshoo	Meng	Wasserman
Esty	Michaud	Schultz
Farr	Miller, George	Waters
Fattah	Moore	Waxman
Foster	Nadler	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Nolan	
Garamendi	O'Rourke	

NOT VOTING—16

Bentivolio	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Brooks (AL)	Lankford	Reed
Gingrey (GA)	Napolitano	Schock
Hanna	Noem	Thompson (PA)
Hartzler	Nunnelee	
Kilmer	Polis	

□ 1647

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall 359 on final passage of H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, my vote was incorrectly recorded as "no." I intended to vote "yes."

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 359, I was unavoidably detained during passage of H.R. 6. An important discussion on matters pertaining to U.S. Marine held prisoner in Mexico. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 25th, 2014, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 359 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on final passage of H.R. 6—Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

LOWERING GASOLINE PRICES TO FUEL AN AMERICA THAT WORKS ACT OF 2014

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. 4899.

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 641 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. 4899.

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

□ 1649

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. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia in the chair.

In addition to increased offshore energy production, the bill would help expand onshore oil and natural gas production on Federal lands. It would reform the leasing and streamline the permitting process, encourage the development of U.S. oil shale resources, expand the production of the NPR-A, and much more.

While these policies will help lower gasoline prices, they will also create over 1.2 million new American jobs and generate over \$1.7 billion in new revenue. In other words, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a win for our economy and a win for jobs.

It is also important for our national security. The current turmoil in Iraq has already caused the price of gasoline to increase, and it serves as an important reminder of why we need to increase production here at home. The best way to protect ourselves from price spikes caused by international conflicts is to increase the production of American energy resources.

As The Wall Street Journal reported last week, the recent energy boom here in the U.S. is "putting slack in the global oil market." A senior petroleum analyst noted in regard to the recent conflict in Iraq: "If this were 2005, we would have seen a 20-30 cent jump in gas prices, but it's lower today because domestic energy production is much higher."

However, all of the increase in U.S. energy production is happening on State and private lands. Mr. Chairman, let me repeat that. All of the increase in U.S. energy production is happening on State and private lands. As I previously noted, oil and natural gas production on Federal lands has declined under President Obama. We can and we should be doing so much more when it comes to American-produced energy, and doing so will further strengthen our energy security and reduce our reliance on foreign imports and on OPEC.

Finally, we need to take action now because the Obama administration just announced the start of work on the next 5-year offshore drilling plan. With this bill that we are considering today, Congress can advance a responsible plan for developing America's resources. The President's plan, on the other hand, closes over 85 percent of offshore areas to energy production and includes the lowest number of lease sales ever offered in a 5-year plan. The administration's restrictive policies should not continue for another 5 years. That is why there needs to be a new plan, as outlined in this bill on the floor, that opens new areas and helps to put more than a million Americans back to work.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4899 will ease the pain at the pump for American families and small businesses and eliminate Federal Government hurdles that keep American energy locked up. It is good for our economy; it is good for jobs; and it strengthens our national security. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We have before us two bills which have previously passed the House but that have been merged into one bill and that will again pass with a Republican majority.

It mandates offshore oil drilling from Maine to the southeast coast. It mandates offshore oil drilling off of South Carolina. This would all be done under expedited or potentially nonexistent environmental reviews if they didn't meet extraordinarily brief timelines, and they would not be allowed to evaluate any options that did not include drilling. As the Republicans are extremely fiscally conservative, this would double the revenue sharing for offshore oil drilling, creating a \$30 billion loss for the Federal Government and benefiting a few southeast States.

As for the onshore portion of the bill, every permit for drilling on Federal lands in the United States would have to be issued within 60 days, and the concept of multiple use, which is hunting, fishing, recreating, mountain biking, horseback riding—go on down the list—and other activities, are all subsumed to energy development, which becomes the big—oh, wait. What? I mean, really. This is my June 2013 speech. I mean, this is last year's speech. Who gave me last year's speech? Really. Oh, guess what? It really doesn't matter, because this is the same bill from last year—two bills into one. Exactly the same bills passed the House last year and the year before that and the year before that. Every year since the Republicans have taken over, when gas prices spike up, they pass imaginary legislation and pretend they are doing something about high gas prices instead of tackling the real causes, which I will get to in a moment.

□ 1700

So many people have heard about Christmas in July. We now have a new tradition here, which is Groundhog Day in June for energy bills, in a faux sort of attempt to pretend we really care about the extortionate prices that people are paying because of Big Oil in the United States and speculation on Wall Street.

God forbid we should take on either of those very powerful and generous forces, generous to some, not to others. Does anybody believe this?

I guess there are a few people who believe anything, but since they first brought this bill to the floor in 2011, U.S. oil production has gone from 5.6 million barrels a day to 8.4 million barrels a day—not shabby, basically a 50 percent increase.

Let's look at another chart. Exports—we are talking about—now, we have a new theory. This isn't about lowering prices in America; it is about avoiding even higher prices in America because we are stabilizing the world markets.

Well, I have had a lot of complaints from truckers. Look at how much diesel we are exporting. Since the Republicans started this campaign, the combined exports of refined gasoline—remember the shortages, that is why we are paying higher prices, supply and demand—have gone from 700 million barrels a day to 1.5 billion. We have doubled our export of refined product, and the truckers are really getting stuck here.

Look at this line. You want to know why diesel prices are up? Because diesel exports are up phenomenally—phenomenally. So we can blather on about: Gee, all we need is more production, more production—so we can export more?

In fact, now, the oil industry is pushing to end our ban on the export of crude oil. Now—right now, at least—we get some value added, and we get a few more jobs by exporting refined products.

Now, the industry wants us to lift the ban and say that we will export crude oil from the United States of America, I guess, so that we can prevent bigger price spikes if there are future crises because this is the new theory promulgated by The Wall Street Journal.

We hear a lot about the President. Here is a reality check on that issue: Federal onshore production is up 30 percent under President Obama. In fact, President Obama is providing over record production levels and plummeting imports, while the exact opposite happened under the Bush-Cheney energy policy, which actually was designed to make us more dependent upon foreign oil, and that did happen in spades during the Bush-Cheney administration.

The Energy Information Administration, they are right, there was a blip in our production offshore. It had to do with a little oil spill called Deepwater Horizon, and there was a temporary suspension of drilling and new permits. That is history now, but that does make your average look lower over time.

The Energy Information Administration says that offshore production will reach record levels—that is, all Federal offshore oil production will reach record levels by 2016; but that is reality that doesn't matter.

Now, we have a really nifty title, and that is something that they spend lots of money on consultants around here—both parties do—to come up with nifty little sayings. The nifty title is Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014.

Well, since we started this argument with the Republicans on this issue about increased oil production leading to lower gas prices—well, 2008, when we had drill, baby, drill, in order to lower gas prices that were \$3.50 to \$4 a gallon—and guess what?

They haven't gone down, so that argument kind of doesn't work anymore, but now, they are saying: well, they would have been higher if we weren't producing more oil.

If we produce just more, they might not have been even more higher, or maybe they would be lower because that is what we said for the last 4 years, that they would be lower.

Since we are exporting a whole heck of a lot of it, they are not because we are paying a world price for oil, and now, they want us to pay a world price for natural gas, one place where we do have an advantage, so the prices don't go down.

There is such an abundance of oil, as I mentioned earlier, the American Petroleum Institute wants to lift the ban on the export of crude oil from the United States. Wouldn't that be great?

The U.S. can export crude oil to China. China can use it to run their electrical generating facilities, which supply their manufacturing facilities, which will produce value-added products, things that we formerly used to make here in the United States, and they will sell them back to us.

We get to sell them a raw material, kind of like a colony, and they sell us back sophisticated materials. That is kind of like something we fought a revolution over a couple of hundred years ago, but now, that is okay with some on the other side.

This is both coasts and Alaska and tremendous degradation of environmental protections on the inland areas, as I mentioned earlier. This will really do away with multiple use.

Now, we heard from the chairman, who is an esteemed colleague, that the spike in Iraq would have been worse if we weren't producing so much and exporting so much.

Actually, I just saw the statistics yesterday. Oil production hasn't dropped at all. The other OPEC companies are putting more oil out, and Iraq is at 95 percent of where they were before this, so actually, there has been no reduction anywhere, but somehow, prices are up about 20 cents a gallon at the pump.

Now, if we just produced more oil, that wouldn't happen. No, that is not true. We are producing more oil.

If we just exported more refined oil and diesel and gasoline, that wouldn't happen. Well, no, because we are. What happened?

Wall Street is speculating on the price of oil. We had sworn testimony from the CEO of ExxonMobil 2½ years ago, before the United States Senate, when gas was getting to 4 bucks a gallon, and he said, hey, don't blame me, this isn't ExxonMobil doing this, it is Wall Street—because of the deregulation of Wall Street, the fact that we haven't yet implemented position limits on speculators, on commodities, as we were supposed to do under Dodd-Frank, which they want to repeal.

He said 60 cents a gallon. Drive up to the pump, and you are sending 60 cents a gallon to Wall Street speculators.

So if they wanted to do something today or tomorrow or yesterday or last year—or maybe next June—about spiking oil prices, it would be to go after

the speculators on Wall Street. That is the quickest relief that we could provide.

Mandate position limits—or even better—repeal the provisions of the Commodity Futures Trading Modernization Act—which I voted against, which was a Clinton-era Republican bill—that actually allowed massive new speculation by nonconsumers, nonproducers, something that we never had, never needed, and don't need today.

So next time you go to the pump, say, oh, well, if we just drill right here off of Maine or right here off of Massachusetts or right here, I would pay less; or think, wow, if they wanted to really give me relief, they would take on the big oil companies, they would take on Wall Street—but they won't do that.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank Chairman HASTINGS for his work on H.R. 4899, a bill that actually will ease the pain at the pump for moms and dads. There is no doubt about it.

Just since President Obama has taken office, gasoline prices have more than doubled, and I am not telling the American people anything they don't know because, when they reach in their wallet and take out money to pay for that gas—just to go back and forth to work or take the children to their sporting events or to school—they realize that more of their discretionary income is going to pay the fuel that runs the cars and the trucks that they drive.

I drive a diesel truck. I am paying—what—\$3.69 a gallon, most recently. I took this picture at a pump there in South Carolina, \$3.69 a gallon for on-road diesel fuel. Now, on that on-road diesel fuel is factored in all the highway taxes, but there was another pump right beside that one. It was for off-road diesel fuel.

Now, historically, off-road diesel fuel is a lot less than on-road diesel fuel. Why? Because there are no Federal taxes involved. It is not going to run on the road, so they are not going to collect taxes for that.

Where is that fuel used? It is used on farms. If you look at the price, it is \$3.54 and 9/10 cents a gallon. What does that mean? Well, that means farmers that are just finishing putting their crops in the ground across this Nation paid \$3.54 a gallon for off-road diesel fuel. Their input costs have gone up.

What does that mean? If this remains the same at harvest time, guess what? The commodity prices in this country will go up. We are already seeing historically high milk prices, historically high beef prices.

You can try to blame the commodity prices in the fall on the drought in California. Some of that will be the fact, but I can tell you that the input

cost for fertilizer and for diesel fuel to put the crops in the ground and harvest those are definitely a factor.

Moms and dads know what is going on. We can increase production in this country offshore and onshore through this bill. The President takes credit for increased production onshore, and I will give him this: production has increased onshore, but it has nothing to do with the policies of this administration.

It has everything to do with the private and State-owned land in South Dakota and places like Eagle Ford, Texas, where production is up. That State and private land has nothing to do with the administration's policies over the last 6 years.

Him taking credit for increased production is like the rooster taking credit for the sunrise every morning. Moms and dads in this country know you are spending more money for fuel costs.

The other side seems out of touch with America, about as out of touch as Hillary Clinton is, the pain you are feeling when you go to the pump to fill up your tank to provide for your family, going back and forth.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, as a Nation, we must work together if we are ever going to get a realistic energy policy that will provide clean, reliable energy for all America, that will reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources and preserve the beauty of our land.

We need a comprehensive energy plan for a country that includes not only the conventional resources like oil and gas, but also takes advantage of the new and renewable resources such as wind, solar, biomass, and geothermal energy.

At the end of the day, I don't believe we can simply afford to take any of these energy resources off the table. I, for one, am a firm believer that using all the energy tools in our energy tool box is the way that we must go forward.

In the San Joaquin Valley of California that I represent, we have shown that we can take an all-of-the-above approach. We have oil production taking place just down the road from our solar fields and our wind farms; yet, of course, we are all concerned about the rise of gas prices, but as the gentleman from Oregon said, there are multiple factors that are causing those rising gas prices.

I represent one of the newest University of California campuses in Merced, and it is blazing a trail for energy efficiency, crafting technology necessary for the next generation of solar energy production.

Conventional energy, together with renewable resources and a strategy for energy conservation—which we do quite well in California—I think will best serve our long-term energy needs. That is why I have cosponsored the

American energy opportunity act of 2014.

We must create a viable energy policy that not only acknowledges our short-term challenges, but our medium and our long-term challenges as well. We must enhance our path toward energy independence—which we have made remarkable progress in the last 4 years—from over 60 percent of importing our energy needs, now down to less than almost 40 percent.

We can do more. Expanding responsible domestic energy production on the Outer Continental Shelf, advancing alternative energy, including wind, solar, biomass, wave, geothermal, and other clean alternatives.

Developing clean coal technology, developing additional nuclear energy technology, expanding the energy of efficient products and alternative fuel vehicles, and restoring and protecting our Nation's wildlife refuges and national parks and lakes and waterways are not mutually exclusive with a good energy policy; and if we do this, we can also pay off our national debt.

Again, that is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 4956. This bill does all of those things. It could do them in different ways, though, because clean energy is a critical component of our future.

Before we debate any energy legislation, I think we must acknowledge that a green energy supply is not happening as fast as we might like it to.

However, this transition must happen in order to address the continuing impacts brought on by climate change—yes, climate change—and regardless of whether or not one acknowledges the human contributions of climate change, it is a fact.

As a matter of fact, it has been changing for millions of years.

□ 1715

A combination of increasing our own domestic supply of natural gas and oil as well as reducing demand will lower energy costs, create jobs, and allow us to transition to cleaner fuels.

It also has another important factor. As we know, our European allies are focusing and refocusing after the events of Ukraine and Russia, which seems to be here and there about focusing as a responsible energy supplier.

H.R. 4899 is an important measure that we are discussing. I agree with my colleague from Washington, Representative DOC HASTINGS, when he said that the “best way to create jobs and help address rising prices is to develop the American energy resources we have right here at home.”

And there are beneficial provisions within this bill, such as expanding domestic energy production on the Outer Continental Shelf, expanding domestic energy production on our Federal lands, directing the administration to complete an energy strategy every 4 years, and reducing the Federal debt, which are all good, commonsense public policies.

Unfortunately, this bill is not perfect. No bill ever is. The bill

prioritizes—and I am concerned about this—extractive energy policies and fails to take into account the need to diversify our energy portfolio.

I voted in favor of both the offshore and onshore provisions of this bill because I think we need to expand their utilization for domestic use.

But it is clear that this bill will not become law as it is, as my colleague from Oregon has indicated. We have previously voted on these measures before in other bills in this Congress, and the United States Senate has failed to take them up, nor will they take this bill up.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. COSTA. So if the Senate is not going to take up this bill and our constituents are counting on us to create legislation that, in fact, will solve problems and, therefore, truly make a positive impact in their lives, then we cannot continue to push talking points over well-crafted, thoughtful public policy. The only way to accomplish that is for us to start working together and stop talking past one another, which is what we must do.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), a subcommittee chairman on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman for his great leadership on energy in the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014.

The offshore and onshore provisions in this bill will create American jobs, contribute to economic growth, and increase revenue to both State and Federal Governments. This legislation takes steps to move our country forward on a path towards energy independence.

This legislation will streamline the onshore permitting process and ensure that energy projects can be permitted in a timely fashion. It will instill regulatory certainty into the leasing process by ensuring that BLM, the Bureau of Land Management, leases a minimum number of acres annually, and it will allow energy developers to move forward with energy production.

It also requires the Secretary to develop a 4-year plan for energy development, opens up the national petroleum reserve in Alaska for production, and modernizes the leasing process by allowing BLM to conduct lease sales through the Internet.

The Obama administration has made energy production on Federal lands so burdensome that companies are avoiding Federal land in favor of State and private lands. Both oil and gas production on Federal land are down under Barack Obama, by 6 percent and 28 percent respectively. In a State like my

home State of Colorado, with a significant amount of Federal land, this is a problem because less energy production means less jobs and less growth.

This bill injects much-needed certainty into nearly every step of the energy production process. It will ensure timely permit approvals, ensure that BLM field offices have the funds they need to process permits, prohibits the Secretary from changing lease terms, and ensure that our Nation has a plan for an energy future.

I urge all my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentleman from Washington, Chairman HASTINGS, for yielding time and for his leadership on this critical matter. I appreciate the opportunity to be able to work closely with him on this legislation and am pleased my Planning for American Energy Act was incorporated as part of the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014.

Mr. Chair, this final commonsense package seeks to put in place a responsible energy plan that reduces gas prices and other energy costs for consumers, while also spurring economic growth and job creation.

Unlocking our vast natural resources right here at home will lead us closer to energy independence. The legislation before us today would unleash the potential for thousands of new jobs and establish a reliable, affordable, and secure source of American energy through responsible production.

As Americans make plans to celebrate our Nation's independence next week and prepare for summer trips, they are noticing that gasoline prices are rising. Many people are facing gas prices above \$3.50 a gallon to \$4 a gallon at the pump. These rising fuel costs have a ripple effect across our economy. But, sadly, this upward trend has been steady for the last several years. Fortunately, this doesn't have to be the case.

Nature and entrepreneurial ingenuity have created the potential to allow America to take complete control of its energy future. This legislation will enhance the value of our energy reserves by removing overly burdensome, redundant bureaucratic barriers that stand in the way of responsibly developing our Nation's energy production infrastructure.

Incorporated in this vital legislative package, my Planning for American Energy Act seeks to establish commonsense steps to create an all-of-the-above American energy plan for using Federal lands to meet America's energy needs. Under title II of this legislation, the nonpartisan Energy Information Administration would be required to provide the Secretaries of the

Interior and Agriculture the projected energy needs of the United States for the next 30 years. The Secretaries would use this information to establish environmentally responsible 4-year energy production plans.

The bill allows for energy development on public lands in order to promote the energy and national security of the United States, in accordance with the multiple-use management standard established by the Federal Land Policy Management Act. It requires that all energy resources, including wind, solar, hydropower, geothermal, oil, natural gas, coal, oil shale, and minerals needed for energy development, be included in the plan. These goals would be accomplished responsibly, without repealing a single environmental regulation or review process.

Since President Obama took office, energy production on Federal lands has declined significantly. Additionally, the drastic increase of burdensome Federal regulations imposed by this administration is having a detrimental effect on small businesses, jobs, and consumer prices across the board. A recent study showed that the regulatory burden on Americans is costing our economy about \$1.8 trillion annually.

Colorado and our Western neighbors are home to vast energy reserves that, if tapped and developed responsibly, could fuel our Nation's economic recovery and ensure the United States remains competitive in the world market. By promoting a commonsense regulatory framework, embracing domestic energy research and development, and applying environmental and safety standards already on the books, rather than adding costly new mandates, we can help meet America's energy needs right here at home, providing energy and economic security that will benefit American families.

America's energy capabilities are being strangled, and rising gas prices is one of the consequences. This doesn't have to be. A true all-of-the-above energy strategy that unleashes our abundant resources will lead to affordable energy for our families and small businesses for years to come. Our nature and the future prosperity of our citizens requires a true all-of-the-above domestic energy plan that responsibly increases production on Federal lands while streamlining efficiencies and reducing red tape.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TIPTON. That is exactly what H.R. 4899 will accomplish. This legislation puts people to work, putting people in America first, keeping energy costs low for families and businesses, and strengthening our national security.

I urge immediate passage of this bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, nothing I have heard has refuted the points I made earlier.

In fact, the gentleman from South Carolina made the point about high diesel prices. Well, if he was harking back to a time when diesel was actually cheaper than gasoline, well, back then, we didn't export much refined diesel. Now we are exporting in the vicinity of 1 million barrels a day of diesel. So the price of diesel is up because we are paying the so-called world price. And if we exported 2 million barrels a day, the world price wouldn't go down.

And then you have the issue with the speculators on Wall Street, as I mentioned earlier. According to the head of ExxonMobil, 60 cents a gallon—and that would be diesel and gasoline—goes directly to speculators on Wall Street, those high-frequency traders who are so vital to our economy.

We do have a few statistics just to keep it straight. Gasoline production was at a record high in May, but unfortunately, gas prices were pretty darn high. This is from the Energy Information Administration, and they quote the American Petroleum Institute, which is the group that wants to begin to export crude oil. So if we produce more crude oil, we will put it in the world market or sell it to China so they can refine it. And that will somehow insulate us against price spikes because we will be flooding the world oil market with oil that is produced more cheaply here but sold more expensively over there. But unfortunately, that means that we pay the same price here that gets paid over there. That is another problem.

But anyway, the chief economist for API, John Felmy, said: "We've developed a good export market for distillates. So we produce more gasoline than demand warrants." Yet the price is up. Go figure.

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

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

I will make a couple points here, Mr. Chairman. My good friend, the gentleman from Oregon, was right, that we have debated these issues on the floor before. We passed the bills—the offshore bill and the onshore bill, two separate bills—with bipartisan support. But there seems to be a pattern in this Congress that we are trying to break because we know that any legislation cannot become law until the House acts on it and the Senate acts on it. And those bills are over there awaiting action in the Senate. So hope springs eternal. Maybe if we put these things together and then have some reforms on the offshore regulation, maybe, just maybe, the Senate will come to some sort of epiphany and say, we will pass these bills together. So that is the hope that we have here, and hopefully that will happen.

Now, I want to make a couple of other points that have not really been made here in the debate today. We need to understand that crude oil is a global product and, therefore, is subject to

global price pressures. But there is also one other factor that is rarely mentioned, and that is that the global market is largely controlled by one cartel, and that is OPEC. The last figures I have is that they control roughly 40 to 45 percent of the world market.

Now, we know from basic economics, where you are talking about other commodities where there is a cartel holding prices up, the best way to beat cartels is to out-supply the cartels. When you out-supply the cartels, you have less speculation in the marketplace, as has been proven over time. And the point that we are making here with the potential resources we have in America, we have the opportunity to start the process of out-supplying cartels. That is what is so important in this debate. And that is why we should act on these bills, and that is why the Senate should act on these bills.

And finally, the last point: when we do have leases in this country, it takes a long time, from the standpoint of when the lease is let, until you produce oil or produce any product whatsoever.

At the start of this administration, back in 2009, this administration had the benefit of the lease sales that went into place under the Bush administration. So this administration had the benefit of high production on Federal lands because of the work of the Bush administration for the 8 years before that.

But as I mentioned in my opening remarks, lease sales have gone down now, production has gone down, the fact that this 5-year plan that was just introduced by the President will probably take more time. I think we are going to see more of a decrease in production on Federal lands. That is why this bill is needed so much.

□ 1730

So, Mr. Chairman, this is legislation that the House has faced in the past and has passed with bipartisan support. We need to do it again because, with rising gas prices, this is an answer to the long-term rising gas prices and energy prices in this country.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

The legislation before us today is hardly worth debating, not because these issues are unimportant, but because these are the same tired pro-big oil and gas bills that we have debated over-and-over again.

H.R. 4899 is a combination H.R. 2231, Offshore Energy and Jobs Act and H.R. 1965, Federal Lands Jobs and Energy Security Act of 2013.

Both these bills have already been passed by the House in the First Session, over my objections, and in the 112th Congress we similarly considered nearly identical bills.

The White House threatens to veto these bills, the Senate will never bring them up, but here we are again, on the week before the July recess, in another attempt to score political points by pushing policies that harm our

environment and ignore the threat of climate change.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle wouldn't consider themselves environmentalists, but I'm glad to know that at the very least they support recycling.

I think this has been said before but there are three Rs to recycling and one of them is reuse.

However, another recycling-R is to reduce but we certainly are not making an effort to limit how many times we can bring the same bill to the floor. And the bill before us absolutely does not recognize that our domestic demand for oil has decreased in recent years even as production has continued to rise.

I'm opposed to H.R. 4899 for the same reasons I have opposed H.R. 2231 and H.R. 1965.

This bill would require a new outer continental shelf leasing plan, even though the Department of Interior has already begun the process of writing a new plan. It would require leases of offshore areas that have been excluded from leasing previously because of lack of infrastructure and environmental concerns.

The bill cost the federal government money by providing more offshore revenue to a handful of coastal states.

The bill prevents coordination of agencies with coastal management responsibilities by prohibiting the National Ocean Policy. This will create more offshore conflicts and likely limit the ability of energy companies to operate safely and effectively in coastal areas.

And all of that is just offshore.

Onshore H.R. 4899 irresponsibility and unnecessarily would expedite the approval of drilling, while limiting judicial review.

The bill would also require a plan to lease an ever increasing amount of area onshore, in part by requiring a plan to cover the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska with a spider web of roads and pipelines.

In closing, oil and gas production is up, thanks in part to the policies of the Obama administration, and as a result energy imports are down.

This bill will not lower energy prices, and it will not help us develop new sources of clean energy. These are the same policies and the same talking points we have heard again-and-again.

And again, I am strongly opposed to this bill and I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4899.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATIONAL PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today on behalf of both the Progressive Caucus and the Equality Caucus, as we are here today to talk about June being national Pride Month—Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Pride Month—as we celebrate every June.

This year has been an especially significant year. We have had a lot of victories. One year ago Thursday—tomorrow—is the year anniversary of the Supreme Court decision that ensured that people could have their marriages recognized by the Federal Government.

We have also had a number of States in the last year—bringing us up to 19 States and the District of Columbia—where you can legally be married in this country and several others that have approved it, but are currently in the legal status, including my home State of Wisconsin. We have had a big year, in that Michael Sam was the first openly gay person to be drafted into the NFL.

So we have had a lot of successes in the last year since our last Pride. We are here today to talk about that and what an important contribution to this country we have from our gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender citizens, but as much we have had all these successes, we have also had a number of projects that we still have to get done.

Until everyone has access to full equality in this country, we have not provided equal treatment under the law to each and every person as we would expect.

Mr. Speaker, we still have a number of States where you can be fired simply for being gay or lesbian. Michael Sam, as much as he has finally made it into the NFL, could be fired in a number of States in this country under the current law.

We still have too many students and too many youth who attempt suicide who are bullied in school. We have to make sure they have equal access to a quality education, and we still have too much uneven treatment, depending on what State you live in, whether or not your family is recognized. Whether you are in Wisconsin or Massachusetts, the law is different, certainly, in the State level.

We are here today to talk about the many successes we have had and the challenges we still yet have. I am very happy to be joined by a number of colleagues today, and I would like to yield, if I could, right off the bat, to one of my colleagues who has been an outspoken advocate for equality, Representative AL GREEN from the great State of Texas.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I greatly appreciate your yielding the time, and I greatly appreciate your work in the Congress of the United States of Amer-

ica to bring equality to all persons, regardless of who they are, where they are from, or where they happen to be at a given point in time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one God created all of humanity to live in harmony, regardless of sexuality. I believe that human rights are not conferred by a State. I don't think they are accorded by a constitution. I think that human rights are birthrights, and these are rights that one acquires simply by being born a child of God.

As such, I believe that all human beings deserve dignity and respect and that all human beings deserve equality under the law, regardless of who you are, regardless of your race, creed, color, national origin, familial status, or sexuality.

I believe that we, who hold ourselves out as people of goodwill, should do all that we can to make sure that every person on the planet Earth is treated fairly and with a great degree of dignity.

To this end, I am proud to have filed in the Congress of the United States of America H. Res. 416, which recognizes the month of June and celebrates it as LGBT Pride Month.

I am proud to say that this resolution has been cosponsored by 25 Members of Congress, including all seven cochairs of the Equality Caucus. I am also proud to tell you that the Honorable Barney Frank, who was an openly gay Member of Congress and chaired the Financial Services Committee, is an honorary sponsor of this legislation.

I would like to, if I may, my dear friend and brother, I would like to just give some indication as to what the resolution does, so that persons who may not be familiar, who may not have an opportunity to peruse certain records and documents, will at least hear some of what it does.

This resolution specifically recognizes the protesters who stood for human rights and dignity at the Stonewall Inn, on June 28, 1968, as some of the pioneers of the movement.

It celebrates the creation of gay rights organizations in major cities in the aftermath of the Stonewall uprising. It highlights the importance of the American Psychiatric Association removing homosexuality from its list of mental illnesses in December of 1973.

It recognizes Elaine Noble as the first LGBT candidate elected to a State legislature in 1974 and Barney Frank as the first Representative to come out as an openly gay Member of Congress in 1987.

It highlights the importance of the Civil Service Commission eliminating the ban on hiring gay persons in most Federal jobs in 1975.

It celebrates Harvey Milk making national news when he was sworn in as an openly gay member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on January 8, 1978.

It praises the thousands of activists who participated in the National March on Washington for Lesbian and

Gay Rights to demand equal civil rights in 1979 and the National March on Washington to demand that President Reagan address the AIDS crisis in 1987.

It highlights the importance of the 1980 Democratic National Convention, where Democrats took a stance in support of gay rights. It highlights the importance of the Supreme Court ruling in *Romer v. Evans*, in May of 1996, which found a Colorado constitutional amendment preventing the enactment of protection for gays and lesbians unconstitutional.

It celebrates Vermont becoming the first State to legally recognize civil unions between gay and lesbian couples in 2000.

It highlights the importance of the Supreme Court ruling in *Lawrence v. Texas*, in June of 2003, which found that, under the 14th Amendment, States could not criminalize the private, intimate relations of same-sex couples.

It goes on to do many other things, but I want to focus now on something that I think the resolution should do. It is my hope that I will live to see the day that this resolution will not only be spoken of in Congress in the month of June, but that it will actually come to the floor of the Congress of the United States of America and that it will pass the Congress of the United States of America because, on that day, we will have taken one more step toward equality for all of humanity.

Mr. Speaker, on that day, we will have taken another step toward making real the great and noble American ideal of liberty and justice for all.

On that day, we will have taken a step toward making real the concept that all persons are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

On that day, when we pass this resolution in the Congress of the United States of America, we will have said to the world that the United States of America understands and recognizes the human rights of persons, regardless of their sexuality.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to give these expressions, and I pray to live to see the day that this resolution will pass the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative GREEN, not only because you have been a veteran fighter for civil rights for everyone in this country, but I believe that is the first time that that resolution has been introduced in the body of Congress to recognize this month as Pride Month. We appreciate all the hard work you have done to make sure that happens.

I agree with you. I look forward to the day that we actually get a chance to vote on that in the month of June and make sure we recognize everyone in this country, so thank you so much for your contributions.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you very much, and I look forward to work-

ing with you and other Members of Congress to give us the opportunity to have a vote on the resolution.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that, when the gentleman talked about the historical aspect of why this month is so important, he mentioned the Stonewall riots.

In fact, this Saturday—June 28—will mark the 45th anniversary of the Stonewall riots, which is often seen as the real birth of the movement for equality for the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender communities.

The gentleman mentioned Harvey Milk from California, who just this year was recognized on a stamp by the U.S. Government, the U.S. Postal Service, so we can recognize the many contributions that Harvey Milk made for this country, so that so many people could be out and run for office.

Mr. Speaker, I like to remind people that, in my home State of Wisconsin, one of the things is we talk about each coast and the many things that have been done on our coasts for people for equality who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered.

My State of Wisconsin—we were the State that sent the first person who ran out for Congress, TAMMY BALDWIN, to the U.S. House, the first person elected to the U.S. Senate, in TAMMY BALDWIN.

With my election, TAMMY BALDWIN's, and a Republican's—Steve Gunderson, who came out while he was in office—we have sent more openly gay and lesbian people to Congress than any other State in the country—and that is from the heartland, the State of Wisconsin.

So we are really proud of this entire country, from coast to coast and especially in the heartland. We are trying to do everything we can to make sure that everyone is treated with respect and dignity and they have the liberty to live their lives to the fullest, and that is exactly what this month is about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to another one of my colleagues who has been a hardworking fighter on behalf of equality for every single person. In fact, I think he may have the distinction of being the first person to fly a rainbow flag outside of his office here in Washington, DC, have it outside of his door in his office.

He has been a tremendous fighter from the Long Beach area of California and a very good friend of mine. I would like to yield to my colleague from the great State of California, Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Thank you, Congressman. It is an honor to be here. It is an honor to work with you on LGBT issues and all issues before the Congress, but as you point out, this is a historic time that we are living through.

This month, as you point out, marks LGBT Pride Month, a time for all of us to come together and remember the struggles for inclusion and the steps we are taking together to promote equal-

ity today, tomorrow, and generations to come.

Also, as you pointed out, it marks the 45th anniversary of the Stonewall riots in New York. The riots in June of 1969 were a turning point for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community and also for all its allies, friends, and family.

This is a moment when the community came together and stood up and said no—to intolerance, no to homophobia, and no to homophobic public policies.

□ 1745

So much has changed since that night at the Stonewall Inn. Today, the egregious Defense of Marriage Act has been overturned by the United States Supreme Court, and marriage equality has come to 20 States, including my home State of California.

I am pleased to say two weekends ago I had the honor of being an affiant in the marriage of a loving couple of the LGBT community. The momentum for marriage equality is continuing, and we are living through a time when change is before us.

As you pointed out, I was listening to the discussions before the United States Supreme Court on DOMA and on Proposition 8, and I was so caught up and offended by people not wanting to provide equality when they would testify before it that I said that I would fly the pride flag from that day forward until equality is attained by all people, and especially the LGBT community. And that flag still flies today. Although there have been great strides, equality is still not here.

For example, there is no Federal law that explicitly protects the LGBT individuals from employment discrimination. Congress now has a unique opportunity to change that and make history. The Employment Non-Discrimination Act, also known as ENDA, has 205 bipartisan cosponsors and will ban all workplace discrimination against the LGBT community. This bill is the next important step on the inevitable march towards equality, and it will change the way in which we deal with all of our brothers and sisters, and it will provide the dignity that the LGBT community deserves.

I was pleased to hear that President Obama has indicated that he is soon to issue an executive order regarding LGBT discrimination, that he will ban all Federal Government contractors from discriminating against employees based on their sexual orientation and gender identity. Since taking office, the President has added critical protections to the Violence Against Women Act that protects the LGBT community and repeals the decades-old military policy of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

These are great steps, and we are living through a time of great change, but now it is Congress' turn to act so we can finally close this chapter of inequality. We must pass ENDA during the 113th Congress so we can take the

next step towards ending discrimination now and forever.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL). You have been an outstanding advocate for every single one of your constituents, including the LGBT community, and I can't thank you enough for all of the work you do.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank you very much.

Mr. POCAN. As Representative LOWENTHAL mentioned, one of the things we need to get done yet is a bill called the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, or ENDA. In 29 States in this country, you can still be fired simply because of your sexual orientation, and in 33 States based on your gender identity. This is 2014. Our country has moved far beyond the fact that you can be fired simply because of who you love. In fact, most people assume this is already the law of the land, yet it is not the law of the land, and depending upon what States you live in depends on whether or not you can have discrimination against you. That is simply wrong.

The ENDA bill has the support of virtually every Democrat in the House. Eight Republican Members have officially signed on as sponsors. And if that bill were to come to this floor, Mr. Speaker, there would be the votes to pass this bill. The problem is getting it to the floor of Congress.

Right now we are not able to do that. The Republican majority has not allowed that bill to come to the floor, but we know and we feel confident that there are the votes to pass that in this House if we can only get it on the floor. We can join the 90 percent of Fortune 500 companies that provide for equal treatment for their employees. And the fact that 82 percent of the U.S. public supports this, it is far past due to make sure that we protect each and every person with these protections.

Another thing that Representative LOWENTHAL said that deserves extra recognition is that the Obama administration, President Obama and Vice President BIDEN, have been outspoken advocates for equal treatment under the law for each and every single person.

In fact, when I think about 1 year ago tomorrow when that Supreme Court decision came out, I was outside the Supreme Court when the decision was declared. I remember going back to my office, and that day we were on the phone with the President and his administration telling us how they were going to make sure that the Supreme Court decision would be implemented in law as quickly as humanly possible. I can tell you, that has certainly happened. In fact, just last week, the Obama administration released a report on the implementation of the Windsor decision detailing exactly how Federal agencies have moved to implement the law, and we have had tremendous progress in virtually every area.

While we still have some areas to move forward, specifically in Social Se-

curity and in veterans benefits, we are moving forward with that law, making sure that the Supreme Court's decision is implemented in the laws of the land in this country so that everyone is treated equally. I tell you, that President Obama and Vice President BIDEN have made it such a priority that everyone is treated with dignity and respect in this country has been amazing, and it is part of why we have the progress that we have. If only this Congress could get an employee non-discrimination bill on the floor, I know this Congress would pass in a bipartisan way the very protections that we need. In fact, the President just within the last 2 weeks made sure that some of those protections are in place.

The LGBT Equality Caucus has long asked the President could we possibly do an executive order to make sure that anyone who does business as a Federal contractor provides these protections to their gay and lesbian employees, just as should happen under the law. If this Congress can't act, it doesn't mean nothing should happen. If this Congress can't act, something has to happen to fill that vacuum. The White House says they will be drafting an executive order to make sure that any Federal contractor does not discriminate based on their sexual orientation. That is a tremendous step forward, but we still have to make sure that each and every one of those States that doesn't provide these protections does provide those protections under the law.

Another area within the Federal Government where we need to do more is specifically on a number of bills that have been introduced by a number of Members from across this country to make sure that everyone is respected under that court decision—no matter what you do for a living, that you have that respect and dignity.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) has introduced the Respect For Marriage Act to ensure that those who live in States that aren't recognized can be recognized.

For example, in the State of Wisconsin, my husband and I were married in 2006 in Toronto. My State still has hate in its constitution. By Federal law, we are recognized for the thousand rights and responsibilities that are afforded to marriage, but the 213 under State law are still in limbo. Despite the fact that a Federal judge recently ruled our marriage ban as unconstitutional, it is still back in legal limbo. Until that decision gets made, people who have been married, which is in the hundreds in Wisconsin who just got married, and before that hundreds and hundreds more, can still have recognition of their benefits so we have consistency in the law.

There are other bills that I am going to talk about as we go through this hour, but I would like to yield to another one of my colleagues, someone who has been an outstanding Representative from the State of Rhode Is-

land. First he served as the mayor of Providence, and he is an outstanding advocate for equality for each and every single person of this country, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for organizing this Special Order hour.

We certainly have a lot to celebrate in terms of progress toward full equality for the LGBT community, and a lot to be proud of. We are now living in a country where, in 19 States and the District of Columbia, individuals are afforded full marriage equality. We have work to do here, as you were just mentioning, by passing the Respect For Marriage Act, to be sure that we repeal DOMA, and legislatively doing what the Windsor case requires.

We have work to do in terms of passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act to ensure that no qualified worker in America loses his or her job because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

I want to compliment the President on his executive order that will ensure that this kind of employment discrimination does not occur in the Federal workplace. This President has provided extraordinary leadership on our collective effort to bring full equality to our community.

I also want to talk about LGBT rights internationally because this is an issue in many places around the world where members of our community are subjected to imprisonment, physical violence, sometimes imposition of death sentences for certain criminal provisions, solely because they are gay or lesbian. So I think one of the things that we need to continue to do is promote the principle of equality around the world and ensure that no one is persecuted or imprisoned or beaten because of who they are. We are seeing in places around the world like Russia and other places in the world really an uptick in anti-LGBT legislation, anti-LGBT activities.

So while we celebrate pride here in our country and the accomplishments of members of our community, we have to recognize that it is not the case for many of our brothers and sisters around the world.

We have made extraordinary progress, as you know. You are a member of the Equality Caucus. I just want to mention that we now have seven openly gay Members of Congress here in the United States, one Member in the United States Senate, so eight in total. We have for the first time in our history an executive director and a paid staff member who is responsible for helping to promote our agenda for equality for our community, to educate our colleagues about legislation important to our community, and who has really professionalized the Equality Caucus. That is historic progress. That would not have happened but for the work of a lot of individuals, a lot of great organizations, like the Human

Rights Campaign, the Victory Fund, and others who have helped to ensure that members of our community are elected to public office and that the great Congress of the United States reflects the great diversity of our community.

You are an important cochair of the Equality Caucus, and I would say to the gentleman that you take on more than your share of the responsibility of advocating for equality for our community and taking a leadership role in events such as this Special Order hour. So thank you for the work you do in representing your constituents, and also bringing equality for our community.

I think we all come here with our first responsibility to our constituents, and do everything we can to represent the people who sent us to Washington. At the same time, we come here with our characteristics and traits and our life experiences, and we all work hard to ensure that in America everyone is treated fairly and that we have access to the same responsibilities and privileges as everyone, and that is what the Equality Caucus does. I think this is a year for great celebration.

I want to end by again thanking our President, who has, more than any President in the history of our country, helped to advance the equality of LGBT individuals in the workplace, internationally, and in the conduct of marriage by implementing the Windsor case in an aggressive way, and by advancing and supporting efforts to reduce bullying and promote respect for our community, ensuring that the LGBT community is reflected throughout his administration in important positions of responsibility. I think there is no question that President Obama will go down in history as the President who has done more than any previous President to advance full equality to our community. We should always be mindful of that, and I thank him for his leadership.

With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POCAN. I thank Representative CICILLINE. You are seen on so many issues as the point person in this Congress; specifically, making sure that we respect those who may be lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender in other countries. I think I heard a statistic this year that one out of six people who previously had rights lost them this year because of countries like Russia, India, and other countries across our globe. It is a real concern. While we are having progress here, it is leaving a lot of other people behind around the world. Thank you for all of your advocacy around that.

In fact, one of those countries that is a country that has not gone forward in the area of equal treatment of their citizens is the country of Brunei. Brunei is a country that is currently part of the negotiations that we are having with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a trade deal that is generally of-

fered to countries that we have something in common with, that we want to be able to not only have increased trade with, but you actually want to make sure that they somehow reflect your values.

□ 1800

And unfortunately Brunei just recently implemented shari'a law, which includes the stoning of gays and lesbians, the stoning to death for gays and lesbians in their country. This is something that we have great concern about.

There was a bipartisan letter recently signed by 119 Members of this body that went to both Secretary Kerry and the U.S. Trade Representative, Michael Froman specifically saying why are we rewarding something that is considered such a prize, to have status in trading with us as one of the countries that we are going to put into a trade agreement, when they have such terrible human rights conditions? 119 people, in a bipartisan way in this body, sent that letter.

So we are hoping that—as Representative CICILLINE said, we are seeing us go backwards in Russia, and it looks like we may be going backwards in India and some other countries. Certainly, they have advocated the stoning of gays and lesbians. That is truly a backward idea and something that this country needs to do everything we can to change. I am glad that so many of our colleagues, in a bipartisan way, did that.

Some of the other bills that Members of Congress have introduced to try to address some of the issues that we need to move forward on, Representative TITUS from Nevada has introduced the Veteran Spouses Equal Treatment Act, specifically getting at some of the complexities that we haven't gotten to yet within the Veterans Administration to make sure that everyone has their family relationship recognized and that that treatment is extended to their spouses.

Representative WALZ also has Protecting the Freedoms and Benefits for All Veterans Act; Representative ADAM SMITH has Military Spouses Equal Treatment Act—all trying to make sure that if you serve this country and you are a gay or lesbian citizen, you have the same benefits and rights offered to your family as offered to the other members of the military.

There is also a bill Representative RON KIND from Wisconsin has introduced, the Social Security and Marriage Equality Act, trying to address the other problem that we have within Social Security, to make sure that everyone has those benefits offered to their life partners, their husbands or wives in same sex-sex relationships. Right now that has not happened yet since that Windsor decision, and it needs to happen and we are moving forward on that.

There is a bill that I have introduced that specifically is looking to—the Re-

store Honor to Servicemembers Act. One of the, I think, uglier parts of our Nation's history when it comes to treatment of folks who may be gay or lesbian has been the fact that we had for so long a policy—and previous to that, outright discrimination—against gays and lesbians who choose to serve this country in the military. Under President Clinton we implemented Don't Ask, Don't Tell, but that still didn't fix it so that you could serve openly in the military.

And finally, when Don't Ask, Don't Tell was repealed and anyone was able to serve in the military regardless of sexual orientation, we found that 114,000 people since World War II in this country were discharged with something different than the honorable discharge they should have received for their service to this country because we so often let people go previously out of the military because they are gay or lesbian with a either dishonorable discharge, other than honorable, or some other status.

Don't forget, a dishonorable discharge in some States is the same as a felony. It can take away your ability to vote; it takes away your ability to have veterans' benefits even though you served this country well.

There is a process now that people can get that status changed to the honorable status they should have received, but it is a complicated process. While it is in place under this current President, a future President could change it because it is not actually in statute. Often people have to go and hire a lawyer because it is a complicated process.

We have introduced a bill to make sure that we really treat all those veterans with the respect and honor they deserve for treating this country in the way they did by putting their life on the line to do everything they could to make sure that we have the liberty that we all have, that they should now have the liberty that they deserve and have that record changed. That is a bill that we are also trying to get done that we think is very important in moving forward.

This is a historic month. When we have Pride Month, we try to recognize the many areas that not only have we moved forward on, but also what we still need to improve. I think by talking about some of the bills that still have to move forward to make sure that everyone has that equal treatment under the law—again, those things include equal treatment for employment, which is why we have the Employee Nondiscrimination Act. In 29 States in this country you can still be fired simply because of whom you love.

We have too many students who are still being bullied in school, and the suicide rate among LGBT youth is much higher than youth in general, and we have to help restore that.

It shouldn't matter what State you live in whether or not your family is recognized. So, if you live in Wisconsin

that unfortunately still has hate in our State constitution, the fact that I live there with my husband doesn't mean I should be treated any differently than if I lived in Illinois or Minnesota or Iowa, neighboring States that all recognize the relationships regardless of whom you love.

Those are all things we still have to get done in this country. We need to do that in this body, Mr. Speaker, in this Congress. We need to get these bills to the floor and pass them and move on from what I think at one point in this history was a certain way to get out certain voters. There is a certain constituency that was built around hate. We need to move beyond that. I think many people have. While the Democratic Party certainly, I think, has been a party of inclusion and moved in a positive way, I think I am seeing that happen among Republicans, but we need to have the leadership of this House also moving.

We had a Republican Member just yesterday who has been a strong supporter of equality for all people just win his Republican primary. That is important because he has been an outspoken voice for equality. Representative HANNA, I am glad you won your primary. You stood up for your values, and your constituents supported you.

I think it is time that more of our colleagues, especially on the Republican side of the aisle, need to also stand up for what is right, because we all have colleagues and we all have constituents who are gay and lesbian, bisexual or transgendered. We can't pick and choose who we represent. You support and you represent every single person in your district, and when you don't support full equality, you are really not standing up for each and every constituent, and that is truly unfortunate.

To end, I really want to focus again on those successes. We have had a tremendous year. We have had so much progress from the Supreme Court decision exactly 1 year ago tomorrow, where we have now had a number of States just in the last year move towards full marriage equality, where we have had a country where Michael Sam could finally be the first openly gay person drafted into the NFL.

We have been able to move forward in so many areas. This is because society has moved. A majority of people in this country support marriage equality. I believe the last I saw was 58 percent of the people. Even more important, 81 percent of people 30 and under support marriage equality. That is where this country is going. We want to treat everyone with respect and dignity and allow them the liberty to live their lives. Until we do that for every single citizen, we have not reached the goal of treating everyone with equality and equal treatment under the law.

With this time that we have had, the Progressive Caucus and the Equality Caucus, I wanted to share some time with our members so we could make

sure we celebrate this Pride Month and all of our constituents who may be gay or lesbian, bisexual or transgendered and say thank you for all you do. We are going to continue to fight for your equality, not only in this body in Congress, but throughout society.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

REMEMBERING THE YARNELL HILL FIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of the tragic Yarnell Hill Fire, which claimed the lives of 19 elite Granite Mountain Hotshot firefighters in late June of 2013.

The Yarnell fire began when lightning struck approximately 30 miles southwest of Prescott, Arizona, off of Highway 89 on June 28, 2013. The blaze burned approximately 8,400 acres and damaged more than 1,000 structures over a 15-day period.

During the disaster, 19 firefighters from the Granite Mountain Inter-agency Hotshot Crew lost their lives battling the fire, the sixth deadliest American firefighter disaster overall and the deadliest wildfire ever in Arizona. Indeed, this dark day yielded the largest loss of firefighter life since September 11, 2001.

To this day, words cannot express my sadness and the depth of my condolences to the families of these brave 19 first responders who gave their lives protecting our community. I will certainly remember this horrible tragedy for the rest of my life, as well as the public memorial service that was attended by more than 1,200 members of our community. These brave men made the ultimate sacrifice fighting to protect our citizens, and for that we will be eternally grateful.

Even though a year has passed, please continue to keep the families of these Hotshot firefighters in your prayers. Furthermore, I ask that the Federal agencies responsible for actively managing our forests not forget this tragedy and take the steps to prevent similar catastrophic wildfires from re-occurring.

The citizens of Yarnell, Arizona, and the surrounding communities know all too well the importance of proactive wildfire management. While the wildfire that claimed the lives of 19 brave souls was one of the worst tragedies in the history of Arizona, millions more across the country are also impacted by these disasters.

Looking back over the past year, it is important to highlight what progress has been made in finding commonsense solutions to preventing wildfires while still acknowledging the reality that more must and can be done. We owe it to our local heroes who risk everything

in order to protect our lives, our communities, and our homes.

Congress still needs to consider additional legislation that will work to get the executive branch out of the way when action must be taken swiftly. This problem can be mitigated by empowering the private sector to create rural jobs and resurrecting the timber industry as loggers thin millions of acres of badly overgrown Arizona forests. Although we are never going to prevent all forest fires, these legislative efforts will help make fires less frequent, less intense when they do occur.

I remain optimistic that, above all else, the heroic actions of the Granite Mountain Hotshots will continue to inspire our leaders to make the necessary changes to prevent future devastation and destruction. We owe nothing less to these heroes. More importantly, I will continue to do everything in my power to ensure that their legacies live on and yield substantial forest management changes.

I would like to conclude my remarks by reading the names and ages of these 19 firefighters in tribute to their service:

Andrew Ashcraft, age 29; Robert Caldwell, age 23; Travis Carter, age 31; Dustin Deford, age 24; Christopher MacKenzie, age 30; Eric Marsh, age 43; Grant McKee, age 21; Sean Misner, age 26; Scott Norris, age 28; Wade Parker, age 22; John Percin, age 24; Anthony Rose, age 23; Jesse Steed, age 36; Joe Thurston, age 32; Travis Turbyfill, age 27; William Warneke, age 25; Clayton Whitted, age 28; Kevin Woyjeck, age 21; Garret Zuppiger, age 27.

All these brave men were taken from us way too young leaving behind families and friends. Let us never forget their sacrifice.

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

TELLING OUR CONSTITUENTS THE TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Arizona who actually has an amazing district and was actually an amazing leader when we lost 19 of our firefighters this time last year, I appreciate him putting that into the RECORD for all of those in Arizona.

I wanted to do something a little different tonight. A few months ago, we came to the floor here and sort of walked through what was really going on in the math. One of the things that sort of enrages me is so much of the debate we have here in Congress is the noise. We talk about this issue or that issue when we have the 10,000 pound gorilla in front of us, and that is what is happening to us fiscally.

Right now, and I am going to be using a lot of numbers tonight, and we

are going to try to put up as many of these on our Facebook page and on our Web site so folks can actually see these charts. First off, if this were 1 year ago, we were having discussions of what was the fiscal year 2014 deficit going to be, and we had some folks making these optimistic projections that we were only going to be in the \$400-some billion shortfall that year.

□ 1815

It is still a stunning amount of money. It has only gotten worse though. Remember, we were supposed to be on the way out. Employment was getting better; income was getting better. Taxes are up dramatically in this country. Remember, we have just hit the alltime high revenues ever for the United States.

So what could possibly be wrong? Because then, this last April, the projection of the deficit for this fiscal year was \$492 billion, then in May, it was \$648 billion; and with today's news that the first quarter GDP was down—was negative, went down—our growth and our economy went down 2.9 percent, that is a stunning amount of GDP to lose.

We were going to be giddy if we were over 2 percent, and we had a negative GDP in the first quarter of 2.9 percent.

I am going to make you a projection and a prediction that, when we end the 2014 fiscal year, we are not going to be much different than we were last year. So all these discussions of, well, it is getting better, and the spending and with all these new taxes, the future fiscal burden we are about to dump on our kids and our grandkids is going to get better—it is not in the math. It is not showing up.

This is important. I wanted to actually walk through a little reality check here and to show you how disappointed I am on so much of the discussion that you will hear here in Washington.

You see the chart next to me. If I came to you right now and said: tell me what you think the debt and unfunded liabilities are for the country—now, we can all go to these Web sites where it is the debt clock, and if you look at it right now, it is going to say: well, the unfunded liabilities and the debt for the United States are about \$127 trillion.

Well, there was a study done—it was done over at George Mason's Mercatus Center, and it was done at the beginning of the year. The number is \$205 trillion that we are about to dump on the heads of our kids and our grandkids.

What should terrify you about this number—well, let's find a way to talk about this. If I said our unfunded liabilities—our debt and the promises we have made in this government—are at \$205 trillion, go on a search engine right now and search for: What is the entire wealth of the world?

Mr. Speaker, you are going to pull up estimates that it could be \$167 trillion. I saw one that was \$180 trillion.

So process this: what we have promised in benefits, promised in spending, what we have already borrowed is greater than the wealth of the world today. Process that. If you, right now, grabbed every penny of the wealth of the world, it would not put enough money in the bank to cover the promises we have already made as a government.

You have got to understand this. This should be the discussion of our times, and yet it is uncomfortable. Look, I am in my second term, and let's have a moment of brutal honesty here: What do most elected officials—what do we often focus on? Being re-elected.

When you stand up in front of a room, the pollsters and the political consultants often tell us: well, happy talk or talk about something that is easy because big numbers scare people and, besides that, they are so negative, you would lose votes.

If you talk about what is happening in the entitlements, if you talk about \$205 trillion being the debt and unfunded liabilities of your country, SCHWEIKERT, you are likely to get unelected.

We have got to step up and start telling the public, telling our voters, telling our constituents the truth: the single biggest issue facing your government is the debt and the explosion of the entitlements.

I am going to spend a little time here talking about what is really driving this. Just how do you get to this? Part of this is this is what it would look like if you used honest GAAP accounting.

Now, what is GAAP accounting? So let's put this in perspective. If I came to you right now, today, and said: all right, the country, we already know if you go on the debt clocks on the Web, you will see we are about \$17.5 trillion of borrowed money.

About \$4 trillion to \$5 trillion of that, we borrowed from ourselves, which we steal out of Social Security, we steal it out of Medicare, but the \$17.5 trillion—but then I come to you, and let's do something that is simple math.

The Social Security trust fund, with the benefits we have promised right now, is about \$23 trillion underfunded. Okay. So my \$17.5 trillion of hard debt right now and the \$23 trillion we owe—and if we were doing GAAP accounting, if we were doing honest mathematical accounting—like we all learned in, hopefully, accounting classes—you are looking at \$40 trillion that you would put onto this number because that would be honest.

That \$23 trillion that we owe to Social Security beneficiaries, that we do not have the money, we just pretend, yeah, we owe it, but we are not going to tell the public about it because it will make them nervous.

That is the GAAP accounting, so when we start doing the honest accounting—like every business, every charity would have to do—that is how

you get to real numbers and understand the real situation that the government, that the people, the beneficiaries, and those in Congress should be dealing with today.

Mr. Speaker, why is this not working? Why the problem? Let's actually go to the next chart, and maybe this will sort of help because we have had so many discussions.

Do you remember all the rhetoric that was around this place before the 2012 Presidential race and the election, the discussion of how much better everything was getting, how much better the job situation was about to get, these debts and deficits will start becoming under control?

Well, it just wasn't true. The political class, probably for reelection—heaven knows the President did—we misled the people. We didn't tell them the truth about basic math.

So what is wrong here? We are going to walk through what is really going on in these charts, but think about just the last year or two. What has happened out there when even we have succeeded at getting good legislation—bipartisan legislation—passed through the House, getting our brothers and sisters in the Senate to actually work with us, and getting the President's signature? Something like the JOBS Act, passed it 3 years ago.

Think about this: little things that were going to help the individual entrepreneur, like crowdfunding, the reg A, some of the mechanics in there where we were just trying to help capital formation for the little guys, for the startup businesses—what happened? They got lost in the bureaucracy.

Some activists on the left said: oh, we are scared of this, and we took away the optionality for everyone out there to grow that business out of their house, out of their garage.

It breaks my heart—something as simple as crowdfunding has now had so many rules and regs, and it still is in reg writing, even though we were supposed to have the rules 2 years ago.

Think about it. Even when Congress has gotten it right, this President and the bureaucracies he controls—he is appointed to—continue to destroy the optionality that we were trying to give to the American people to get this government out of their way and start growing this economy.

Let's take a quick look at this chart—and I am sorry, I know how hard it is for those folks who might be watching on television or sitting in the back row or galleries, these are hard to read—but what is important about this is the blue line here was our projection a year ago.

We were actually projecting that the deficits and debt were actually going to get better. Then when we actually had to start doing our recalculations and realizing the economy is not growing, it is not producing the economic expansion, the economic wealth that we need in this country to cover the promises we have made, that became the red line.

Now, we need to do the next part of the discussion of what really goes on in government math. You do realize that government math, the budget projections, the debt projections that are put out—I am going to be fairly harsh here—border on fraud.

Here is simply why: this red line is based on current law. Well, you do realize in current law—something we call the SGR, you will often hear it as the doc fix—that in about 10–12 years, we expect doctors to accept 73 percent less to see a Medicare patient. That is the current law, so that is why this line goes this direction—because we have these things in law where we expect these fantasies to take place.

Now, the reality of it is: How many of you think a doctor is going to see a Medicare patient for 73 percent less? It is just not happening.

So we will run here to the floor and say: oh, heavens, we have got to make sure that our seniors have access to their doctors, we have got to make sure doctors are at least covering their costs, and we will come in here, and we will raise that doc fix, that SGR, another year.

One of the reasons it does not happen around this place for the 10 years out or the 20 years—our permanent fix—is because, all of a sudden, the math changes again, so we get the benefit of fake math. We know we made the promise that there is going to be this health care within Medicare.

We put out these fancy charts, and I see some of my brothers and sisters speechifying with the numbers they are handed. When you start to grind into what is underlying underneath those numbers we are often given by the Congressional Budget Office, you start to realize: well, they say this is based on current law.

You have got to understand, inside that current law are things that are implausible. Actually, go look at the Medicare actuaries report and go to the very last 2 or 3 pages, and even the head Medicare actuary makes it very clear that the projections in the report—because the projections in the report are based on current law—are implausible.

The head actuary actually uses the word—year after year, when they do their Medicare actuary report—that it is “implausible.” Why is that not the headline? Is it because it comes with big numbers?

Here is what happens. There is something also that our Congressional Budget Office does, which is referred to as the alternative scenario, when you actually take out the things that are in current law and put them into what actually is more likely to happen: we will do doc fix and other things that are current law that hit the wall that are unfunded in the future, and we will step up because of the political pressure and adjust them and raise that spending.

Well, what happens when we do that? You get a curve, this green line. I know

it is hard to see, but just understand that what this means is, if we hit this alternative scenario, in about 14 years—actually, slightly less—your country hits 100 percent of debt to GDP.

Okay. That is debt to GDP where, actually, that is just what we are booking. Remember, we started the conversation with we tell everyone here is the money we are borrowing, so here is our debt to GDP.

This would not even have—that 100 percent to GDP in 14 years would not actually have GAAP accounting. It would not have the real numbers because you do understand, that number we did before, saying if you just take Social Security and our current debt, add those together, it is approaching \$40 trillion, you do realize that is double your country’s GDP right now.

We are already not at 100 percent of GDP. If we actually had honest accounting—just those two are 200 percent of GDP, yet how often do you hear us talk about it?

This is the issue of our time. If we don’t step up and start dealing with it, I have no idea, I have no idea what happens in the future when we hit the wall—and we will hit the wall.

Oh, by the way, understand, if you just add up the debt we have and the unfunded liability in Social Security, we are far beyond where Greece is. I think Greece was \$1.7 trillion, so 100 percent debt to GDP. If you just add up those, we are at 200.

□ 1830

We need to have some folks actually start to learn some calculus, and that was actually one of my running jokes for my first year here. I started to realize many of my constituents thought the problem in D.C. was Republicans versus Democrats, and I have grown to believe it is those that own calculators and those that don’t.

A question I will actually give—and we have had this discussion with a lot of Members both on the right and the left—is: Why do we seem to fight so much? Seriously. Why do we seem to fuss with each other so much? And I am going to make you the argument it is about the money.

In the next couple of charts, I am going to try to walk through what is really happening with the money so you understand if you are tired with Congress fighting with each other about the money, it isn’t going away. It is about to get—and will continue to get—dramatically worse.

Another chart, probably almost unreadable from a distance, but understand here is what you are looking at. Do you see the red lines there? The red lines are what we call discretionary. That is what I get to come to the floor and debate over and work on these appropriations bills where we are trying to move money here, take it away from here, try to save here. That red line is discretionary. That red line is your military. It is your parks. It is the FBI.

It is things that are not mandatory spending, things that are not entitlements.

Here is where we are right now. We used 2013.

In 9 fiscal years—2024—do you notice something in the pattern on this chart? Do you notice that what we vote on here in Congress, the discretionary, is pretty much the same? Nine years from now, 10 years from now, it is basically the same.

But what we call mandatory, which is mostly entitlements—and I will get phone calls tomorrow from folks that are enraged that I used the word “entitlements.” That is what it is. It is an earned entitlement, but it is still a promise. It is a social contract we made as a government with our people. We just forgot to tell them we didn’t have the money to pay it.

So understand from here, from 2013 to 2014, that increase, we will now be sitting at a \$2.29 trillion increase on mandatory spending—and that is in 9 fiscal years. They are huge numbers, but you have just got to follow the chart.

Let’s say you are someone who is passionate about drug research, passionate about the national parks, passionate about securing our borders, passionate about the military. That is in this red line. It is being consumed by mandatory spending.

So understand, the simplest way I can phrase this is your government is very quickly becoming a health insurer and an entitlement provider with a shrinking army.

Process that for a moment. That is where we are at. That is what is going on around us in our lives.

We will have these charts up hopefully in the next couple of days on our Facebook page and our Web site so you can vet them yourselves. It is important. If you want to understand public policy in the United States, if you want to understand public policy that is happening here in Congress, everything is about the mandatory spending.

Do you remember the first board we put up where I was showing you the \$205 trillion of unfunded liability and debt? It is important to understand that half that is Medicare. Medicare right now represents close to \$100 trillion of promises we as a government have made, and there isn’t money to pay for it. And those are in today’s dollars.

We are going to come back and forth to a couple of these so that we better understand them.

This is actually the 2013. You will notice the red. That is what we all come here and we debate over and we fight over and work through and come up with ideas. That is the discretionary. It is 32 percent of all of our spending.

We have Social Security and Medicare. We don’t have the Obama subsidies in here yet, but that is one of our newest entitlements. Remember, we were almost promised that this ultimately was going to be a savings. It wasn’t the truth.

Medicare, income security. These are food stamps and other types of programs that are entitlements because of where you sit income-wise—veterans' benefits, other mandatory certain pensions, certain other requirements we have to meet, mostly on the retirement side, and interest on the debt.

I want you to pay attention if you can see this. Six percent of what we spent in 2013 was interest.

I am going to be rotating back and forth so this is going to get a little awkward with these boards, but it is important to see.

So where will we be in 9 fiscal years? Now, this is important. Remember, you just saw discretionary spending. This is your military. This is your drug research. This is the FBI. This is the border. It is 32 percent of all our spending. In 9 fiscal years, it is 22 percent of all of our fiscal spending. Social Security becomes 24 percent of all of our spending. Medicare becomes 17 percent of our spending. Best guess—and this becomes a moving target right now—the ObamaCare subsidies in about 9 years will be about 2 percent of our Federal spending. A little different than we were told a couple of years ago; right? Medicaid, 9 percent of your entire Federal budget; income security, 8 percent; veterans, 3 percent; other mandatory, 1 percent.

And this is the most dangerous part of this chart. Do you see interest?

Remember, in the previous chart we were saying interest is 6 percent in 2013. How many of you believe today's interest rates are normal, are real? What happens when we go back to normal interest rates? Well, this projection is that 9 years from now we will be back in normal interest rates. At that point, 14 percent of your entire Federal Government spending is interest.

Understand how fragile that makes all future discretionary spending if we had an interest rate spike. What happens if we were in the early eighties, late seventies type of interest rates? This number explodes, and it would consume what is sitting in the discretionary budget. As we continue to borrow, as we continue to add to programs and make promises and not set aside money for them, we are squandering our future.

On occasion, I get to sit down with an audience where I will see parents and grandparents and the grandkids and you will turn to them and say to the parents, "How many of you love your kids?" and most of the hands go up. And then you will turn to the grandparents and say, "How many of you love your grandkids?" and all the hands go up. Then you start to show them these charts, and you turn to the parents and the grandparents and say, "Do you understand what you have done to your children, what we have done to our grandchildren, and what we have done to a generation that is not even born yet?"

The math right now, just to cover the promises that are already done—this is

baked in the cake; this is done—your kids, your grandkids, your unborn children are going to have a 60 percent mean tax rate. And that is not for those with a high income; that is everyone. Sixty percent of your income will have to go just to cover this spending. And that is not your State, your local, and your FICA; that is just 60 percent of your income. You will have a 60 percent income tax just to cover the promises that are already made. And that doesn't pay anything off. That just maintains where we are, because you start to have externalities like the net interest that you have got to pay. And what happens when interest rates move again?

So for those of you, once again, who care a lot about the military, care a lot about protecting the border, care about drug research, care about education, care about all these things, if you really do care, every time you speak to an elected official, every time you speak to someone with election ambitions, every time you speak to a policymaker, every time you speak to someone from the press, please ask the question: What are you willing to do about mandatory spending, because the mandatory spending, the entitlements, are consuming us as a people. And they are consuming your Republic's future.

One more time. Basically, this is 9 fiscal years from now. So take a look. Here is what actual was for 2013. These are the actual numbers. We had 32 percent of our budget go to discretionary. That means not Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, ObamaCare. Those are the mandates. This actually crashes to 22 percent. This is in 9 fiscal years.

So what is the solution? The solution actually is pretty obvious, and it is really tough. We need the American people to understand maybe not the math but what it means.

It is hard to get in front of an audience and say a trillion this and trillion that. How many folks even understand what a trillion is, the thousand billion and a million. So many of our brothers and sisters do not understand what these numbers mean, but they need to understand what it means to their future and that what we are doing today isn't working.

These numbers continue to get worse and worse month by month because we have policy from this administration and we have policy coming from the U.S. Senate where they won't take the pieces of legislation that we put out of this House that would actually help us to start to grow the GDP.

So let me give you how simple and how tough the solution is.

Number one, we are going to have to step up and tell the truth and do something about mandatory spending.

How many politicians, how many consultants out there will say: If you talk about Medicare, you are going to get unelected? Wouldn't it be amazing if the public started to understand this and say: If you don't talk about Medicare, you get unelected?

The other thing is you have two things that potentially start to really grow our economy. The energy renaissance—let me walk through this because this is sort of a stream of consciousness, but it is really important.

If I had come to you a decade ago, when you would pick up the newspaper, when you would pick up the magazine, when you would go online, whatever you read, there was this term called "peak oil"? Do you all remember that 10, 12 years ago? It is very simple. The next incremental barrel of oil was going to be less than we had the day before. The world was running out of energy.

How many of you out there can tell me what is wrong with that? Seriously.

The fact is that it was absolutely wrong. We are not running out of energy. As a matter of fact, as of today, we have more known fossil fuels than any known time in history. We have been blessed, substantially through technology. And be prepared, there is another wave of technology coming, particularly for natural gas, between now and the end of the decade that may even make it better and more accessible and, hopefully, even cheaper. You have an energy renaissance happening in your country.

How do I keep Congress, the bureaucrats, the control freaks here in Washington from destroying this energy renaissance?

□ 1845

The second thing that is happening is even more complicated to talk about. I have grown to believe there is an economic renaissance around us, but it is unlike anything we have ever experienced. Let me see if I can find a way to make this work.

I believe we are entering the age of the hyperefficient economy. Who here has ever used a ride-sharing service? I guess the big ones are the things like Sidecar. How many of you have ever used something like Uber? Okay. You have this little computer in your hand that, on occasion, works as a phone. What about the other things that it is doing in business? If I came to you right now and said, "In the country, who is the largest pet groomer in the United States? I think it is PetSmart. Who is the second largest one in the United States?" It is an app on your phone, where you hit it, and that is how you access your pet groomer. Think about that. Then at the rate of growth, in a couple of years, it becomes the biggest. If I came to you right now and if you were a policymaker in New York City or were a hotel owner, would you consider something like Airbnb an existential threat to your business? Remember the discussions coming out of New York about what it is doing to the bed tax.

So, when you start to worry about incumbents coming to their politicians and saying, "You need to stop this new economy," the incumbents aren't always the businesses. It is also the tax

system that is built on the way it is, not on the way it is becoming.

We had a presentation from one company. I think it was out of Michigan. It had this idea—I think it was 1000 Tools—where you could go online, and instead of going down to your favorite hardware store and buying the \$1,200 compound miter saw with laser sighting—and if my wife is listening, that is actually what I want for my birthday—you now hit the button on your phone, and you rent it from your neighbor. Think about that. That is a change in the economy. The sale no longer happened at the hardware store, and the manufacturer didn't get to sell a new compound miter saw with laser sighting, but you as the consumer—you, as the renter of this equipment—now probably have, not the \$1,200 you would have spent, but the \$1,140—because you spent \$60 on the rent—still in your pocket. Do you go and spend it on other things? Do you spend it on investments? Do you spend it on your family?

There is this rotation happening all around us of things that you and I have not even thought of. Will the bureaucracies and will the incumbent businesses show up in legislative bodies and courts around the country and do everything they can to stop that new hyperefficient, highly optional economy that is around us right now? Will they try to put the Ubers out of business? Will they try to put the Airbnbs out of business? Will they try to put the 1000 Tools—and who knows what else is out there?—out of business? Every day, entrepreneurs in this country are coming up with ideas, but those ideas are restructuring the economy, so let's walk through some of the options we have.

We have an energy renaissance. Every week in our office, we have people coming to us, saying, "Oh, DAVID, we really want you to regulate hydraulic fracturing because—oh, yeah—we worry about it, but it is also ruining our investments because we invested in alternative energies, and when there is \$4.50 long-term futures in natural gas, it is screwing up our investments over here." Remember the family rule: money, power, vanity. It is about the money. You would be shocked to know how much of the public policy that so many Americans think is Republican and Democrat is about the money.

Will this Congress do everything in its power to maximize this future of the energy renaissance and the revenues that it produces—both inbound, outbound? Will it be like some of the discussions we even saw earlier tonight of: let's come up with ways to regulate or let's come up with ways to minimize what we are able to sell when we are bringing in revenues from both our own country and from around the world?

Be prepared and think it through.

It is so often about: well, the people who support it are I and my political party, who are invested on the other side, so we need to stop this because it

is hurting their investments. Then remember the number one thing most elected officials care about—their re-elections. Forgive me. I know I am trying to be brutally honest here.

The second half is, today, here in D.C., the taxicab industry spent an hour blocking the roads and honking. My understanding is a substantial portion of that was the disdain for the competition from rideshare applications, from things like Uber—another optionality. It is a changing economy. There is going to be displacement in it, but with that also comes opportunity, and with that comes the new efficiencies that give us a chance to grow this economy.

Remember the first board here. We are \$205 trillion upside down. If we don't get amazing growth, we are never going to provide the promises that we have made to 76 million baby boomers who now have begun to retire. As just a bit of trivia, why is that so important? Average baby boomers—my math may be about a year out of date—will have put about \$100,000 into Medicare. My understanding is they are going to take out about \$320,000 to \$330,000. If you take that shortfall and multiply it times 76 million of our brothers and sisters who are baby boomers, then just in that one program, you start to see some of the demographic and math problems we have.

How do we start to grow the economy?

The last part of this is the regulatory zeal that has come from this administration.

Please, President Obama, turn to your folks. It is time to rethink this. How many more bad GDP numbers do you need? How many more misses do you need on the projections of: "Oh, the economy is getting better. No, it is crashing the other way. Oh, we are going to be this much better in our deficit. Oh, dear heaven. We are a year later, and it is still the same even with all of these new, higher taxes"? Regulatory overreach on things like waters of the U.S. and on so many other programs out there that are coming out of the bureaucracy are crushing the expansion of this economy.

My closing is pretty simple here. If you have someone out there who is asking for your vote or if you really care about the future, have the conversation, and be willing to open your mind up and understand the math—even though it is uncomfortable—that the mandatory spending is consuming everything in its path. If we don't deal with that and, at the same time, if we don't do everything we can to grow this economy absolutely vigorously, it could be a very dark day in the future. Yet I am incredibly optimistic that, if we embrace the new hyperefficient economy, if we embrace the energy renaissance, if we start to understand the regulatory crushing that has been going on right in front of us—if we deal with those and deal with them honestly—I think we actually have an

amazing future, and we are going to make it through this.

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

IRS "LOST DATA" SCANDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) for 15 minutes.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, last week, we learned the IRS—the most powerful and intimidating Federal agency in existence and the agency now working to monitor our health care—has "lost" over 2 years of emails from at least six employees.

In a master stroke of unluckiness, the IRS claims that the only computer systems impacted are those belonging to top senior officials connected to the targeting of Americans who held conservative political beliefs—beliefs like the notion that the First Amendment should always be protected in order to have a lasting, free democracy.

Nothing is ever this convenient.

Mr. Speaker, are we to believe the same entity that can turn the lives of Americans upside down and that can demand 7 years of financial and personal records just "lost" 2 years of data from its own employees?

Mr. Speaker, what would happen to your constituents, to my constituents or to any of our constituents—Democrats, Republicans or Independents—if they were investigated by the IRS and "lost" 2 years of data? Do you think the IRS would simply say, "That's okay. I am sure it was an accident. These things happen. We will drop our investigation now"? Of course not. Yet that is what the IRS is telling Congress. "Oh, sorry. We lost our data. Oh, well. Let's move on."

Mr. Speaker, how can we as Representatives tell our constituents to cooperate with an entity that refuses to cooperate with Congress? How can I tell my constituents to hand over personal information about their lives to the IRS when the IRS won't do the same?

I will conclude with a simple question to my friends across the aisle: Have you no shame? Your entire political outlook is based on the idea that government can work in an unbiased and effective way. Yet, when it becomes fairly clear that something isn't quite proper at the most powerful agency in the United States, you simply obscure the investigation instead of joining us in the call for a special prosecutor.

When it becomes clear that ordinary citizens who are engaging in their natural rights were targeted by a major officer at the IRS and when that official tries to take the Fifth Amendment to put up roadblocks to an investigation, you simply play politics. You are worried about poll numbers rather than the Republic.

I recently asked the current IRS Commissioner whether or not he believed that IRS workers could remain objective towards a group of American citizens who believes that the IRS should be disbanded. He was confounded by the question before answering that they were professionals. I have no doubt that the people at the IRS are professionals. The way they attacked conservative groups could only have been done by professionals.

Let me open my question to all of my friends from across the aisle: As members of the party of government, do you believe that any person can sustain objectivity towards someone one perceives as a threat to one's livelihood?

If you believe the answer is "yes," then join me in calling for a special prosecutor to help us find the truth. Prove your beliefs with action. Defend your ideas that government can be involved in most aspects of our lives by proving that nothing criminal happened at the IRS. Show the American people that bureaucrats can remain objective in the face of someone's telling them that their jobs shouldn't exist.

Mr. Speaker, our number one job here in Congress is to protect the rights of the people, not to take them away. It is time for everyone in this Chamber to remember that.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 12 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. KILMER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 26 on account of a family emergency.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 26 on account of a family obligation.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1681. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

A BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 25, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 316. To reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the dead-

line for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 26, 2014, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

CURT CLAWSON,
Nineteenth District of Florida.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6143. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2013 Packers and Stockyards Program Annual Report"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6144. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6145. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Detention of Drugs Intended for Human or Animal Use [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0365] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6146. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Microbiology Devices; Reclassification of Nucleic Acid-Based Systems for Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Complex in Respiratory Specimens [Docket No.: FDA-

2013-N-0544] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6147. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the interim report to Congress on the "Community First Choice (CFC) Option"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6148. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans — Maricopa County PM-10 Nonattainment Area; Five Percent Plan for Attainment of the 24-Hour PM-10 Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0762; FRL-9912-01-Region 9] received June 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6149. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama: Volatile Organic Compounds [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0311; FRL-9110-90-Region 4] received June 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6150. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Tennessee; Knoxville; Fine Particulate Matter 2008 Base Year Emissions Inventory [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0738; FRL-9911-97-Region 4] received June 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6151. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities; New York; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-R02-OAR-2014-0127; FRL-9912-05-Region 2] received June 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6152. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0413; FRL-9912-03-Region 9] received June 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6153. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tricyclazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0903; FRL-9910-39] received June 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6154. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — [alpha]-alkyl-[omega]-hydroxypoly (oxypropylene) and/or poly (oxyethylene) polymers where the alkyl chain contains a minimum of six carbons, [alpha]-alkyl-[omega]-hydroxypoly (oxypropylene) and/or poly (oxyethylene) polymers where the alkyl chain contains a minimum of six carbons and a minimum number average molecular weight (in amu) 1,100; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0210; FRL-9910-87] received June 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6155. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final

rule — Implementation of the Commercial Advertisement Loudness Mitigation (CALM) Act [MB Docket No.: 11-93] received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6156. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-039, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6157. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and continued by the President each year, most recently on November 7, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6158. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the sixty-eighth Semiannual Report to Congress of the Office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2013, through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6159. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the fiftieth Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-up, covering the six month period ending March 31, 2014 in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6160. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6161. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6162. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, transmitting the 2013 management report and statements on the system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6163. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification and Establishment of Restricted Areas; Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0729; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AEA-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6164. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate previously held by Eurocopter France) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0306; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-046-AD; Amendment 39-17850; AD 2014-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6165. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1103; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-131-AD; Amendment 39-17842; AD 2014-09-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6166. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0618; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-355-AD; Amendment 39-17844; AD 2014-06-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6167. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30956; Amdt. No. 3589] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6168. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30957; Amdt. No. 3590] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6169. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2013 Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LATTI, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4957. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to exceptional event demonstrations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 4958. A bill to provide monetary awards to any individual who provides information pertaining to the electronic communications sent by Lois Lerner during her employment at the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 4959. A bill to direct the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to maintain up-to-date information on its website regarding charges and actions brought by the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Mr.

KIND, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 4960. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the substantiation rules for the donation of vehicles valued between \$500 and \$5,000 dollars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 4961. A bill to prevent organized human smuggling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 4962. A bill to provide for enhanced border security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Natural Resources, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 4963. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to provide protections to borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4964. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Social Security to continue to make Social Security number printouts and benefit verification letters available at field offices of the Social Security Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 4965. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to improve childhood care and education for local governments and local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 4966. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide that meat, poultry, and egg products containing certain pathogens or contaminants are adulterated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4967. A bill to provide congressional review of nuclear agreements with Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MESSER, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 4968. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Maya Angelou in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period

to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 4969. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to extend to private land use restrictions its rule relating to reasonable accommodation of amateur service communications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 4970. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 4971. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct annual surveys of veterans on experiences obtaining hospital care and medical services from medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4972. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Althea Gibson, in recognition of her groundbreaking achievements in athletics and her commitment to ending racial discrimination and prejudice within the world of athletics; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4973. A bill to amend the rural and low-income program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to include professional development in STEM education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 4974. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the repayment of higher education loans for certain employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4975. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Vietnam Veterans Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H. Res. 642. A resolution calling for the immediate and unconditional release of the three kidnapped teenagers held captive in the West Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 643. A resolution calling for further defense against the People's Republic of China's state-sponsored cyber-enabled theft of trade secrets, including by the People's Liberation Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIGELL (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. RAHALL):

H. Res. 644. A resolution condemning and disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing national security concerns over the release of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Res. 645. A resolution requesting that the President of the United States transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Executive Office of the President that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Res. 646. A resolution directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Justice that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Res. 647. A resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Res. 648. A resolution directing the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Commission that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Res. 649. A resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WALZ):

H. Res. 650. A resolution congratulating the American Motorcyclist Association on their 90th Anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

225. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 319 urging the Congress to oppose the Department of Defense's budget proposal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

226. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Resolution No. 1124 urging the Congress and the President to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 4958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 4959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 4960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debt and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 4961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; Article I, section 8, clause 4; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 1, which reads: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the US Constitution

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 4968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 and Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 4969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1 [Rights Guaranteed]; ...the means employed to effect its exercise may be neither arbitrary nor oppressive but must bear a real and substantial relation to an end that is public, specifically, the public health, safety, or morals, or some other aspect of the general welfare.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 4970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 4971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 4974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 4975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Clause I of Section 8 or Article I of the Constitution, Congress has the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 36: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 543: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 621: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 732: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 792: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 842: Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 920: Mr. FINCHER.
 H.R. 1015: Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1020: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. DENHAM.
 H.R. 1070: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 1074: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 1127: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 1225: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 1507: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 1518: Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 1563: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1761: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 1795: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 1812: Mr. WOODALL.
 H.R. 1844: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 1893: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 1924: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 2220: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 2283: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 2291: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 2324: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2453: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HARPER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 2485: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 2500: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 2536: Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 2689: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2772: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2852: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2914: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 3351: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 3398: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 3431: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 3485: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 3486: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
 H.R. 3505: Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 3516: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 3536: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 3680: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3681: Mr. COTTON.
 H.R. 3714: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3829: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 3851: Mr. COTTON.
 H.R. 3877: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3899: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BARBER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESTY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ENYART, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MOORE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MENG, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3902: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 3954: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 3971: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 3978: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 3991: Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 3992: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 4010: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 4035: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 4077: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 4150: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 4162: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4187: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4190: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 4251: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 4301: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 4303: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 4321: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 4325: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 4347: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 4351: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 4365: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 4383: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 4385: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 4406: Mr. COTTON.
 H.R. 4411: Ms. BASS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. CHU, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. DENT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 4427: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 4432: Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 4440: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 4450: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 4461: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4510: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KIND, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 4515: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 4541: Mr. POCAN and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4566: Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 4629: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4651: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HALL, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4653: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 4674: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4701: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 4711: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 4716: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 4717: Mr. DAINES.
 H.R. 4771: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 4772: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 4781: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 4783: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 4792: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 4802: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 4808: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 4826: Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4828: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4833: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 4837: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 4878: Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 4879: Mr. ENYART, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 4893: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 4906: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Ms. HAHN.
 H.R. 4909: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 4920: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 4934: Ms. FOXX, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 4935: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 4942: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 4948: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.J. Res. 56: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H. Res. 19: Mr. NOLAN.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. LONG.
 H. Res. 153: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H. Res. 188: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H. Res. 435: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 456: Mr. HALL and Ms. ESTY.
 H. Res. 525: Mr. HIMES and Mr. DOYLE.
 H. Res. 549: Mr. CRAMER.
 H. Res. 562: Mr. MORAN.
 H. Res. 588: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SIREN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. BACHUS.
 H. Res. 601: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. PERRY.
 H. Res. 606: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. ESTY.

H. Res. 631: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. BURGESS.

 PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

84. The SPEAKER presented a petition of The City of Pleasantville, NJ, relative to Resolution No. 67-2014 urging the House of Representatives and the President to pass and sign the Homeowners Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014; to the Committee on Financial Services.

85. Also, a petition of the City Council of Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. 38-2014 recognizing the importance of a unified Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

86. Also, a petition of Ontario County Board of Supervisors, New York, relative to Resolution No. 265-2014 urging the adoption of H.R. 543; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.