

Wolf  
Womack

Woodall  
Yoder  
  
NAYS—187

Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

**JOB AND ENERGY PERMITTING  
ACT OF 2011**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316 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. 2021.

□ 1445

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. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activity, with Mrs. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, as we prepare to take up an important piece of legislation today, H.R. 2021, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado, CORY GARDNER, the sponsor of this legislation; and the gentleman from Kentucky, ED WHITFIELD, the chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, for moving this legislation along.

Madam Chair, the purpose of this bill is real simple. It is to streamline the permit process to allow us more domestic production of oil and gas. In this country, we consume about 19 million barrels a day of oil and we produce about 7 million, and the exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf has been delayed for years because of a broken bureaucracy. The regional EPA, they are going to approve exploration air permits, only to have them challenged again by EPA's Environmental Appeals Board. It has been a never-ending circuit of approvals, appeals and re-applications, and it has stalled exploration for nearly 5 years.

So what does that mean? It means that these resources, which perhaps contain as much as 28 billion—yes, that's billion—barrels of oil and 122 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, have been stalled.

We know that if production is allowed here, safe production, we could produce perhaps as much as 1 million barrels a day from these sites, and it would add about 54,000 American jobs. Yet 5 years after the original lease sales, not a single test well has been drilled, not a single barrel of domestic oil has been brought to market to reduce our reliance on Middle East oil, and not a single job has been created to develop the resources because the bureaucracy is standing in the way of exploration.

This legislation changes that, and I would urge my colleagues to support this sensible, bipartisan legislation to streamline the permitting process and finally allow us to explore and develop the vast resources of our Nation. This bill was approved by the Energy and Commerce Committee with a strong bipartisan vote, and I look forward to the same result today.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this legislation. The legislation is not about creating jobs. It is not about lowering gasoline prices. It is a giveaway to the oil industry that will increase pollution along our coasts.

This legislation's supporters have promoted it as a narrow bill designed to address specific problems that Shell has faced in obtaining a clean air permit for exploratory drilling off the coast of Alaska.

□ 1450

This legislation will have wide-ranging impacts beyond the Arctic Ocean. The States of California and Delaware have grave concerns about the impact of this bill on their ability to protect public health and welfare from air pollution. In fact, this bill could affect every State on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts.

I agree that the provisions of the Clean Air Act that apply to the Outer Continental Shelf will have some ambiguities that could use clarification, but this legislation takes the wrong approach. Each of the so-called clarifications in this bill would have the effect of allowing more pollution and providing less public health protection for the nearby communities and limiting participation of affected stakeholders in the permitting process.

The Republicans say that it shouldn't take 5 years to get a permit, and I agree with them. But the truth is it has not taken 5 years for Shell to get a permit. Shell has pulled permit applications and modified its proposed operations on numerous occasions. Each time, EPA has had to adjust its assessment of the potential impacts on air quality and public health. This is what EPA is supposed to do. No one should want EPA to take a one-size-fits-all approach to permitting these major sources of pollution.

There are many flaws in the legislation. It allows huge increases in air pollution from oil and gas drilling activities by moving the point of measurement from the drill ship to the shore. It threatens the ability of California and other States to regulate the emissions of support vessels. And it sets an arbitrary deadline of 6 months for final agency action on every offshore exploratory drilling permit, no matter the size or complexity of the proposed operations. The EPA Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that 6 months is too short to allow for adequate technical analysis, public participation,

Ackerman	Garamendi	Pascarell
Altmire	Gonzalez	Pastor (AZ)
Andrews	Green, Al	Payne
Baca	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Baldwin	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Barrow	Gutierrez	Peters
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Peterson
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Heinrich	Polis
Berman	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Hinchey	Rahall
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Rangel
Boren	Hirono	Reyes
Boswell	Hochul	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Holden	Richmond
Braley (IA)	Holt	Ross (AR)
Brown (FL)	Honda	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Inslee	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Israel	Rush
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Carney	(TX)	T.
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Chandler	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Chu	Keating	Schiff
Cicilline	Kildee	Schrader
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Schwartz
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Clay	Langevin	Scott, David
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Lee (CA)
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Sherman
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Shuler
Cooper	Lipinski	Sires
Costa	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lowey	Speier
Critz	Lujan	Stark
Crowley	Lynch	Sutton
Cuellar	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Tonko
DeFazio	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
DeGette	McCollum	Tsongas
DeLauro	McDermott	Van Hollen
Deutch	McGovern	Velázquez
Dicks	McIntyre	Visclosky
Dingell	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Doggett	Meeke	Wasserman
Donnelly (IN)	Michaud	Schultz
Doyle	Miller (NC)	Waters
Edwards	Miller, George	Watt
Ellison	Moran	Waxman
Engel	Nadler	Welch
Eshoo	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Fattah	Neal	Woolsey
Filner	Olver	Wu
Frank (MA)	Owens	Yarmuth
Fudge	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—9

Farr	Lummis	Stivers
Giffords	Moore	Sullivan
Kissell	Murphy (CT)	Young (AK)

□ 1444

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2021.

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

There was no objection.

and administrative review. Witnesses for the States of California and Delaware agree this wouldn't work for their State programs. Yet these concerns have been ignored.

The legislation eliminates the Environmental Appeals Board from the permitting process, even though it is a cheaper, faster, and more expert substitute for judicial review. And it requires all challenges to air permits to be raised before the Federal Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., thousands of miles away from the affected communities.

Claims that this legislation will reduce gas prices or the budget deficit are nonsense. They have no substantiation. There are sensible improvements we could make, but we aren't making them. Instead, this bill waives environmental requirements and short-circuits permitting reviews at the expense of public health.

The administration opposes H.R. 2021 because it would curtail the authority of EPA to help ensure that domestic oil production on the Outer Continental Shelf proceeds safely, responsibly, and with opportunities for efficient stakeholder input. I agree with them.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2021.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee that brought this bill before the body today, and I thank the chairman, Mr. UPTON, for his work on this piece of legislation. Energy security, job creation, working to reduce the pain at the pump, that is what H.R. 2021 is about, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011. I thank the chairman for bringing it to the floor today.

This is an important bill for our country and a step in the right direction when it comes to weaning ourselves off of foreign, Middle Eastern oil. It allows us to utilize the resources that we have in our own backyard—American energy for American jobs—responsibly and environmentally friendly.

Gas prices are fluctuating near historic levels that can send our economy into yet another recession. Millions of Americans are out of work. The unemployment rate has ticked back above 9 percent. Unrest in the Middle East has highlighted our vulnerabilities that stem from dependence on oil half a world away and from many countries that seek to do us harm. In the face of seemingly intractable problems, it is our duty as elected representatives of the people of this country to pursue solutions that benefit our neighbors and our Nation as a whole. One such solution is unlocking America's vast energy potential. The Jobs and Energy Permitting Act is a bipartisan approach—a bipartisan bill—to bring a massive domestic resource online and create tens of thousands of jobs.

I am delighted to have my friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) as the coauthor of this legislation.

In this bill, we move in a nimble and elegant manner to tie the loose ends in EPA's permitting process and the Clean Air Act, itself, to expedite decisions on EPA's issued air permits for offshore oil exploration. The needless red tape inherent in EPA's current permitting process has blocked access to a truly enormous reserve, a reserve in our own backyard, Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi Seas.

Taken together, we have been told that upwards of 1 million barrels of oil a day can be brought online as a result of the responsible development of these resources, entirely offsetting our imports from Saudi Arabia. Doing so will create and sustain over 50,000 jobs as massive projects get underway to bring this resource to American consumers. Such a vast amount of oil will not only reduce prices at the pump in the future, as testimony was given before the Energy and Commerce Committee, but keep us more secure by eliminating imports from hostile regimes abroad.

For these reasons, the President agrees that we should be moving forward with permitting exploration off Alaska's coast. This bipartisan bill is the most efficient way to get the job done.

Through two exhaustive hearings on this bill, we heard testimony from numerous stakeholders and citizens of Alaska. We believe we have created a solution that balances both environmental protection with public priorities, a balance that does not exist with current EPA procedures.

During our subcommittee and full committee markups we debated numerous amendments, giving members the opportunity to propose substantive changes to the underlying bill. I'm glad that we had a very serious and thought-provoking discussion on this bill during those meetings, and I look forward to the debate today.

The Jobs and Energy Permitting Act is a serious bill with serious implications for our economy and our energy security. I am delighted to be here today working with my Democratic colleague to move forward with an effective solution to regulatory problems experienced in Alaska and Alaska's offshore areas.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to our Democratic leader in the energy area, the ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank the ranking member from the full committee, my friend from California (Mr. WAXMAN), for yielding this time.

Madam Chair, I'm not opposed to drilling in Alaska and I'm not opposed to streamlining the permitting process in a sensible and thoughtful manner, but I do object to cutting out input and participation from the very commu-

nities that would be most affected by this process or preempting States' authority in order to expedite the permitting process for one single company.

Unfortunately, many of the less affluent communities who are ultimately being adversely affected by this permitting process do not have the resources of the oil industry to lobby Congress on their own behalf, and so it's up to us, those Members who represent those same people, to come to this floor to represent them.

While this bill will benefit Shell, the repercussions and consequences, both intended and unintended, will have a much greater impact on many stakeholders.

If the majority had been willing to work with our side on this bill, as we offered on many occasions we wanted to—we begged, we pleaded, we almost crawled to try to get bipartisan participation on this bill—if they had been willing to work together, we could have crafted a bipartisan piece of legislation that could move through the House and the Senate and ultimately become law.

□ 1500

However, this bill does not take into account some of the very real concerns that the minority has outlined to the majority on several occasions.

In fact, yesterday, the White House issued a statement opposing this bill because "H.R. 2021 would curtail the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency under the Clean Air Act to help ensure that domestic oil production on the Outer Continental Shelf proceeds safely, responsibly, and with opportunities for efficient stakeholder input. H.R. 2021 would limit existing EPA authority to protect human health and the environment. H.R. 2021 would increase Federal court litigation and deprive citizens of an important avenue for challenging government action that affects local public health."

Madam Chair, this bill is certainly not about creating jobs, and it's certainly not about lowering gasoline prices. It is a giveaway—a blatant giveaway, an unadulterated giveaway—to the oil industry that will increase pollution along our coasts. In fact, as the administration has pointed out, 70 percent of the offshore leases that oil companies currently possess are not even at this very moment in production. Again, 70 percent of the offshore leases that oil companies own are not now in production, and 29 million acres of onshore permits, as we speak, aren't being developed. So it is unnecessary for Congress to intervene by sacrificing public participation and air quality protections for the sake of expediency on behalf of Shell, as this bill does.

Madam Chair, I hope—I sincerely hope—that we can find bipartisan support for the amendments that will be offered today, including my own, which will simply allow the EPA administrator to provide additional 30-day extensions if the same administrator determines that such time is necessary to

provide adequate time for public participation and sufficient involvement by affected States.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I might just add here that the University of Alaska did a study on this legislation in oil and gas development in Alaska's arctic seas, and they concluded that the full development there would create 54,000 jobs.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, Shell Oil Company has spent 5 years of time and \$3 billion trying to drill one well in the Arctic Ocean—5 years and \$3 billion. In that time period, worldwide and in other areas of the Outer Continental Shelf of the world, they have drilled and received permits for over 200 wells—200 and the rest of the world “zero”—in the Arctic Ocean.

All this bill does is set up a fair procedure so that any company that wishes to drill a well—and the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, should probably be renamed under the Obama administration the “energy prohibition administration”—can go through the permitting process and get a decision within an adequate time period.

Our friends in Russia are drilling wells in the territorial waters in the Arctic Ocean up there. Our friends in Norway are drilling wells in the Arctic Ocean in their territorial waters. We in the United States, because of bureaucratic foot-dragging at the EPA, are refusing to even let one well be drilled.

This bill changes that. It sets timetables. It sets standards. It determines where you measure the emissions. There will be some emissions when you drill a few wells in the Arctic Ocean, but they're not going to be extensive. This bill says that you determine the emissions at the shoreline, which in the case of this particular well is about 80 miles away, and you measure it there. Madam Chairwoman, there will be more emissions created from the EPA agency heads and staff assistants in their driving up to Capitol Hill to testify than there probably will be from the service supply ships that go out to service the handful of wells that will be drilled.

This is a commonsense bill. It doesn't change the underlying statutory language at all in terms of standards. It does set timetables. It does define where you measure the pollution, and it does require that you actually make a decision. It is a good bill, H.R. 2021. In blackjack, if you get a 20, that's almost a sure winner. If you get a 21, it's a sure winner. This bill is a sure winner, H.R. 2021. Please vote for it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to a very important member of our committee, the

gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the ranking member very much for yielding.

The underlying legislation represents another attempt by the Republicans to gut the Clean Air Act. Shell Oil spent years changing its mind about how it wanted to drill, what ship it wanted to use and even which of the arctic seas it planned to drill in. They, themselves, dragged out this process interminably.

This legislation prevents EPA from requiring emissions reductions from all drilling support vessels, from icebreakers to the drilling ship, itself, as part of the air permitting process. What that means is that—listen to this number—up to 98 percent of the total air emissions associated with Arctic Outer Continental Shelf drilling could not be regulated by EPA under the permitting process. So hear that again. Their bill says that EPA cannot regulate 98 percent of the emissions.

That's not reasonable. That's not a compromise. That's not balance.

EPA has informed Congressman WAXMAN that, as part of its permit negotiations, Shell has actually agreed to add technology to one of its icebreakers to reduce the icebreaker's NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by 96 percent—to reduce them by 96 percent—and particulate emissions reduced by 82 percent. Shell has already agreed to use a cleaner burning fuel than what would otherwise be required by law. Shell agreed to take these measures so that it could receive its permit from EPA, and the net effect of all the measures Shell has agreed to take will reduce the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions for the entire drilling project by 72 percent. But under this bill, EPA would no longer have the ability to require or to request measures such as these because the bill says that EPA can't require reductions in emissions from mobile sources using its stationary source air permitting authority.

Several weeks ago, Bob Meyers, who led EPA's Air Office during the Bush administration, pointed out at the Energy and Power Subcommittee hearing, that, in fact, EPA can regulate icebreakers and other support vessels under title II of the Clean Air Act. He said that this is why these mobile sources' emissions could be exempted from being regulated as part of the stationary source air permitting process. That all sounds so reasonable, but what these guys are saying is maybe you shouldn't be regulated as both a mobile source and a stationary source under the Clean Air Act.

□ 1510

But there's just one problem. Shell's air permit says that all of its icebreakers and other support vessels are foreign-flagged so they can't be regulated under title II of the Clean Air Act in the first place. And even if they were American vessels, they're all too old to have been subject to the most stringent Clean Air Act or international emissions requirements.

So what they're saying is for all intents and purposes, they're neither mobile nor are they stationary so they're not regulated at all. It's like being a carnivorous vegetarian, or you know, Chevy Chase nightlife. There is no such thing. You know, you have got to have it be one or the other; you've got to pick one or the other here. And you can't wind up nothing being required from them.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

So while Republicans say that this bill just keeps the icebreakers and the ice-breaker part of the Clean Air Act, the reality is that it effectively puts EPA's ability to reduce emissions from these sources on ice.

My amendment to remedy the problem by ensuring that these vessels met the most stringent mobile source standards so that we would realize some emissions reductions from them was rejected by the majority in the committee. So instead of what the majority claims they want to do, which was to ensure that these vessels were not regulated as both mobile source and stationary source under the Clean Air Act, what this bill does is ensure that the emissions from these vessels aren't regulated at all. That's their goal, that 98 percent of emissions will go unregulated, and I don't think there's anyone listening to this debate that thinks that that's a good thing for the public health of our country.

I urge opposition to this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I might remind our friend from Massachusetts that EPA actually approved the drilling permit, the exploratory drilling permit for Shell, in this case, on three separate occasions; but the delay has been the appeals by the opposing party to the Environmental Appeals Board, which is not even in the clean air statute. So this bill is simply designed to speed up the process and give people an adequate time to oppose the exploratory permitting.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), who's a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Chairman, Mr. GARDNER's bill addresses this country's need on energy and power. Mr. GARDNER's bill prevents the government from going out of its way to stop the private sector from creating jobs. This job alone in the Chukchi Sea will create 54,000 jobs sustained over 50 years. The economic report from Northern Economics and the University of Alaska I will submit for the RECORD.

And with 1 million barrels per day going to our country's need of about 19 million barrels per day makes us more energy secure. So what we hear from the EPA and the minority is they will do everything they can to stop fossil fuels even though this is a fossil fuel

economy. Yes, we need all of the above, but to stop all fossil fuels creates national insecurity, making us more dependent on foreign oil, sending more of our financial resources and jobs overseas; and that's what we need to stop, and that's what this bill takes a large step towards doing.

Now, the EPA has made it impossible for new exploration off the coast of Alaska by continually changing the rules. The EPA has even testified before our committee that there is no anticipated human health risk at issue, and we've still been waiting 6 years and counting for this permit to be issued.

Let's make it clear: Bureaucratic delays are blocking energy development. While the EPA's regional office has granted air permits to allow this deep sea drilling, the process has repeatedly been stalled when the administrator's Environmental Appeals Board rejects the permits already granted. Yes, it gets to Washington; they stop it. And this process repeats itself. We'll have a bill maybe in a couple of weeks where the EPA's done the same thing, where they change the rules to stop a project.

The Federal Government's inability to issue viable permits to drill offshore Alaska is keeping resources and domestic jobs from the American people. The Gardner bill, H.R. 2021, aims to eliminate the uncertainty and confusion that has delayed oil exploration in deep sea Alaskan Outer Continental Shelf, and I hope my colleagues will support this bill.

#### ECONOMIC REPORT OVERVIEW

##### Potential National-Level Benefits of Oil and Gas Development in the Beaufort Sea and Chukchi Sea

A new study on potential national-level benefits of Alaska Arctic OCS development, by Northern Economics and the University of Alaska Anchorage's Institute of Social and Economic Research, builds on a previous study of potential state-level benefits using the same methodology and assumptions. Both reports are available for download from [www.northerneconomics.com](http://www.northerneconomics.com).

#### CREATES SIGNIFICANT ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Development of new oil and gas fields in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas resulting in production of nearly 10 billion barrels of oil and 15 trillion cubic feet of natural gas over the next 50 years could create significant economic effects nationwide.

#### 54,700 NEW JOBS

An estimated annual average of 54,700 new jobs that would be created by OCS-related development are sustained for 50 years. The total ramps up to 68,600 during production and 91,500 at peak employment. These direct and indirect jobs would be created both in Alaska and the rest of the United States.

#### \$145 BILLION PAYROLL

An estimated \$63 billion in payroll would be paid to employees in Alaska as a result of OCS oil and gas development and another \$82 billion in payroll would be paid to employees in the rest of the United States. The sustained job creation increases income and further stimulates domestic economic activity.

#### \$193 BILLION GOVERNMENT REVENUE

Federal, state, and local governments would all realize substantial revenue from OCS oil and gas development, with the base case totaling \$193 billion:

\$167 billion to the federal government  
\$15 billion to the State of Alaska  
\$4 billion to local Alaska governments  
\$7 billion to other state governments

#### SENSITIVITY CASES ARE ALL HIGHER

The study's base case assumed long-term average prices through the year 2030 of \$65 per barrel (bbl) for oil and \$6.40 per million Btu (mmBtu) for natural gas. The estimated total government revenue increases if energy prices remain higher in the future.

#### Total Government Revenue

(Dollars in billions)

Base Case (\$65/bbl, \$6.40/mmBtu) .....	\$193
Case 1 (\$80/bbl, \$7.80/mmBtu) .....	214
Case 2 (\$100/bbl, \$9.80/mmBtu) .....	263
Case 3 (\$120/bbl, \$11.80/mmBtu) .....	312

#### IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

##### Critical Infrastructure Protection

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS) delivers approximately 14% of domestic oil production to refineries on the West Coast and has been identified as critical infrastructure for national security. Built at a cost of \$8 billion in 1977, TAPS throughput has fallen from 2.1 million barrels per day in 1988 to less than 650,000 barrels per day as North Slope oil fields age. Without additional oil development, the TAPS is anticipated to encounter operating difficulty below about 500,000 barrels per day and shut down when it reaches 200,000 barrels per day. Alaska OCS development can help extend the operating life of this critical infrastructure.

Moreover, Arctic OCS development maximizes the value of Alaska's and the Nation's oil and gas resources. Much of the expected incremental revenue from OCS development for the State of Alaska (55%) comes from enhancement of existing onshore North Slope production, in both volume and value. This results from reduced transportation costs (from infrastructure operating at capacity), and from expanded infrastructure enabling development of small satellite fields. OCS development will also enhance the probability of an Alaska gas pipeline due to increased certainty in the available gas resource base.

##### U.S. Energy Production and National Security

Domestic energy production is important for the security and prosperity of the United States. The money spent on domestic energy cycles through in the U.S. economy, thereby increasing domestic economic activity and jobs; while money spent on imported energy leaves the U.S. economy.

The majority (77%) of world oil reserves are owned or controlled by national governments; only 23% are accessible for private sector investment. The United States currently imports over 60% of the crude oil we use. Arctic offshore development could cut this by about 9% for a period of 35 years. Increasing domestic energy production would improve the nation's trade balance.

##### Potential Benefits Delayed

When the first study of state-level economic impacts was written in 2009, first oil was anticipated in 2019 and first gas in 2029 for the Beaufort Sea (2022, 2036 for the Chukchi Sea). This timeline assumed no major regulatory impediments or delays." However, exploration has been slowed, thus delaying the potential benefits of OCS oil and gas development.

#### SOURCES

Northern Economics, Inc. (NEI) and Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) Potential National-Level Benefits of Alaska OCS Development.

NEI and ISER. Economic Analysis of Future Offshore Oil and Gas Development:

Beaufort Sea, Chukchi Sea, and North Aleutian Basin.

Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, [www.capp.ca](http://www.capp.ca).

Shell Exploration and Production. Calculated from TAPS throughput data and EIA Annual Energy Outlook data for domestic oil production.

US Energy Information Administration Annual Energy Outlook 2010.

Minerals Management Service. 2006 Oil and Gas Assessment: Beaufort Sea Planning Area (Alaska) and Chukchi Sea Planning Province Summaries.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I rise today to support H.R. 2021, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act; and I want to thank our Energy and Commerce ranking member for providing time.

Representing a heavily industrialized area that's naturally sensitive to air quality issues, I appreciate how the EPA's enactment of Clean Air Act provisions has positively attributed to our goal of cleaner air. For that reason, I have remained hopeful that EPA's administrative air permitting barriers to exploring Alaska's Outer Continental Shelf would be addressed, but they haven't. As such, we continue to see air permits for offshore exploration wells perpetually go back and forth between the producer, the EPA, the Environmental Appeals Board, with no movement towards a final decision.

That's why I am an original cosponsor of the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act, which would rectify several of those process questions so that we can safely and responsibly produce our natural resources in the Arctic Ocean. The EPA needs to have a permit approval system in place that is predictable, workable, and understandable.

When I hear that in the last 5 years Shell has drilled over 400 exploration wells worldwide while waiting for one single permit for Alaska, something's definitely wrong with the process.

While the opponents of this legislation are saying that this bill guts the Clean Air Act, that's just not true, because all this bill does is match EPA's Outer Continental Shelf permitting process with the air permitting process employed by the Department of the Interior in the Gulf of Mexico, a Clean Air Act air permitting process that has been successfully used for decades.

By doing so, we can rest assured that we have a strong, offshore air permitting process, but that these projects are not left in limbo like we have seen with the Environmental Appeals Board in recent years.

I also want to remind my colleagues that this bill just addresses permits for exploration wells where activity typically only lasts for a few days, not production wells where activities last for months.

I have long been a supporter of safe and responsible drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf as these resources are a vital source of energy for the

United States. With skyrocketing fuel costs, it is imperative for the U.S. to diversify our energy sources by exploring this area, and this bill is the first step in that process.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I might just also remind everyone that this 5-year, 6-year period for this permit was for only an exploratory permit, not even a production permit.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2021 and appreciate Mr. GARDNER bringing this to our attention.

You know, this is not a bill about Shell Oil Company. This is about a system that is broken. Shell Oil Company has been trying for almost 5 years to get a permit and still doesn't get the answer. In the meantime, they've drilled over 400 exploratory wells around the world, but they can't drill in the United States.

I've recently spent time at gas stations talking to people, their frustration over our gas prices is why are they so high here, why are the prices going up. This bill answers why they're going up. We have a government that has a war on American jobs and a war on American energy. We have a war on Western jobs because oil production is concentrated in the West.

Every time a drill bit is stopped by its own actions, the price of gas will go incrementally up by just multiple percentages of very small amounts. But when it's stopped by bureaucratic action, then the market's going to assess that a government is going to be unfriendly to future production and the price begins to escalate because people get out of dollars and out of other investments into this because they know the price of gas and oil are going to go up because they can see the bureaucratic delays being played out.

So understand that when we have high gas prices in this country it is because the government is making them high. It's making them high by moratoriums. It's making them high by delaying tactics in our administration's responses to these things like this permit.

□ 1520

The gentleman from Colorado's bill simply says we're going to simply unravel one piece of the delays that have been happening. It's a well-thought-out bill, it's a well-thought-out process, and it's one which will result in lower prices for American consumers. There's absolutely no health hazard. Lisa Jackson herself has said that. They're going to give the permits.

What we're doing today is passing a bill that won't help Shell at all, that will help future producers to understand that they can get regulatory certainty, that they can get answers when they're asking questions of the government. It's a reasonable request and one which we should do.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute to correct some of the statements that have been made that I don't think are accurate.

Lisa Jackson, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency, said if they got a permit that was approved by the EPA, there would be no adverse environmental impact, but what the proponents of this bill are trying to do is to circumvent the EPA action and to have Congress shorten the ability of the EPA to act. There will be pollution problems. States will not be able to control the pollution off their coasts. That is why California and Delaware have expressed such great concern, but other States are going to be in the same situation.

This bill does not deal with just the problem in Alaska. It tries to circumvent the orderly procedure by which those who are trying to get permits will come in and submit their permit and show that they're justified, unlike the situation with Shell, where they submitted a permit, pulled it back, submitted another one and pulled it back.

At this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2021, the so-called Jobs and Energy Permitting Act.

I oppose this legislation for several reasons.

First, it gives oil companies a pass to pollute. It exempts offshore drilling companies from applying pollution control technologies to vessels like crew and supply boats, which actually account for most of the air pollution from drilling off my congressional district's coast. It also opens up a loophole for drill ships to pollute with no limits while the ship moves into place. And, instead of measuring pollution at the source, itself, H.R. 2021 allows oil companies to measure the impacts at the shore, with net results of more air pollution overall.

Second, H.R. 2021 does away with proven processes that provide an expert, efficient, and impartial review of air permitting decisions. I would note that in 20 years, the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District has never denied an offshore drilling permit, and there is more drilling off my district than just about anywhere in this country. The local air permitting review process works. We don't need to change it.

In addition, this bill's provision to remove all appellate action to Washington, D.C., is wholly unfair. This limits the rights of my constituents to participate in very important matters affecting their health. It forces cash-strapped local governments to travel thousands of miles to defend their permitting decisions, placing a serious burden on local taxpayers.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly to my constituents, H.R. 2021

poses real health risks to the communities surrounding offshore drilling by weakening local air quality standards. Pollution from the nearly two dozen oil platforms and the vessels that supply them in the Santa Barbara Channel includes high levels of airborne pollutants. These pollutants can cause severe lung problems and other major health issues. That's why our State adopted rules to strengthen air quality standards and help protect coastal residents from this pollution. It makes no sense to block these rules that will help my community clean up its air.

In sum, Madam Chair, H.R. 2021 is a bad bill.

Let me also address a theme that's been repeated on the other side. Supporters of this bill continue to parrot the Shell Oil talking point that it has taken them 5 years to get a Clean Air Act permit for their proposed drilling in the Arctic Ocean. They cite this 5-year delay as the justification for this legislation. This claim might make a nice sound-bite, but it is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the facts.

Here are the facts. First, Shell has pulled its permit applications, modified its proposed operations, and changed its target drilling sites on numerous occasions over the past few years. Shell pulled the permit application for drilling in the Beaufort Sea for 2 years until going back to EPA with a brand new request in 2010. Every time Shell changed its plans, EPA had to adjust its assessment of the potential impacts on air quality and public health. That's what we expect EPA to do. No one wants EPA to take a one-size-fits-all approach to permitting these major sources of pollution.

Second, Shell delayed final EPA action on its air permit for drilling in the Chukchi Sea by submitting insufficient permit applications. That's Shell's fault, not EPA's.

Finally, EPA has prioritized Shell's permit applications and finalized them quickly. The two Shell permits at issue were proposed and finalized within 3 to 4 months of receiving completed applications. Both went from submission of a completed application to a decision by the Environmental Appeals Board within 1 year. EPA now says it is on track to finalize Shell's revised permits by the end of this summer.

If this bill is about addressing Shell's so-called 5-year permitting delay, then I see no basis for this legislation. The truth is that this bill isn't about expediting the permit process. It's about rolling back air quality protections. This bill will create more problems than it purports to solve because it will allow oil companies to pollute more offshore and cut concerned stakeholders out of the very process itself.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I would also like to clarify that this bill does not change the Clean Air Act in any way as it relates to monitoring

stationary sources or mobile sources. I wanted to point that out.

Second of all, the gentlelady from California mentioned additional drilling going on in the Pacific region. The government records show that since 1994, not one exploratory permit has been issued. There are production wells out there, but not one new exploratory permit since 1994.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2021, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011.

Every generation has an opportunity to excel in one area. Every 10 years or so, a country decides whether they're going to be a recipient of something or whether they're going to be a world leader.

For too long, the United States of America has accepted that we are going to be a net importer of energy, that we are always going to be energy dependent, that we are always going to be reliant on foreign sources of energy.

Ladies and gentlemen, two of Alaska's arctic seas contain up to 27.9 billion barrels of oil and 122 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. This could deliver up to 1 million barrels of oil a day, beginning the process of getting us unaddicted to foreign oil, beginning the process of bringing us energy security, and getting America back to work.

We have an opportunity here in the United States to get people back to work, but it is being limited and hamstrung by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., and by those with a political agenda.

We have the equivalent of a pile of cash under our mattress, but we're taking out loans from the Mafia to care for our energy needs. It is high time that we stand up and say we have resources in the United States, and we're not going to allow political agendas to drive us to continued energy dependence, and we're going to stand up and say produce it here in the United States of America and do it now.

The American people, Madam Chairman, are beginning to understand that this administration and its agencies are having real consequences and real impacts on the unemployment rate, on the joblessness, and on the price we are paying for a barrel of oil and a gallon of gasoline, because every dollar that a gallon of gasoline increases, it is a regressive tax on Americans. Meanwhile, we sit around and we argue while bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., have their way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Madam Chairman, the legislation before us would repeal pollution standards for ships and oil rigs located offshore anywhere in America. It appears to be based on the belief that as a gen-

eral principle, air does not move. This legislation endangers air quality from Alaska to Virginia while offering another token of appreciation to the oil companies that were so generous in creating a new majority in the 112th Congress.

□ 1530

The premise of this bill is that pollution generated offshore doesn't matter because it will not affect any humans onshore or humans working offshore. And I know that those of us who represent littoral States are most reassured by our colleagues from Colorado, Kentucky, and Nebraska in reassuring us that we won't negatively be affected by this legislation.

Based on the content of this bill, apparently the majority believes that individuals employed on offshore oil rigs and ship servicing rigs do not breathe while they're working offshore. This bill would deregulate ongoing oil drilling in Alaska and prospective oil drilling off the coast of Virginia and all other coastal States. The majority is attempting to pass yet another bill to sacrifice the health and economic livelihoods of American citizens to pad the pocketbooks of Big Oil.

This legislation, which presupposes that air does not move, is as dangerous as the previous Republican oil bills which denied the existence of global warming and enacted wholesale repeals of the few safety and environmental safeguards that still protect coastal communities from oil drilling.

We keep hearing from across the aisle that this legislation will create 50,000 jobs. My friends, don't be misinformed. The study they referred to is a Shell Oil-funded study that simply estimates how many jobs could be created, all things being equal, like no pollution regulation, by offshore oil drilling in Alaska. Today's debate is not about whether to drill; it's about whether we will allow a massive increase in pollution when we do it. It is a false choice, and I urge my colleagues in the House to reject it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, my friends on the other side of the aisle would make it appear that we are abandoning all environmental protections, and I would say that under this bill, there are still five opportunities for public comment. The NEPA process is not changed in any way.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my colleague from Kentucky for giving me this time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2021, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act. This bill will help clarify and improve EPA's decision-making in air permitting off the coast of Alaska and restore much needed certainty to that regulatory process.

Estimates show that the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas have the potential to produce up to 1 million barrels of oil

per day while creating over 54,000 American jobs. It is unacceptable that the bureaucratic permitting process has caused delays for 5 years and continues to block American energy resources from being developed. This bill would hold the administration accountable for its actions and provide the certainty so desperately needed by the private sector to grow jobs and get our economy back on track.

At a time of record high gas prices, we should be committed to developing American energy resources, reducing our dependence on Middle Eastern sources of energy, and providing good-paying American jobs. Let's put America back to work. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield myself 5 minutes.

I would like to say that the American people expect the Congress to provide opportunities for us to fully explore our natural resources. This is a very modest bill that only changes one very small part of the Clean Air Act. It relates explicitly only to exploratory drilling permits, and it changes only appeals to the Environmental Appeals Board. The Environmental Appeals Board is not even in the statute of the Clean Air Act; it was put in by regulation.

And what's happening here in the one issue that we're talking about today, the EPA has approved this drilling permit on three separate occasions, yet it's been appealed to the Environmental Appeals Board, and it's tied up and tied up and they will not make a final decision. And if you cannot exhaust your administrative remedies, you cannot even go to the court system. So this legislation simply expedites the process without removing protections for people concerned about the environment, as we all are. And I wanted to make that comment.

I would also at this point like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

We've heard all kinds of arguments today, red herrings that would make the Fulton Fish Market proud of this debate.

This bill is not about jobs, my colleagues on the other side of this debate said. This bill is not about pain at the pump, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said. This bill won't create jobs, I've heard in the arguments today. That it is a massive excuse for people to do incredible things to the environment, unthought-of things. Again, red herrings that the American people are tired of.

The American people are asking for jobs. They are asking for relief at the pump. This bill is nothing more than creating economic opportunity for not only people in Alaska but throughout this country with the creation of 50,000 jobs. When we access our resources,

evidently, there are some who believe it doesn't create jobs. When we create 1 million barrels of oil a day coming into our supplies, apparently that doesn't create jobs. When we build operations for our workers in the north shore of Alaska, the supply facilities in the lower 48 States, apparently that doesn't create jobs.

Apparently we don't lose jobs when people are beginning to pay nearly \$4 a gallon for the price of gas. That seems to be the argument that I hear against this bill.

My constituents are paying \$3.50, \$3.60 for a price per gallon of gas. And apparently, as energy prices increase, some believe that doesn't cut jobs, that doesn't hurt our economy. I have heard time and time again, through testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee, through town meetings, constituent calls and letters, they are tired of paying \$50, \$60 every time they fill up the tank with gas. They are tired of paying their hard-earned money for rising gas prices because this Congress has failed to pass energy policies that rein in the bureaucrats and regulators.

We have an opportunity with H.R. 2021 to create jobs, to create opportunities for energy security in this country. And I would remind my colleagues that these permits, the rights to explore have already been leased, paid for. I ask that Members support this bill, and I ask for a "yes" vote.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Madam Chair, I want to, first of all, say that this bill will not create jobs. This bill is not meant to create jobs. If the drilling is to create jobs, those jobs would be created regardless of whether this bill passes or not.

This bill's supporters also claim that it will lower gasoline prices, that it will reduce the budget deficit, and that it will cut unemployment. Well, they might as well have said that it would cure the common cold as well.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem.

This bill was written by Shell, for Shell, to address its frustrations with the permitting process in Alaska, a frustration that it was responsible for, Shell, itself. Ironically, the EPA has said on many occasions that it is working overtime to finalize Shell's permits by the end of this summer.

This bill won't get a drop of oil to American markets for American consumers one millisecond faster.

□ 1540

Shell told the Energy and Commerce Committee they won't be able to produce oil from its Arctic operations for at least 10 years, at least another decade. Even if this bill increased the rate of offshore production, new drilling is unlikely to affect world oil prices.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. RUSH. In 2009 the Energy Information Administration looked at the difference between allowing full offshore drilling and restricting offshore drilling. The EIA found that there would be no impact on gasoline prices from full drilling in 2020, and only a slight impact by 2030, with gas prices falling by a mere 3 cents a gallon.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011. If you want to talk about a jobs bill, you want to talk about a bill that will actually allow us to decrease our dependence on Middle Eastern oil, this is it.

Now, some of my colleagues on the other side say, oh, it's going to take 10 years to get that oil. The reason it's going to take 10 years is because for the last 4 years they've been trying to get their permit to go and drill where there's known oil, known reserves and the EPA's been combining with these radical environmentalist groups to block them. And so what they're saying is, those people don't want the energy in America. They want to go to places like Brazil, they want to go to Egypt, they want to go to some of these other Middle Eastern countries, many of whom don't like us, and get the oil there. But when we find known reserves in America, they are using our own Federal regulators to block American energy.

So what we're saying is, let's pass the piece of legislation that's here on the floor now that's going to allow us to utilize our own American energy. This one find alone up in Beaufort and Chukchi Sea in Alaska, this one known reserve right here that we have the ability to put online is going to bring in a million barrels of oil a day. That's American energy. That's not oil that's going to be imported on tankers where 70 percent of your spills occur from Middle Eastern countries, where the billions of dollars we're sending them are going to countries who don't like us. That's American jobs, over 50,000 jobs that can be created by getting these bureaucratic hurdles out of the way.

They've got to follow all the rules. They've got to play by the rules, but you can't keep using these bureaucratic agencies combining up with radical environmentalist groups who don't want any American energy to be used to block production of American energy. That's what this bill does. It creates American jobs. It allows us to say, okay, a million barrels a day we no longer have to import from Middle Eastern countries.

So anybody that pays lip service and says they want to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, if they oppose this bill, then they're supporting foreign oil because this bill says a million less barrels of oil we have to bring in from

these other countries because we have got it in America.

We want to bring in our own oil. We want to create American jobs, and we want to lower the price of gasoline at the pump. This is how you do it. This is how you put more oil through that Alaskan pipeline, which is getting ready to dry up because they won't let them explore for energy in America. Let's explore for energy and create jobs.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I just want to take issue with the statements that have been made over and over again that this drilling in Alaska by Shell Oil will relieve our dependence on foreign oil.

Let's look at the facts. This country consumes 25 percent of the world's oil. All the oil reserves in the United States amount to 2 percent. We are not going to reduce our dependence on foreign oil by producing more oil. We don't have enough oil to produce to satisfy our demand.

Now, that doesn't mean we shouldn't produce more domestic oil. And I want us to produce more domestic oil.

The gentleman from Louisiana said let's play by the rules and not let these radical environmentalist groups stop the permit. Well, I don't even know what he's talking about, and he may not know what he's talking about when he talks about radical environmental groups. There's no radical or other environmental groups that are opposing this drilling in Alaska. The people who are seeking the permit have put it in and pulled it back, and they've spent this additional time keeping EPA from acting on their permit.

Now, there's been talk about this Environmental Appeals Board, that it's not in the Clean Air Act. Well, the Clean Air Act provides that administrator shall set up an energy board to review the environmental issues.

Play by the rules? The Republicans want to repeal the rules. They don't want this appeals board, which has been in creation since President George H.W. Bush, which has worked well. They don't want them to review the application. They want to change the rules.

Now, let me tell you what it does in California. And my colleagues from California, Democratic and Republican, you don't know what your districts are going to be yet, so pay attention because our State is going to be hurt.

According to the State of California, which opposes this bill, in addition to increasing pollution, this legislation preempts local control and review. The bill short-circuits California's existing effective delegated permitting process, greatly increasing the likelihood of litigation, and removes all proceedings to Washington, D.C., imposing a substantial burden on the State and local governments and effectively disenfranchising local stakeholders.

Now, we hear so much from the Republican side of the aisle: Why should we have Washington make the decisions? Instead, what they're trying to

do is keep California from making its own decisions.

Well, what does California have to do with drilling off the coast of Alaska? Nothing, except in this bill they drafted it in a way that prevents California and Delaware and Virginia and other States from taking charge of what is known within their purview.

Let's let Shell get a permit under the regular procedures. If they need some help in clarifying ambiguity, we're glad to work on it.

But Republicans want to repeal the laws that protect the public interest and environmental protection just to give Shell a special break. It's not going to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. We won't even see that oil for another decade. It's a giveaway to Shell Oil, and they're using this as an excuse to repeal protections for other areas to control their own pollution sources.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It is a power grab, and the bureaucrats, the radical bureaucrats on the Republican side have come up with this bill; and they're trying to impose it on the whole country to help the oil companies.

I don't think that it's worthy of our support, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The gentleman, in his statement, noted that we consume 25 percent of the world's oil, but we possess only 2 percent of the world's reserves. And that's precisely why we're trying to pass this bill, because oil resources can only be counted as proven reserves if they've been fully explored, and we have not had the opportunity to fully explore.

And so why should we continue to be dependent on foreign oil when we have not been able to even explore because we have a bureaucratic agency at EPA, the purpose of which is to deny the opportunity to fully explore?

This is modest legislation. It simply clarifies that if you have a ship, that ship is going to be treated as a mobile source. If you have a drilling platform, that's going to be treated as a stationary source.

If you're drilling, we're going to look at the ambient air quality impact onshore, not offshore. And then we're just going to ask the EPA to eliminate the Environmental Appeals Board for exploratory permits only, nothing else, and to make a decision within 6 months after the completed application is there.

□ 1550

I think that this graph adequately demonstrates what our problem is here in America. This is the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. In 1985 we were moving 2.1 million barrels a day through that pipeline. Today, we're down below 600,000 barrels a day. So if we have the

reserves, the American people are simply asking us to restore some balance in these Federal agencies. We want to protect the environment, but we also want an opportunity to explore and use our own oil resources, and we have reason to believe that they are abundant.

I want to thank Mr. GARDNER for his leadership on this issue. And I would urge everyone in this body, just like we had five Democrats in committee who voted for this bill, I think it's imperative for the American people that we do so, and I would urge that we adopt H.R. 2021.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2021, which undercuts Clean Air Act standards and would allow large oil companies to circumvent air pollution regulations. I strongly believe that America needs to ensure our energy security and reduce our dependence on imported oil, but this bill is not the way to accomplish this goal. I support safe and responsible resource extraction and further developing our renewable energy capacity. But energy independence will not be secured by curtailing the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Clean Air Act to protect the nation's air quality standards.

H.R. 2021 would severely limit the EPA's authority to protect human health and the environment. It would allow companies to waive permit reviews by the Environmental Review Board and would exempt them from requirements to use pollution control technologies, despite the ready availability of these technologies. Removing these controls would allow damaging pollutants to be released into the air, including nitrogen dioxide, particles, and sulfur dioxide, which would have significant health, environment, and climate impacts. The regulations to prevent this pollution are reasonable, commonsense provisions, yet this bill would undercut them, allowing widespread damage to human health and the environment for benefit of few wealthy companies. The health and environmental damage would be seen on all coasts where drilling takes place.

According to some estimates, Shell's proposed 2010 drilling plan for the Arctic alone would have released as much particulate matter as 825,000 additional cars on the roads, traveling 12,000 miles each. This is only a single company's plan for a single drilling location; the full ramifications of this bill across all companies and all regions would be immense and disastrous.

H.R. 2021 would also increase Federal court litigation, taking authority from local courts and giving it to the D.C. Court of Appeals. This replaces an established, inexpensive process for citizen challenges to government actions with a longer, more expensive review process by a court that may not be familiar with the local coastal and air quality conditions.

In the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster, Federal policy should be more diligent than ever in pursuing safeguards and regulations that make sure that such costly, destructive events are made less frequent, rather than commonplace. Stripping out the environmental protections that we already have is irresponsible and it puts not only the Oregon coast, but communities from Alaska to California and from Maine to Florida at unnecessary risk. H.R. 2021 does nothing to secure a

clean, safe path toward energy security. I oppose this legislation.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act. The duplicitous nature of the title itself should be sufficient reason to oppose it. This bill should actually be called the Shell Oil Exemption Act, because that is the intent and the effect of this legislation. Operating on the myth that the State and Federal Clean Air Act permits are blocking oil industry efforts to drill offshore, the legislation would grant them generous exemptions at the expense of the public's health and at needless harm to the environment.

Shell, the world's second largest oil company, can't seem to get its act together. Rather than admit to its feckless effort to drill offshore in Alaska and invest in pollution control technology, it has invested in the political process to buy some regulatory relief. I guess it's cheaper. But claims it makes that its Clean Air Act permits have taken five years is simply false.

EPA Assistant Administrator Gina McCarthy affirmed that and I quote, "every time Shell has applied for a permit, a permit has been issued by the agency within 3 to 6 months of that permit application being complete." She also noted that Shell "has consistently revised the request, changed the project, changed what sea they want to drill in." Shell also pulled its application to drill in the Beaufort Sea for two years and submitted an incomplete application.

There is no rational reason why Shell or any other oil company should be able to exempt their offshore operations from the Clean Air Act. Operations in the Gulf of Mexico aren't exempt.

This proposal also affects the environment in areas other than Alaska including my home state of Virginia and other areas where future drilling may occur like California, and Florida that unlike Alaska face more serious challenges of bringing their non-attainment areas into compliance with the Clean Air Act.

It's my understanding that exploration drilling can result in the release of as much particulate as 825,000 carts traveling 12,000 miles; as much CO<sub>2</sub> as the annual household emissions of 21,000 people; more than 1000 tons of NO<sub>2</sub>, a pollutant associated with respiratory illness; and more than 57 tons of particulate matter (PM)<sub>2.5</sub>, a pollutant linked to respiratory illness and climate change.

Exempting offshore drilling would mean that other, land-based businesses would be subject to additional reductions to offset the pollution generated offshore.

Madam Chair, this bill is bad news for the public's health, the environment and for businesses.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2021

*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 "Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011".



**SEC. 2. AIR QUALITY MEASUREMENT.**

Section 328(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7627(a)(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: “, except that any air quality impact of any OCS source shall be measured or modeled, as appropriate, and determined solely with respect to the impacts in the corresponding onshore area”.

**SEC. 3. OCS SOURCE.**

Section 328(a)(4)(C) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7627(a)(4)(C)) is amended in the matter following clause (iii) by striking “shall be considered direct emissions from the OCS source” and inserting “shall be considered direct emissions from the OCS source but shall not be subject to any emission control requirement applicable to the source under subpart 1 of part C of title I of this Act. For platform or drill ship exploration, an OCS source is established at the point in time when drilling commences at a location and ceases to exist when drilling activity ends at such location or is temporarily interrupted because the platform or drill ship relocates for weather or other reasons.”.

**SEC. 4. PERMITS.**

(a) **PERMITS.**—Section 328 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7627) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“(d) **PERMIT APPLICATION.**—In the case of a completed application for a permit under this Act for platform or drill ship exploration for an OCS source—

“(1) final agency action (including any reconsideration of the issuance or denial of such permit) shall be taken not later than 6 months after the date of filing such completed application;

“(2) the Environmental Appeals Board of the Environmental Protection Agency shall have no authority to consider any matter regarding the consideration, issuance, or denial of such permit;

“(3) no administrative stay of the effectiveness of such permit may extend beyond the date that is 6 months after the date of filing such completed application;

“(4) such final agency action shall be considered to be nationally applicable under section 307(b); and

“(5) judicial review of such final agency action shall be available only in accordance with such section 307(b) without additional administrative review or adjudication.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 328(a)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7627(a)(4)) is amended by striking “For purposes of subsections (a) and (b)” and inserting “For purposes of subsections (a), (b), and (d)”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in part A of House Report 112–111. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER**

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 112–111.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 2 (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment which strikes section 2 of the bill.

Section 2 of this bill would amend the Clean Air Act to force emissions from any offshore source to be measured only at the corresponding onshore location. Yes, you heard me correctly, the bill demonstrates willful ignorance of the fact that pollution is also harmful over water, not just on land. This dirty air loophole is so big you can float a Deepwater Horizon-sized oil rig through it.

I know our philosophies differ here, but the fact is that even if we produced every drop of recoverable oil offshore today, it would only last us for 3 years at our current consumption rate. Then we would be right back where we started from without having reduced our demand on oil, except we would be about billions of dollars poorer after subsidizing the oil companies to turn the rest of offshore USA into the Gulf of Mexico. That does not sound like a deficit-cutting, jobs-creating proposal to me.

H.R. 2021 purports to simply reduce the amount of time it takes to get a permit to drill, but it also gives Big Oil a free pass on having to properly account for the toxic pollution it releases on the Outer Continental Shelf. It moves the geographic point where emissions are measured from offshore, near the drilling location, to an onshore point many miles away.

This change would clearly weaken public health protection for oil workers—are we interested in them?—fishermen—are we interested in them?—recreational boaters, not to mention all those who do business or make a living in our coastal communities. Apparently, it's the old out-of-sight, out-of-mind approach; what you can't see won't hurt you. After the BP oil spill just last year, such an approach should be dismissed as reckless.

One year ago today, oil was gushing into the gulf and toxic emissions were streaming into the air. But if this bill passes, the same level of Clean Air Act protections that gulf oil workers, fishermen, and coastal residents relied on to fight BP for damages would no longer apply in the gulf or anywhere else.

Let's be clear. In this bill, the rules don't apply to Shell. Shell wants to drill in the Arctic Ocean off Alaska without monitoring at the source. I get it. We all get it. But that isn't prudent; that isn't fair; that isn't safe.

Here are the facts this bill would cover up:

Shell's plans to drill for oil in the Arctic would dump as much particulate matter into the air as over 825,000 cars

traveling 12,000 miles; as much CO<sub>2</sub> as the annual household emissions of 21,000 people; and more than 1,000 times of NO<sub>2</sub>, a noxious pollutant that causes respiratory illness. This is according to Shell's own permit applications. The pollution may be emitted from rigs or vessels far offshore, but the effects are felt miles away by native populations with vibrant fishing communities by the coast.

If Shell Oil or any other company wants to do business on the Outer Continental Shelf, they need to demonstrate that they can meet standards set forth in the Clean Air Act. I mean, that's just fundamental. Instead, they have succeeded in getting Republicans here in Congress to waste taxpayers' time by pushing bills granting them exemptions from the rules at the expense of public health and the environment. In fact, by creating this loophole, H.R. 2021 would actually further complicate the permitting process and increase expenses for all parties involved.

The California Air Resources Board, which oversees oil and gas permitting in my State, testified on this very point in committee. This bill, they said, will require more time and expense to properly model onshore emission impacts. Districts may incur added cost and delay to deploy an adequate onshore monitoring network and obtain data sufficient to establish a baseline—costs that will be passed on to the permit applicants.

As a “jobs and energy permitting” measure, therefore, this bill would fail on both counts while doing real harm to air quality in California and many of the 20 other coastal States. It will certainly achieve the goal of increasing oil company profits at the cost of everyone else.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and oppose this dirty air loophole.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I would like to quote from Lisa Jackson, who was talking explicitly about the permitting issue here. She said: I believe that the analysis clearly shows that there is no public health concern here. And that's why EPA, on three separate occasions, approved this air quality permit, but on the appeal process it was denied by the Environmental Appeals Board.

Now, if you look at the legislative history of the Clean Air Act, it is very clear in that legislative history that, as it pertains to Outer Continental Shelf sources, they were concerned about the impact onshore and the ability of onshore to attain and maintain their Clean Air National Ambient Air Quality standard requirements.

And so all this legislation does is to clarify that point. We're not changing

the ambient air quality standards. We're not changing the way they monitor stationary sources. We're not changing the way they monitor mobile sources. We're simply clarifying that that was the legislative history, that was the intent, and the full range of environmental protections are still in place.

So I believe that this amendment is not necessary. We already have adequate monitoring in place.

Madam Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield the balance of my time, in opposition, to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

The issue that we are discussing here was actually brought up in debate at the time of the conference committee, this very language, the very title that we are discussing. I will read some language from the conference committee report.

Of primary concern is the fact that OCS air pollution is causing or contributing to the violation of Federal and State ambient air quality standards in some coastal regions.

□ 1600

We are dealing with onshore. The debate is on onshore. The debate at the time was over onshore regulations, on coastal regulations.

In addition, the testimony before the House Energy and Commerce Committee focused on this language in the regulations dealing with the rational relationship to the attainment and maintenance of Federal and State ambient air quality standards and the requirements of the PSD program, and that the rule is not used for the purpose of preventing exploration and development of the OCS, going directly—directly—to the interpretation that the focus on OCS requirements, as the regulations themselves state, is onshore, that the onshore air quality represents a rational relationship between OCS sources and obtaining and maintaining air quality standards.

California, this was the language, this was the conversation. The debate took place during the very conference committee about coastal regions, about onshore regulations.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentle-

woman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike "but shall not be subject" and insert "and shall be subject".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, in the past I have made the statement regarding offshore drilling as a native Floridian that I will be the last person standing opposed. But it would seem to me there is ever-mounting evidence that Republicans are willing to expand offshore drilling regardless of cost to the environment.

This particular iteration of what I describe as a near-criminal energy policy takes the form of a sellout of hard-working Americans' right to breathe clean air. In particular, this bill excludes Shell Oil's icebreaker ships in the Arctic from regulation under the Clean Air Act.

Shell has and will continue to argue that since its icebreakers are regulated under title II of the Clean Air Act, the vessels don't also need to be regulated under title I. Yet the fact is that Shell's ships would not be regulated under title II due to the fact that they are foreign-flagged and predate the effective date of the regulations.

Shell is asking Congress, and Republicans are obliging, to create a legal loophole so that Shell, their company, can pollute with impunity and not be bothered by complying with environmental regulations designed to minimize our desecration of the Earth.

This loophole would create a dream scenario for Shell and the rest of the oil industry, currently taking in record profits as gas prices soar for the average American family. For its 2010 drilling operations, it was not the amount of emissions from the drill ship itself that triggered the application of the Clean Air Act regulations to Shell's operations, but the emissions from Shell's icebreakers.

The exploration drilling proposed by Shell, as has been noted, would release particulate matter well in excess of 800,000 cars traveling 12,000 miles. These kinds of support vessels are responsible for up to 98 percent of the air pollution from drilling outfits, and Republicans are asking Congress to close our eyes to this matter.

My amendment would bring the oil companies' dreamworld crashing down around them. My amendment eliminates the loophole created in this bill,

giving EPA the authority to regulate the support vessels and the emission sources that they are.

I was in the Rules Committee. I heard this argument about 5 years and Shell, and I also heard my colleague Mr. RUSH clearly explain that Shell filled out applications that were not fully filled out, and then when they were sent back at some point they even pulled their application before sending it back incomplete. Now, you can't have it both ways.

But, more important, I would ask every speaker that speaks in favor of this measure, tell the American public today how much this is going to reduce the cost of gasoline today, tomorrow, or next week, or next year.

The fact is, Hilda Solis, the Labor Secretary, did something today about the next iteration of jobs. She announced grants for different segments of this country in the amount of \$38 million in grants for the Green Jobs Innovation Fund program. That is where our head needs to be. Our heart may still be in the need to use fossil fuels, but this measure isn't going to make one whit of a difference with reference to the cost of gas.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CULBERSON). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I rise in opposition to the amendment, which mixes two basic concepts of stationary title I issues and mobile title II sources. What we are talking about here is something akin to requiring the employee of a factory to overhaul his engine simply because he parks next to the factory. It is requiring a re-engining of service vessels simply because they happen to be in the area of a stationary source.

So basically what we are talking about in the bill is saying that once a drilling ship starts to drill, that is when it becomes stationary. To require the vessels that service that drill ship, to require them to be stationary would be like requiring the UPS truck to fall under the same regulations as the factory that it is delivering to, or treating an emissions testing facility like it has wheels and ought to be moving around to everybody else because it is testing the emissions of a stationary source. So I rise to oppose this amendment, again, because of issues it is trying to deal with, mixing stationary and mobile sources.

The issue of foreign-flagged ships is dealt with in international law under our treaties that we have in this country. It is dealt with in the MARPOL Treaty. If we want to increase those regulations on U.S. vessels, Congress can do that. However, to increase regulations on service vessels only because they were hired to service an OCS vehicle makes no sense.

It was said in debate earlier too, I believe it was said we are not going to reduce our dependence on foreign oil by

producing more oil. I guess that argument means the same thing as we are not going to have more food by producing more food; we are not going to have more appliances in this country by producing more appliances. The arguments we have heard against this bill are off point, off subject, and are simply on claims that don't make any sense.

So when it comes to this particular amendment, delivery trucks aren't regulated as stationary sources, nor should the service vessels to a stationary source, the drilling ship, as will be considered once this legislation becomes law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time and ask for a record vote.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Mr. WELCH. 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 4, after line 9, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

“(1) such completed application shall include data on oil subsidies provided by the Federal Government to the applicant;

□ 1610

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, oil companies, of course, benefit from significant subsidies. This amendment would require that applicant oil companies for permits to drill would disclose as part of their application the taxpayer-provided subsidies that they enjoy. They would make that specific as to the leases for which they're seeking permission to drill.

Now, we've had a long debate, Mr. Chairman, in this body about the wisdom of subsidies to oil companies and we have a strong contingent in this body that favors those subsidies, making arguments that it's good for the economy, good for producing energy, and beneficial to the taxpayer. We have many in this body, myself among

them, who believe that these subsidies are too rich and they're unnecessary.

When oil company profits are a trillion dollars in the past year, when the price of oil has been hovering between \$95 and \$113 a barrel, when the companies have enjoyed record profits this year, the question arises by me and by many as to whether or not it makes sense to ask the taxpayers to reach into their pockets and to provide subsidies to a mature industry—an important industry, but a mature industry and a very profitable industry with a very high-priced product where they can generate and are succeeding in generating significant profits for that industry.

This is not about whether they're doing good or they're doing bad—we have oil companies that are doing their job—but it is about whether taxpayers should be, at the very minimum, made explicitly aware as to how much it is they're being asked to subsidize oil companies when they seek these leases.

One of the challenges we have that has been a major point by the new majority is that we have a budget deficit and we've got to control spending. Spending is both on the direct appropriations side and what's called here the tax expenditure side. I think our constituents would know that as tax breaks. Why not take every action we can when it comes to spending and it comes to tax breaks to mobilize the awareness of the American people so they know what it is we're spending their money on, whether it's for a spending program or a tax break subsidy.

So this is about disclosure. It's about unleashing the power of knowledge, making it available to the American people so they can tell their representatives, You know what? We think that subsidy is a pretty good idea, or, You know what? We don't have to continue to be shelling out money for that subsidy. We want to go in a new direction.

So, Mr. Chairman, my amendment is about empowering the democratic objectives of this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. POMPEO. I rise in opposition to the Welch amendment and in strong support of H.R. 2021, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act, a piece of legislation that would create jobs in America and American energy for American consumers.

The Welch amendment requires a company applying for a permit to provide data on “oil subsidies provided by the Federal Government.” Mr. Chairman, this is an absolute red herring. There's no definition of “oil subsidy.” That's intentional. The gentleman who proffered this amendment is an attorney. He ought to know better. I don't know what oil subsidies to which he's referring.

Section 199, manufacturing deduction, which goes to all businesses whether they produce oil or otherwise, so long as they're engaged in manufacturing. Maybe he's referring to the writing off of intangible drilling costs and claiming tax credits for employing American workers. If those qualify as American Government giveaways, that should absolutely be something that I would think that he would support. These folks are paying royalty taxes and giving great revenue to the United States Treasury.

This piece of legislation, without this amendment, will create many jobs and revenue for the United States Treasury.

What Mr. WELCH is really interested in, Mr. Chairman, what this amendment really does is it attempts to punish oil companies for producing American energy and American jobs. This piece of legislation, H.R. 2021, will do just that, and this amendment attempts to stop it.

If there were subsidies that applied only to the oil industry or specifically benefited folks who purchased traditional oil and petroleum, I'd be the first to rise and say, You're right; that's a subsidy. We ought to get rid of it. But that's not what this amendment attempts to do. Rather, this amendment attempts to stop a piece of legislation that will create energy; will lower the price of gasoline for American consumers; will, again, add jobs all over our country; and, once again, provide American energy so that American consumers may benefit.

I'd like to urge all of my colleagues to oppose the Welch amendment and support the underlying Jobs and Energy Permitting Act.

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

Mr. WELCH. I would just say this to my colleague: You and I disagree, obviously, on the subsidies. We don't disagree that the oil industry does provide good jobs to a lot of American families and a product that we need to keep our economy going. But there's a reasonable basis for disagreement about whether a particular subsidy has outlived its useful life. It is real money out of the pocket of the taxpayer.

While the suggestion is made that it would be tough to figure out what the subsidies are, these companies that enjoy these subsidies have accountants who scour the Tax Code to make certain that every legally available subsidy is one that they, in fact, do take. They actually owe that due diligence and that effort to their shareholders to make certain that they get maximum value for the shareholders, and that includes paying not a nickel more in taxes than they're legally required to pay by the rules that this House of Representatives sets.

So this is not about whether you're for or against the tax subsidies as they exist—we disagree on that—but it is about saying to the American taxpayer, when the company is filling out

this application, after they've done their tax filings, which they do every year, they can specify what the benefit is they are getting courtesy of the United States taxpayer. That's really what this is about.

What is the problem with letting people know how their money is being spent?

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. 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 Vermont will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Mr. KEATING. 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 4, after line 9, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

“(1) such completed application shall include data on bonuses provided to the executives of the applicant from the most recent quarter;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

I rise to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 2021.

As constituents see soaring gas prices, soaring oil prices, oil companies have revealed record profits. The top five multinational oil companies earned over a trillion dollars in the past decade. In my district, where jobs and commerce depends on a coastal marine and tourism economy, I have constituents that are paying up to \$4.50 a gallon. These oil firms, these conglomerates, are eating up more and more of our constituents' paychecks.

And where is it going? Only a small portion—some estimate as little as 7 percent—are reinvested back into the economy to pay for efficiencies and research into alternatives to oil. Rather, oil companies are providing bumps for stockholders and high bonuses to their company executives—a pat on the back for high prices at the pump. Remember that up to 90 percent of the tax subsidy money given to executives and companies by the taxpayers went to buybacks for preferred stock purchases.

My amendment would provide transparency to the U.S. taxpayer.

□ 1620

The amendment requires that all completed permit applications include data on executive bonuses distributed by the applicant company in the most recent quarter.

In May I offered a similar amendment to H.R. 1231, which would have required the Secretary to make available to the public data on executive bonuses for any company that is given a drilling lease, and it received at that time 186 votes. We have an opportunity now to successfully pass this amendment, and the time is now to hold the largest oil companies accountable. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment in order to provide transparency to the American taxpayer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, once again, we are faced with the question of whether we want to focus on the issues that this bill is intending to address—the issue of job creation, the issue of energy security—and whether or not we are going to take advantage of the resources that we have in our own backyard, which is American energy for the American people.

This amendment presents, once again, one more distraction from the very purpose of this bill. It is a distraction for our colleagues. I understand that they want to oppose this bill, but I believe they ought to oppose the bill on its merits. If they want to oppose the bill, vote “no” on the bill. If they want to offer constructive amendments, then introduce amendments to try to improve the bill, but presenting red herring amendments in amendment after amendment ought to be defeated.

Aside from the distraction that this amendment creates, there is no real need for this amendment from a practical perspective. If an interested person wants to know the amounts of bonuses paid to an oil company executive, the information is available. As it is a publicly owned company, it's already available. I don't believe we require bonus disclosure when environmental groups apply for grants. When a staffer helps out on a particular piece of legislation when we introduce the bill, I don't believe that we have disclosure on a bonus to a staffer. Again, this is a red herring on a bill that focuses on jobs and job creation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KEATING. I think the point is that environmental groups, marine jobs groups and groups that depend on tourism in my district don't have shareholders. They aren't the beneficiaries of this. The purpose of this amendment is to find out who really benefits.

If you represent a district like mine, there is a great risk in this—a risk in jobs, a risk in commerce, a risk that is irreparable, a risk that is one that should be taken very seriously. If one is taking that very seriously, one has to look at who, indeed, is benefiting by this. It's clear, given some of the other alternatives that are there right now, that the people at the pump are not benefiting by this. The people in my district who are depending on jobs that could be risked as a result of failures from this drilling have a great deal to risk. It is not a red herring. In fact, if you're going to apply any kind of fish analogies, another important industry in my area, the fishing industry, is one that is assuming this risk as well. Now, all of these risks are there. Who is benefiting by this risk?

The purpose of this amendment is to tell the public who, indeed, benefits by it. It is the executives who are getting these large bonuses, because this is about profits, and the profits go to those executives. They aren't there to help reduce costs for the people at the pump, and they certainly aren't there to help the people in my district who are bearing all the risk of this type of drilling.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Who benefits from this bill? The American people benefit from this bill.

In testimony before the House Energy and Commerce Committee, it was made very clear that the west coast could import less oil because of the development of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. Testimony was received before the House Energy and Commerce Committee that this could reduce the price of gasoline when we create more supplies, particularly for areas along the west coast, because of the presence of the Beaufort and Chukchi Sea reserve. So the American people are the beneficiaries of increased American production.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Mr. RUSH. 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 4, line 13, insert before the semicolon “, except that the Administrator may provide additional 30-day extensions if the Administrator determines that such time is

necessary to meet the requirements of this section, to provide adequate time for public participation, or to ensure sufficient involvement by one or more affected States”.

Page 4, beginning at line 18, strike paragraph (3) and insert the following:

“(3) no administrative stay of the effectiveness of such permit may extend beyond the deadline for final agency action under paragraph (1);

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today would strengthen this bill by ensuring that we maintain an opportunity for State and community input even as we seek to streamline the permitting process, as this bill attempts to do.

My amendment would simply allow the EPA administrator to provide additional 30-day extensions if the administrator determines that such time is necessary to provide adequate time for public participation and sufficient involvement by affected States. Mr. Chairman, input by those most affected by drilling is a vital and necessary part of the permitting process.

There was a time not too long ago when my Republican colleagues valued local participation and States’ rights; and now that they are in the majority, they are attempting to strip away the power of States and the power of local communities to even participate in the decisions that will affect them the most.

As Representative of the people, I do not believe that it makes sense for us to legislate away the ability of our citizens to comment on drilling decisions that will impact their health, impact their livelihoods, impact their well-being. I also don’t think that our constituents will buy into the argument put forth by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we must make it easier for all companies to drill and also take away the public’s ability to comment, even while they say this is for the public’s own benefit. It’s ludicrous.

This bill’s supporters have said that this is a narrow bill designed to address problems Shell Oil Company has faced in obtaining a Clean Air Act permit for exploratory drilling off the coast of Alaska; but in fact, this legislation will impact every State on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. The States of California and Delaware testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that they have grave concerns about the impact of this bill on their ability to protect public health and welfare from air pollution.

I truly believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is imperative that the States and the local communities that will be most affected participate in the process of awarding permits, and this amendment would ensure that adequate time is

given for that purpose. I don’t believe that we should ever sacrifice the interests of the American public in order to expedite the interests of oil companies, so I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in supporting my amendment.

□ 1630

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I’ve had the opportunity to serve many years with the gentleman from Illinois, who’s the ranking member of this subcommittee, and have a great deal of respect and admiration for him. But I would point out to him that this legislation does not in any way curtail, stop, impose the opportunity for anyone to express opposition or comment about a permit. We do not in any way change the comment period that EPA has to determine if they’re going to issue, in this case, an exploratory permit.

We do not in any way change the National Environmental Policy Act that provides four additional opportunities for communities, local, State, individuals, environmental groups to comment on an exploration permit. There are today five opportunities for people to comment about air permits. After this bill is passed, there will still be five opportunities for entities to comment.

Today, individuals and entities can file a lawsuit against the EPA and their actions. After this bill is passed, they can still file a lawsuit.

This amendment basically gives the EPA Administrator the opportunity to grant 30-day extensions on final agency action as the Administrator deems it necessary; but it’s not limited to one 30-day period, two 30-day periods or three 30-day periods. In fact, it could go on ad infinitum, and that’s the whole reason we have the bill here today, because I don’t care what company it is out there trying to explore to determine if the oil is there, if you cannot even get an administrative decision, as in the case in point it has taken 4 or 5 years and there’s still no decision, you can never get to the court system.

So this bill is a commonsense bill that provides some balance, some checkpoints at EPA so that we have the maximum opportunity to explore, to determine how much oil we have off the coast of Alaska. And I might say, in the hearings Alaska government authorities came up and pleaded for us to do something to help get a decision from EPA.

So I would oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RUSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let us not be bamboozled by this argument that my friend on the other side is trying to perpetuate on the American people. There is one problem with this bill—well, there are actually two problems with this bill.

One problem is that it gives the EPA and State permitting authorities just 6 months, 6 lousy months, to finalize an air permit for offshore exploratory drilling, which is not enough time to perform an adequate technical review while allowing for adequate public participation.

Number two, it preempts State authority. It preempts the right of the State of California, the State of Delaware, and other States with designated authority to impose more stringent emission controls on vessels servicing an offshore drilling operation.

Mr. Chair, this amendment attempts to cure a very serious problem with this bill.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield myself 2 minutes.

To close this debate, I would simply say that we think 6 months is totally adequate to make some decisions about air quality permits for exploratory purposes only, and I would remind everyone here that EPA had a 60-day comment period for its utility MACT regulation that was a 1,000-page regulation imposed by EPA’s own estimate of \$10 billion on the American people and increased electricity costs, if it goes into effect, by 4 or 5 percent, and they did that in 60 days.

Certainly, the 6 months that we give in this bill for an air quality permit for drilling purposes alone is adequate, and I would respectfully request that we oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. RUSH. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 4, beginning on line 14, strike paragraph (2) and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2021, a bill that curtails the EPA's authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate pollution from offshore oil drilling and to limit the public's participation in decisions that directly affect our health.

My amendment strikes the text which strips the ability of the Environmental Appeals Board to remand or deny the issuance of clean air permits for offshore energy exploration and extraction. Quite simply, this amendment allows the EAB to operate as it does today, saving taxpayer dollars and keeping unnecessary litigation out of the courts and in a place where unbiased and apolitical judges can make sound decisions with input from local constituencies who are most affected.

It's worth noting that the EAB was established under George H.W. Bush, created in recognition of increasing levels of appeals from permit decisions and civil penalty decisions. Further, three of the four sitting judges were appointed by Republican administrations. The judges who sit on the EAB are not political appointees. They are critical EPA officials whose terms do not end at the end of an administration.

The board takes approximately 5 months on the average from the time a petition is filed to receive and review briefs, hold oral arguments, and render a comprehensive written decision in a prevention of significant deterioration air permit case. Federal court review would likely take at least three or four times as long. Only four of the board's 100-plus air permit decisions have ever been appealed to a Federal court, and none of the board's air permit decisions have ever been overturned.

The EAB is cost-effective and efficient and has proven to be the fastest, cheapest way to achieve a final permit. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment to allow the EAB to continue to serve to protect the public health, to keep unnecessary lawsuits from the court system, and to take into account local community input.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So my colleagues can understand what this bill is about, this does not repeal the ability of the Environmental Appeals Board to hear issues relating to production, production permits. This simply addresses the issue at hand of whether or not the Environmental Appeals Board can be used as a stalling period for exploratory permits.

□ 1640

Let me say it again. Exploratory permits are for a very limited duration. We're talking an activity that may last 30 to 45 days.

Unfortunately, what has happened, the EAB, which is by all accounts litigation with judges in robes in Washington, D.C., that are appointed lifetime bureaucrats, unaccountable, created by the administration, the EAB would still be able to hear appeals related to production. They will not be a part or allowed to delay exploratory permits. Why? Because we believe exploration of our resources is important, that it should not be delayed for 5 years.

In the time that it has taken to reach this point, 400 wells have been drilled by the lessee around the world. That's job creation, but certainly not in the United States. That's energy production, but certainly not in the United States. This bill presents a solution, an up-or-down, yes-or-no answer to a permit within 6 months, without going to the EAB for a ping-pong delay back and forth, EPA, EAB, delay after delay, and says we are going to focus on an issue of national importance, developing our resources, getting exploration performed, so that we can indeed make sure that we are heading down the path toward energy security.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the numbers speak for themselves. What we're talking about with this legislation is really just two permits that folks were concerned about. The reality of the matter is the average is 5 months.

Now, I understand what we're talking about is with just exploration, but we would like to get this right and not have amnesia about what happens when we get this wrong, because that's not just job-killing, it's ecosystem-killing. It destroys an entire region. There's a lot at stake here.

These aren't unaccountable people. They're appointed by administrations, created by a Republican administration, three of the four appointed by Republican administrations. It is in fact, in a sense, the executive branch. And while the executive can't do all this, it's delegated to appropriate authorities to make sound, apolitical decisions that affect communities not just for months or years but conceivably for generations. There's a lot at stake.

This is a simple amendment to deal with a critical problem, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm getting confused by some of the arguments I'm hearing against this bill, because I hear that 6 months isn't enough time even though the average permitting time is 5 months, some will say. I hear that this is only dealing with two permits, although I hear that California, Delaware, and Massachu-

sets are at risk with this legislation. I hear the argument that some say this is ecosystem-destroying.

Let me read a quote from Lisa Jackson, the administrator of the EPA, testifying before the United States Senate:

"I believe that the analysis will clearly show that there is no public health concern here."

"I believe that the analysis will clearly show that there is no public health concern here."

Gina McCarthy, the assistant administrator of the EPA, did not rebut this testimony that was given by the administrator herself, Lisa Jackson, before the Senate. Gina McCarthy didn't refute it before the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The arguments seem to be confusing and grasping for straws. This is about energy security, about economic opportunity and making sure that we can deliver energy that's produced right here in the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Ms. ESHOO. 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 4, line 21, insert "and" after the semicolon.

Page 4, beginning on line 22, strike paragraph (4) and redesignate the subsequent paragraph accordingly.

Page 5, line 2, strike "such".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This bill, H.R. 2021, contains a rather extraordinary provision. It says that any appeal of an exploration permit decision can only be heard by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. This is a fundamental change to longstanding law and precedent governing the venue for judicial review of challenges to EPA action.

Over 40 years ago when Congress adopted the Clean Air Act in 1970 and established venue for judicial review, Congress made a very sensible distinction. That distinction was that local

and regional EPA actions would be reviewed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit. Nationally applicable actions would be reviewed in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

This distinction has worked well for the past 40 years. If a major new industrial source will have significant local air pollution impacts, nearby communities will want to weigh in. Local businesses will want to ensure that a new source doesn't force more stringent cleanup requirements for existing sources. State and local authorities will have views. And the industrial source itself may disagree with EPA's decision. All of these stakeholders may want to appeal EPA's decision. Under the Clean Air Act, they can do so in the nearest court of appeals, without traveling to Washington, D.C. And for permits issued by States or localities, the decision is reviewed by State courts.

But this bill creates a new regime for exploration permits. In fact, under this bill, even for an exploration permit issued by a State or local permitting agency, all appeals would have to go to the Federal court here in Washington, D.C.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to criticize centralized government; bash Washington, D.C.; Washington, D.C. lawyers. They extol the virtues of local control. They cite the 10th Amendment. But this legislation centralizes control in Washington, D.C. In fact, it's a boon for Washington, D.C. lawyers.

This provision makes it far more difficult for regular folks to appeal a decision that can directly affect them. It took one of our Energy and Commerce Committee witnesses from the North Slope of Alaska 16 hours to travel to Washington, D.C., at a cost of at least \$1,000 for that ticket.

This provision forces State and local authorities to fly to Washington, D.C. to defend a challenged permit decision. That's a huge burden in terms of money, and particularly so in these tough economic times.

The premise of this bill is that the oil industry needs faster permit decisions. Moving review from one Federal circuit court to another does not expedite permit decisions, and the committee that I'm a part of received no testimony identifying any actual problems with review in the relevant circuit courts.

I encourage Members to support this amendment, which would preserve local control, which would preserve community participation and really speaks to some fiscal common sense.

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

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, our friend from California's amendment sort of makes a lot of sense. There are

a couple of issues that I would like to point out about it.

First of all, under her proposal, you would appeal the decision of the EPA at the local district court, wherever the project might be, let's say California. So you go through that appeals process through the U.S. District Court, and then if you don't like that decision, then you have to go to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

□ 1650

Well, today, if our bill did not pass, anyone could appeal a decision of the Environmental Protection Agency to the Environmental Appeals Board, which is located in Washington, D.C. So, today, any appeals to that board have to come to Washington, D.C., and it really is a judicial hearing. There are lawyers. There are judges. There is evidence. And so, today, that's the case.

Our bill simply says that in order to curtail the length of time it takes to receive or to even get a decision for an exploratory permit only, nothing else—we're not changing any other aspect of the EPA or Clean Air Act. We're simply saying, for this one purpose, we want a decision within 6 months, yes or no, so that the administrative decisions are exhausted. And then once the decision is made by the EPA, any party can go to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. They don't even have to go through that extra layer at the Federal court but go right to the district court of appeals here in Washington, D.C.

So this legislation does not in any way change the venue. As I said, if we did nothing, as it is today, if they appeal to the Environmental Appeals Board, they come to Washington, D.C., to have the hearing. So I have been sympathetic to her desire to save people money, not require them to come all the way to Washington, but that's the way the law is today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 8, strike "subsections (a), (b), and (d)" and insert "subsections (a), (b), (d), and (e)".

Page 5, after line 8, add the following new section:

**SEC. 5. STATE AUTHORITY.**

Section 328 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7627) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) STATE AUTHORITY.—Any State with delegated authority to implement and enforce this section may impose any standard, limitation, or requirement relating to emissions of air pollutants from an OCS source if such standard, limitation, or requirement is no less stringent than the standards, limitations, or requirements established by the Administrator pursuant to this section."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I'm offering with Representatives CARNEY and CASTOR addresses one of several concerns we have about this bill: its harmful impact on State programs that today are working to issue permits while protecting local air quality.

Last month, the Energy and Power Subcommittee heard testimony from officials of the States of Delaware and California. Both expressed serious concerns about the impact of this bill on local air quality. The Delaware Department of Natural Resources has this to say about the legislation: "The constraints placed on States' rights and authorities will adversely affect our State's ability to protect public health and welfare from the harmful effects of air pollution." The California Air Resources Board also testified that this measure "could have far-reaching, unintended consequences on public health."

California and its local air districts in some cases require emission controls that go beyond Federal law, and that is to address our unique pollution problems. For example, emissions from commercial harbor craft and ocean-going vessels represent the largest source of smog-forming air pollution in the entire Santa Barbara County. These emissions account for over 40 percent of our local air pollution. In response, the California Air Resources Board adopted rules to help coastal areas like California come into attainment with ozone and particulate matter air quality standards. But H.R. 2021 would nullify some of these State requirements, and it would increase pollution by preventing our local air quality district from incorporating them into their air permits for offshore drilling production and processing.

It's very critical to our local air quality and to public health that emissions from these marine vessels and offshore drilling are subject to commonsense regulations, and that is why this simple amendment is before us today. It says that if a State with delegated authority wants to enact more stringent air quality protections for offshore drilling, it can continue to do so.

Mr. Chairman, this is about giving flexibility to our local air quality districts so that they can apply the technologies that work best for them—they've been doing so for 20 years—so they can continue their work protecting our air quality and the health of our communities. This amendment says that a one-size-fits-all approach that comes from Washington politicians and giant multinational oil companies is the wrong approach.

I urge my colleagues to support this straightforward amendment. It's common sense. It will allow State and local air districts to continue to do their job to protect the air quality of coastal communities like the central coast of California—nothing more, and nothing less.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady from California for being a part of this debate today.

We had, I believe, this amendment or a similar amendment in committee. We discussed this amendment. As I mentioned, we've had two separate committee hearings on this particular piece of legislation. We had a markup where a number of amendments were offered. A tremendous amount of debate took place, and I believe debate took place on this very amendment.

One of the concerns I have with this amendment is the practical impact it would have in what could best be described as a balkanization in the regulation of Federal waters, creating a patchwork quilt, so to speak, of regulations as it applies to the Federal areas in the OCS. The amendment allows States to promulgate any regulation for the OCS as long as it can be deemed no less stringent. This will result in chaotic regulation of Federal waters, many of which may conflict with interstate commerce.

But perhaps even more important is the dramatic expansion of State jurisdiction that this amendment would have. And this was also an issue that was discussed back and forth during our markups both at the subcommittee level and at the full committee level, whether or not this would create challenges for the expansion of State jurisdiction.

The current law only allows for the delegation of the exact authorities of the administrator and not the flexibility to create the State's own laws to implement the act. I think that's one of the distinctions that we have sort of walked over during this debate.

It's also important to recognize that the Federal OCS is different from onshore State borders, where the States do have this type of flexibility in setting their State implementation plans. We talked in committee, once again, about the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

They were enacted for this very reason: to federalize and provide harmony in the offshore.

So State regulations of the OCS will be used, I believe, unfortunately, by those who would try to obstruct and stop domestic energy production. The policy of this bill, of the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act, is to provide a clear process so that resources can be explored, and I am afraid this amendment would cause the opposite.

The Jobs and Energy Permitting Act is a bill that was brought forward because of significant delay in a bureaucratic process through an Environmental Appeals Board that was not created by Congress but was created as an administrative construct; something that was designed, I'm sure, with good intentions. But unfortunately, in its applicability, in the way it is working, the way people have used it, it is now being part of a great delay.

In the time that it has taken for the EAB to work on this bill, 5 years, the company that has the lease in the Beaufort-Chukchi Sea area right now has drilled over 400 wells around the world, not in the United States, not creating U.S. jobs here, not creating U.S. energy, but working abroad.

□ 1700

And if we are going to set this country on a path toward energy security, I've said it before and will continue to say it, if we are going to set this country on a path to energy security, then we have to recognize the national importance of allowing exploration to occur, exploration permits activities that will take 30 to 45 days.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would like to make one additional comment. I think you have a very good point on the balkanization. We have these Federal waters, the Outer Continental Shelf. We have a lot of oil reserves, and we're trying to explore, trying to produce more oil. And if this amendment is adopted, different States can have different rules, so that would complicate things.

And we already have a situation where we have different agencies of the Federal Government issuing these permits. In some areas we have the Department of the Interior. In other areas we have EPA. If you take that, on top of the balkanization, it's going to take a lot longer than 5 years. We may never get a permit.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Reclaiming my time, it's frustrating too because we continue to hear statements from the administration, from others who wish to pursue a vibrant energy policy for our country that they too agree that we need expanded resource development in the United States, expanded U.S. energy opportu-

nities. But it's almost like lip-synching. They are talking about it, but not actually doing it. And, unfortunately, what we are seeing is conversations by the administration without the action to back up that conversation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my colleague from Colorado, the author of the bill.

Section 328 of the Clean Air Act is what is at issue here today in this amendment. It was created more than 20 years ago, largely at the insistence of California officials. In fact, my Republican predecessor, Congressman Lagomarsino, introduced this legislation because residents were unhappy about uncontrolled air pollution from offshore drilling, as well as local industry and business groups who were upset that offshore sources were basically free to pollute, while onshore sources bore the burden of heavier regulation to try to make up for the degraded air quality. Only two States now have this permission.

I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, and I will submit this letter from the Delaware Department of Natural Resources for the RECORD.

While I oppose the underlying bill, I will only speak to this amendment. It addresses what I think is a nonpartisan issue and, frankly, it appeals to States' rights, which my Republican friends typically support.

Delaware is in nonattainment with Federal clean air standards, mainly due to emissions that come from outside our State borders. In order to comply with Federal law and protect public health, Delaware has the ability to implement pollution control strategies beyond EPA's requirements.

Last year Delaware was given Clean Air Act authority for the Outer Continental Shelf, meaning that the State, rather than EPA, regulates emissions there. Delegated authority is working. The one OCS permit requested of Delaware was granted within weeks, not months. Disputes go through a quick administrative review, rather than costly litigation. It does not mean a delay, as my Republican colleague alleged.

In fact, this delegated authority is working so well that other States are actively looking into it. Maryland, Virginia and Alaska have each asked Delaware for its documents on delegated authority.

A one-size-fits-all approach like H.R. 2021 is not in the best interest of our States. Our amendment simply preserves delegated authority to the States that want it, enabling our States to oversee pollution control as they see fit. This is not balkanization; it's common sense.



I urge my colleagues to preserve States rights by supporting this amendment.

STATE OF DELAWARE,  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL,  
Dover, DE, June 21, 2011.

Hon. JOHN C. CARNEY,  
United States Representative,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARNEY: I write to you today to express State of Delaware's opposition to H.R. 2021, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011. Our concerns with this bill are outlined below:

(1) The proposed bill will impede states' authority to regulate emissions and create unnecessary burdens on state agencies;

(2) By restricting the consideration of air quality impacts solely to an onshore location in the corresponding onshore area, the proposed bill does not sufficiently protect human health and the environment;

(3) The proposed bill shields a potentially significant portion of emissions from OCS activities from emission control requirements; and

(4) The proposed bill subverts our state's established procedures for due process and replaces them with a potentially cumbersome and costly judicial review.

Delaware's air quality is so severely impacted by transported air pollution from the Southwest and the West that Delaware can no longer produce a plan to meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone even if it eliminated all in-state emissions. This bill will open a new Eastern front in the assault on our air quality and at the same time removes available and much needed tools to address these emissions. Delaware's citizens and those living on the East coast deserve clean air and need the continued protection afforded them by the Clean Air Act.

I urge you to reject this bill.

Sincerely,

COLLIN P. O'MARA,  
Secretary.

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

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. HOCHUL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Ms. HOCHUL. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 8, add the following new subsection:

(c) REPORTING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress a report that details how the amendments made by this Act are projected to increase oil and gas production and lower energy prices for consumers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chair, I stand here today to ask one simple question: How will the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011 reduce the cost of gasoline for consumers?

I think this is a fair question, one that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle should want the answer to.

The price of gasoline is soaring in our country, and across the Nation Americans are paying too much at the pump. The average gasoline right now is \$3.63, up over a dollar from a year ago. Diesel, which our struggling farmers have to pay, has gone up a dollar per gallon in the same timeframe.

However, as I've stated on this floor before, the people in my district are paying much more than that. In the past, western New Yorkers have paid some of the highest gas prices in this Nation. Rising fuel prices have hurt our small businesses. They hurt our farms, and they hurt our families at a time when money is far too scarce. And that is why we must know how the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011 will increase oil and gas production, and we need to know that this will decrease the cost of energy for our consumers.

Under this bill, American people are supposed to put their trust in the same oil companies that have consistently betrayed that trust. They tell us we need to drill more, and they tell us they need to get more permits on an expedited basis in order to do so.

Well, I agree. I agree we need to reduce our dependency on foreign oil. But I'm asking for the proper oversight. How do we know that the permits we're issuing so oil companies can drill in our waters will result in that production of oil and gas? How do we know they simply won't secure permits and not choose to drill to keep oil and gas off the market, or even worse, just to drive up the price of oil by manipulating supply?

The amendment I'm offering today is quite simple and straightforward. In one line it gives the EPA administrator 60 days to submit a report dealing with how this bill will increase oil and gas production, while lowering the price of energy for consumers. It has nothing to do with the merits of the bill, which I'm not weighing in on at this time. But I think that asking for a report within 2 months of passing this act is not unreasonable, which is why I ask all my colleagues to join with me today in supporting this amendment.

Today the people back home in my district and all across this Nation are still fed up with high gas prices, and they want to know what we are going to do about these problems. This amendment, in a bipartisan way, can be a step toward finding that solution.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. We certainly want to thank the gentlelady from New York for introducing this amendment.

To answer the question about how is this bill going to help oil prices and provide more oil for the marketplace, obviously it can't do it overnight. But the reason that we're here is because it has taken EPA 5 years and they still have not even rendered a decision on a simple exploratory drill permit request, which is not even a long-term activity. It's simply to explore to determine is oil there and can we use it.

Now, in America we're using around 20 million barrels of oil a day, and the vast majority of that is being imported into the U.S. from other sources. And so all we're attempting to do in this bill—we're not changing any aspect of the Clean Air Act, we're not changing mobile source rules, stationary source rules, national ambient air quality standards. We're not changing that. We're not changing the Environmental Appeals Board from hearing appeals on any other permit other than an exploratory permit, and that's all this bill does.

And we want to do it because we're trying to find additional oil in America, and we know we have it. And we also know that if we have more oil, obviously we can't get it produced tomorrow. We've been trying 5 years just to get the permit, and we don't have that yet. But we want any company to have the ability to go out and drill and to get an expedited answer from EPA. We're not even directing EPA to approve the permit. We're simply saying make a decision. And then if the other side does not like the decision, they have an opportunity to go to court. Under the way it's operating today, we can't get a final decision to even go to court. So here we are in limbo.

I might also say that on the gentlelady's amendment, she does not give any time for this report to be issued. And knowing EPA's track record, we could be here 10 years waiting for a report.

But more important than that, EPA really does not perform economic analyses of energy markets. The Energy Information Administration does that. They have the modeling to do it, they have the technicians to do it, they have the information to do it. EPA really does not even do a very good job on their regulations of thinking about the impact on jobs in America.

So I understand the gentlelady's intent; I think it's a very good intent. But as I said, one of the real weaknesses here is she doesn't even set a timeline for this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER.)

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

This issue of studies, this issue of blue ribbon commissions, it doesn't address the actual fact that price is very much dependent on supply. That's the testimony that we have received. If we have 1 million barrels of oil coming into this country from our own resources, American resources, we know from testimony at the hearing that it will impact price, testimony at the hearing that said the west coast of this United States would have to import less, that it would reduce the price at the pump in California.

We don't have time to create commissions that don't actually relieve the American consumers' pain at the pump. They're paying for it now. I too represent farmers, businesses that are paying \$3.50 a gallon—they were paying higher just a few weeks ago—and none of them have come to me and said, you know, I wish you could study whether or not high prices are impacting me or not. I wish you could study whether American production will actually reduce the price at the pump because they know intuitively that increased supply—American energy resources, when we develop them, will add to our supply, and it's a function of supply and demand.

We have the opportunity in this country to create American jobs. I ask for a "no" vote on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL).

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

Ms. HOCHUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 112-111.

Mr. SCHRADER. 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:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:  
**SEC. 5. PROHIBITION AGAINST DRILLING OFF THE COAST OF OREGON.**

No permit may be issued under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) for an Outer Continental Shelf source (as defined in section 328(a)(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7627(a)(4))) in connection with drilling for oil or natural gas off the coast of Oregon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 316, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amend-

ment, co-sponsored by the coastal members of the Oregon delegation. This amendment is very simple; it protects 63 miles of fragile Oregon coastline and many of the communities that depend on its health.

This amendment would prevent any permits required under the Clean Air Act for oil or natural gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Oregon. It respects Oregon State's right to decide what is best for its coast without Federal interference.

Our Oregon coastal communities depend on the health and natural vitality of the Pacific Ocean. They already face tremendous pressure both in the fishing arena and in our tourism economy. They cannot afford an environmental catastrophe like Deepwater Horizon.

While Oregon has operated under a congressionally supported moratorium on drilling since 1982, this had expired in 2008. Oregon's citizens and its businesses deserve certainty to be able to invest in our fishing and tourism infrastructure.

We respect other States' rights to do what they need to do and suggest what they want. Oregon is leading the way in renewables. We have a State energy portfolio that highlights hydro, solar, wind, wave, biomass, and waste-to-energy technologies, not oil or coal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from the north coast of Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment to prohibit oil and gas drilling off the Oregon coast.

As an Oregonian, I question why we would risk our pristine coast to support an energy industry of the last century rather than of the next century, why we would subject our fisheries and visitor-based coastal economy to the dangers of a BP-style disaster in Oregon waters.

We should focus on generating local jobs, not profits for far-off oil companies. We could create these local jobs by investing in the energy industries of the next century that are uniquely suited to the Oregon coast—waste energy and next-generation offshore wind. Oregon can be the Saudi Arabia of renewable wave energy. Wave energy depends on two things, big waves and seabed contours suited to exploit those waves; and Oregon has both. Oregon is the best place in the world where these two factors come together.

As for wind energy, next-generation technology will allow floating wind farms to be operated 100 miles offshore. These are the jobs of the future. These are the technology and the energy of the future.

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 would like to point out that you have to get an air permit for the energy production that my colleague was just dis-

cussing. You have to get an air permit for the offshore wind development, for the wave development. So I believe opposition to this bill actually hurts the very projects that he is promoting.

And so, again, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it basically puts this country in a situation where you can go get a lease, you can achieve an energy lease, but you can't then get a permit for it. So does that create additional liability for this country? Are we going to end up entering into an area where we can get sued because we've issued a lease but then said you can't get a clean air permit—not only for oil and gas development, but for the very projects that my colleague was addressing?

So here we are in a situation that gets back to the fundamental question at issue: Are we going to allow a bureaucratically created board in Washington, D.C., wearing robes and hearing basic judicial proceedings—are we going to allow them to stall an issue of national importance?

□ 1720

Five years it has taken. Five years it has taken in this one particular instance. Access to Federal offshore areas is not determined by the EPA-issued air permits. It is determined by the President of the United States when through the Department of the Interior lease sales are or are not held for Federal lands and waters.

This is once again an attempt to shut off exploration activity in the Pacific. The matter is not to be decided through air permits. It is to be decided when and if lease sales are proposed for those waters. If lease sales are proposed in the future, Oregon's interests and concerns will no doubt be represented by our colleagues who are proposing this amendment, by the opportunities that remain to debate and provide comment through the NEPA process, through the leasing process.

There are five opportunities for public comment to provided on exploration activity, 30 to 45 days' worth of activity. There are five opportunities for the public to comment.

We have got to get this country into a position where we recognize that it is a good thing for American-produced energy to have opportunities to be developed.

We heard testimony from the State of Alaska. This bill has bipartisan support. It is an effort to say, you know what, we have resources and reserves. We have facilities like the Trans-Alaska pipeline that right now has 650,000 barrels of oil going through a day when it was designed to bring in 2 million barrels of oil a day. If it gets any lower, it is going to create mechanical problems transporting the oil. If it gets below 200,000 barrels a day, it will be decommissioned, torn apart. The potential to bring 2.1 million barrels of oil a day into this country will be gone if the Trans-Alaska pipeline is removed.

The Jobs and Energy Permitting Act, H.R. 2021, gives this body the chance to say we are going to utilize our resources in a responsible manner. We are going to tell the EPA that they have got 6 months to do the analysis. Approve it or don't approve it, but make a decision because the American people deserve a decision.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the Congressman from southern Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You are either for States' rights or you're not. It seems on the other side of the aisle, when it is convenient to their agenda, they are for States' rights. But when it is not convenient to their agenda or their generous campaign contributors, the oil and gas industry, they are not for States' rights.

My State voted, the legislature, just last year for a 10-year moratorium on their lands as an expression of interest not only to ban the leasing of the lands within the coastal waters, but beyond that. We are serious about protecting our fisheries, we are serious about our very profitable tourism industry, and, yes, we are serious about wind and wave development. The gentleman made no sense. He said somehow this would preclude wind and wave development. Not at all. You don't need a clean air permit for something that doesn't potentially pollute the air.

So at this point I would just suggest that let's be consistent. If the State of Alaska wishes to push ahead, the gentleman from Alaska has the bill before us. The Republican Party controls the House. Great. He also had a rule that people from local districts and local States, the gentleman from Alaska, get to have their prerogative. This is our prerogative, representing the people of the State of Oregon.

Mr. GARDNER. May I inquire how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARDNER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. I yield 1 minute to the Congressman from the largest port in our great State, Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this. I appreciate all my colleagues who represent the Oregon coast for bringing this forward. Now, my district may not actually touch the Oregon coast, but my constituents and I spend time there, value its beauty, the ecosystem, and the economic benefits it brings to the United States. The underlying bill could bring all of these at risk, allowing expedited drilling for offshore drilling, a process that is expedited for those who would drill, but a process that is much worse for citizens who may object.

We need to continue to respect the wishes of Oregonians to keep oil rigs

off our shores, prohibiting sources from obtaining permits to drill off the coast of Oregon. This amendment is an appropriate safeguard to protect our coastal environment and communities.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, just to clarify a point when I was seeking the opportunity to ask the gentleman to yield, section 328 applies to any offshore project authorized under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. So under the OCSLA, all offshore energy projects must have a permit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chair, Oregonians don't want or need drilling off our coast. This amendment is supported by all three Members of the entire Oregon coastline and our State legislature. We respect, and I hope this body would respect, Oregonians' right to determine their own destiny. We are not talking about Alaska, we are talking about the State of Oregon, and we are only talking about oil and natural gas permits.

House Members representing this coast are very passionate about its health and future vitality. We urge this body to pass this amendment and respect Oregon's destiny.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, again, I oppose the amendment. We have an opportunity with the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act to get this country on a path toward a secure energy future. It is a matter of national interest. It is not just a matter of Oregon or just a matter of Colorado or just a matter of Alaska. Everyone who is suffering through the pain at the pump realizes that the resources we have been blessed with in this country, when used responsibly, can be used for the benefit of our country and the benefit of all.

The 112th Congress has continued to focus on job creation, just like the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act, job creation and long-term economic well-being. It was said before, somebody on the other side said we are not going to reduce our dependence on foreign oil by producing more oil. That doesn't make any sense at all.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SCHRADER. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 112-

111 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 7 by Ms. ESHOO of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 9 by Ms. HOCHUL of New York.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. SCHRADER of Oregon.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 248, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

AYES—176

Ackerman	DeFazio	Jones
Andrews	DeGette	Kaptur
Baldwin	DeLauro	Keating
Bass (CA)	Deutch	Kildee
Becerra	Dicks	Kind
Berkley	Dingell	Kissell
Berman	Doggett	Kucinich
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Langevin
Blumenauer	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Boswell	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Engel	Lee (CA)
Braley (IA)	Eshoo	Levin
Brown (FL)	Farr	Lewis (GA)
Butterfield	Fattah	Lipinski
Capps	Filner	Loeb
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Loeb
Cardoza	Fudge	Lofgren, Zoe
Carnahan	Garamendi	Lowey
Carney	Grijalva	Lujan
Carson (IN)	Gutierrez	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	Maloney
Chandler	Hastings (FL)	Markey
Chu	Heinrich	Matsui
Ciulline	Higgins	McCarthy (NY)
Clarke (MI)	Himes	McCollum
Clarke (NY)	Hinchee	McDermott
Clay	Hinojosa	McGovern
Cleaver	Hirono	McIntyre
Clyburn	Hochul	McNerney
Cohen	Hoit	Meeks
Connolly (VA)	Honda	Michaud
Conyers	Hoyer	Miller (NC)
Cooper	Inslee	Miller, George
Courtney	Israel	Moore
Critz	Jackson (IL)	Moran
Crowley	Jackson Lee	Murphy (CT)
Cummings	(TX)	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Neal
		Oliver

Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger

Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Sutton

Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

## NOES—248

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishek  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Costa  
Costello  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes

Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Holden  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul

McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan

Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg

Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman

## NOT VOTING—7

Blackburn  
Boustany  
Giffords

Gingrey (GA)  
Lummis  
Stivers

Young (AK)

## □ 1759

Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. FOXF, Messrs. DOLD, BACA, and STARK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Mr. CLARKE of Michigan changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 254, not voting 10, as follows:

## [Roll No. 468]

## AYES—167

Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baldwin  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Bernan  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell

Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Insee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin

Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowe  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley

Rahall  
Rangel  
Richardson  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz

Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns

Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

## NOES—254

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishek  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy

Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Hinojosa  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul

Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan

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

NOT VOTING—10

Boustany Gingrey (GA) Stivers  
Braley (IA) Labrador Young (AK)  
Brooks Lummis  
Giffords Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1806

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 238, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

AYES—183

Ackerman Dingell Lee (CA)  
Andrews Dold Levin  
Baca Donnelly (IN) Lewis (GA)  
Baldwin Doyle Lipinski  
Bass (CA) Edwards LoBiondo  
Becerra Ellison Loebsock  
Berkley Engel Lofgren, Zoe  
Berman Eshoo Lowey  
Bishop (GA) Farr Luján  
Bishop (NY) Fattah Lynch  
Blumenauer Filner Maloney  
Boswell Frank (MA) Markey  
Brady (PA) Fudge Matsui  
Braley (IA) Garamendi McCarthy (NY)  
Brown (FL) Gibson McCollum  
Butterfield Green, Al McDermott  
Capps Grijalva McGovern  
Capuano Gutierrez McIntyre  
Carnahan Hanabusa McNerney  
Carney Hanna Meeks  
Carson (IN) Harris Michaud  
Castor (FL) Hastings (FL) Miller (NC)  
Chandler Heinrich Miller, George  
Chu Higgins Moore  
Cicilline Himes Moran  
Clarke (MI) Hinchey Murphy (CT)  
Clarke (NY) Hirono Nadler  
Clay Hochul Napolitano  
Cleaver Holden Neal  
Clyburn Holt Olver  
Cohen Honda Owens  
Connolly (VA) Hoyer Pallone  
Conyers Insee Pascrell  
Cooper Israel Pastor (AZ)  
Costello Jackson (IL) Payne  
Courtney Johnson (GA) Pelosi  
Crowley Johnson, E. B. Perlmutter  
Cummings Jones Peters  
Davis (CA) Kaptur Peterson  
Davis (IL) Keating Pingree (ME)  
DeFazio Kildee Polis  
DeGette Kind Price (NC)  
DeLauro Kissell Quigley  
Deutch Langevin Rahall  
Dicks Larson (CT) Rangel

Ribble Scott (VA)  
Richardson Scott, David  
Richmond Serrano  
Rothman (NJ) Sewell  
Roybal-Allard Sherman  
Ruppersberger Shuler  
Rush Sires  
Ryan (OH) Slaughter  
Sánchez, Linda Smith (NJ)  
T. Smith (WA)  
Sanchez, Loretta Speier  
Sarbanes Stark  
Schakowsky Sutton  
Schiff Thompson (MS)  
Schilling Tierney  
Schrader Tonko  
Schwartz Towns

NOES—238

Adams Gallegly Miller (MI)  
Aderholt Gardner Miller, Gary  
Akin Garrett Mulvaney  
Alexander Gerlach Murphy (PA)  
Altmire Gibbs Myrick  
Amash Gohmert Neugebauer  
Austria Gonzalez Noem  
Bachmann Goodlatte Nugent  
Bachus Gosar Nunes  
Barletta Gowdy Nunnelee  
Barrow Granger Olson  
Bartlett Graves (GA) Palazzo  
Barton (TX) Graves (MO) Paulsen  
Bass (NH) Green, Gene Pearce  
Benishek Griffin (AR) Pence  
Berg Griffith (VA) Petri  
Biggert Grimm Pitts  
Bilbray Guinta Poe (TX)  
Bilirakis Guthrie Pompeo  
Bishop (UT) Hall Posey  
Black Harper Hastings (WA)  
Blackburn Hartzler Hayworth  
Bonner Hayworth Heck  
Bono Mack Hensarling  
Boren Herger  
Boustany Brady (TX) Herrera Beutler  
Brooks Broun (GA) Hinojosa  
Buchanan Huelskamp  
Bucshon Huizenga (MI)  
Buerkle Hultgren  
Burgess Hunter  
Burton (IN) Issa  
Calvert Jackson Lee  
Camp (TX)  
Campbell Jenkins  
Canseco Johnson (IL)  
Cantor Johnson (OH)  
Capito Johnson, Sam  
Cardoza Jordan  
Carter Kelly  
Cassidy King (IA)  
Chabot King (NY)  
Chaffetz Kingston  
Coble Kinzinger (IL)  
Coffman (CO) Kline  
Cole Labrador  
Conaway Lamborn  
Costa Lance  
Cravaack Landry  
Crawford Lankford  
Crenshaw Larsen (WA)  
Critz Latham  
Cuellar LaTourrette  
Culberson Latta  
Davis (KY) Lewis (CA)  
Denham Long  
Dent Lucas  
DesJarlais Luetkemeyer  
Diaz-Balart Lungren, Daniel  
Dreier E.  
Duffy Mack  
Duncan (SC) Manzullo  
Duncan (TN) Marchant  
Ellmers Marino  
Emerson Matheson  
Farenthold McCarthy (CA)  
Fincher McCaul  
Fitzpatrick McClintock  
Flake McCotter  
Fleischmann McHenry  
Fleming McKeon  
Flores McKinley  
Forbes McMorris  
Fortenberry Rodgers  
Foxy Meehan  
Franks (AZ) Mica  
Frelinghuysen Miller (FL)

Tsongas Wolf  
Van Hollen Womack  
Velázquez  
Viscosky  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

Woodall Young (FL)  
Yoder Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Doggett Kucinich Westmoreland  
Giffords Lummis Young (AK)  
Gingrey (GA) Paul  
Hurt Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1813

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 258, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

AYES—167

Ackerman Eshoo McIntyre  
Andrews Farr McNerney  
Baca Fattah Meeks  
Baldwin Filner Michaud  
Bass (CA) Frank (MA) Miller (NC)  
Becerra Fudge Miller, George  
Berkley Garamendi Moore  
Berman Graves (MO) Moran  
Bishop (GA) Green, Al Murphy (CT)  
Bishop (NY) Grijalva Nadler  
Blumenauer Gutierrez Napolitano  
Boswell Hanabusa Neal  
Brady (PA) Hastings (FL) Olver  
Braley (IA) Heinrich Pallone  
Brown (FL) Higgins Pascrell  
Butterfield Hinchey Pastor (AZ)  
Capps Hirono Payne  
Capuano Capuano Pelosi  
Carnahan Carnahan Perlmutter  
Carson (IN) Carson (IN) Peters  
Castor (FL) Castor (FL) Hoyer Pingree (ME)  
Chu Insee Polis  
Cicilline Israel Price (NC)  
Clarke (MI) Clarke (MI) Jackson (IL)  
Clarke (NY) Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA)  
Clay Johnson, E. B.  
Cleaver Jones  
Clyburn Kaptur Richardson  
Cohen Keating Rothman (NJ)  
Connolly (VA) Kildee Roybal-Allard  
Conyers Kind Rush  
Costello Kissell Ryan (OH)  
Courtney Kucinich Sánchez, Linda  
Crowley Langevin T.  
Cummings Larson (CA) Sanchez, Loretta  
Davis (CA) Lee (CA) Sarbanes  
Davis (IL) Levin Schakowsky  
DeFazio Lewis (GA) Schiff  
DeGette Loebsock Schilling  
DeLauro Lofgren, Zoe Schrader  
Deutch Lowey Schwartz  
Dicks Luján Scott (VA)  
Dingell Lynch Scott, David  
Doggett Maloney Serrano  
Dold Markey Sherman  
Doyle Matsui Sires  
Edwards McCarthy (NY) Slaughter  
Ellison McCollum Speier  
Engel McGovern Stark  
Sutton

Thompson (MS) Visclosky  
 Tierney Walz (MN)  
 Tonko Wasserman  
 Towns Schultz  
 Tsongas Waters  
 Van Hollen Waxman  
 Velázquez Welch

Wilson (FL)  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (FL)

Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6  
 Giffords Lummis Watt  
 Gingrey (GA) Stivers Young (AK)  
 ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 Two minutes remain in this vote.

NOES—258

Adams Gibson  
 Aderholt Gohmert  
 Akin Gonzalez  
 Alexander Goodlatte  
 Altmire Gosar  
 Amash Gowdy  
 Austria Granger  
 Bachmann Graves (GA)  
 Bachus Green, Gene  
 Barletta Griffin (AR)  
 Barrow Griffith (VA)  
 Bartlett Grimm  
 Barton (TX) Guinta  
 Bass (NH) Guthrie  
 Benishek Hall  
 Berg Hanna  
 Biggert Harper  
 Bilbray Harris  
 Bilirakis Hartzler  
 Bishop (UT) Hastings (WA)  
 Black Hayworth  
 Blackburn Heck  
 Bonner Hensarling  
 Bono Mack Herger  
 Boren Herrera Beutler  
 Boustany Himes  
 Brady (TX) Hinojosa  
 Brooks Hochul  
 Broun (GA) Huelskamp  
 Buchanan Huizenga (MI)  
 Bucshon Hultgren  
 Buerkle Hunter  
 Burgess Hurt  
 Burton (IN) Issa  
 Calvert Jackson Lee  
 Camp (TX)  
 Campbell Jenkins  
 Canseco Johnson (IL)  
 Cantor Johnson (OH)  
 Capito Johnson, Sam  
 Cardoza Jordan  
 Carney Kelly  
 Carter King (IA)  
 Cassidy King (NY)  
 Chabot Kingston  
 Chaffetz Kinzinger (IL)  
 Chandler Kline  
 Coble Labrador  
 Coffman (CO) Lamborn  
 Cole Lance  
 Conaway Landry  
 Cooper Lankford  
 Costa Larsen (WA)  
 Cravaack Latham  
 Crawford LaTourette  
 Crenshaw Latta  
 Critz Lewis (CA)  
 Cuellar Lipinski  
 Culberson LoBiondo  
 Davis (KY) Long  
 Denham Lucas  
 DesJarlais Luetkemeyer  
 Diaz-Balart Lungren, Daniel  
 Donnelly (IN) E.  
 Dreier Mack  
 Duffy Manzullo  
 Duncan (SC) Marchant  
 Duncan (TN) Marino  
 Ellmers Matheson  
 Emerson McCarthy (CA)  
 Farenthold McCaul  
 Fincher McClintock  
 Fitzpatrick McCotter  
 Flake McHenry  
 Fleischmann McKeon  
 Fleming McKinley  
 Flores McMorris  
 Forbes Rodgers  
 Fortenberry Meehan  
 Foss Mica  
 Franks (AZ) Miller (FL)  
 Frelinghuysen Miller (MI)  
 Gallegly Miller, Gary  
 Gardner Mulvaney  
 Garrett Murphy (PA)  
 Gerlach Myrick  
 Gibbs Neugebauer

Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Owens  
 Palazzo  
 Paul  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Pence  
 Peterson  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Quayle  
 Reed  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Reyes  
 Ribble  
 Richmond  
 Rigell  
 Rivera  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross (AR)  
 Ross (FL)  
 Royce  
 Runyan  
 Ruppersberger  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Scalise  
 Schmidt  
 Schock  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (SC)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Southerland  
 Stearns  
 Stutzman  
 Sullivan  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Webster  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Young (IN)

NOES—253

Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Grimm  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hall  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayworth  
 Heck  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Brooks  
 Hinojosa  
 Holden  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurt  
 Issa  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Kelly  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 Labrador  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Landry  
 Lankford  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Lewis (CA)  
 LoBiondo  
 Long  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Mack  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Duffy  
 Matheson  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCotter  
 McHenry  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meehan  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Myrick

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.  
 The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE  
 The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.  
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 253, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]  
 AYES—172

Ackerman  
 Andrews  
 Baca  
 Baldwin  
 Bass (CA)  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chu  
 Cicilline  
 Clarke (MI)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 Deutch  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Frank (MA)

NOT VOTING—8  
 Giffords  
 Gingrey (GA)

Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Olver  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Payne  
 Peters  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Stark  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1826

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the noes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 173, noes 251,  
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

AYES—173

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Oliver
Andrews	Hanabusa	Owens
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Baldwin	Hayworth	Pascarell
Bass (CA)	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Higgins	Payne
Berkley	Himes	Perlmutter
Berman	Hinchev	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Hochul	Polis
Brady (PA)	Holt	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rahall
Butterfield	Inslee	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Reichert
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carney	Johnson (IL)	Roithman (NJ)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kaptur	Rush
Cicilline	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kind	T.
Clay	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Levin	Scott (VA)
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Courtney	Lipinski	Serrano
Critz	Loeb sack	Sewell
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Cummings	Lowey	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Luján	Sires
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Slaughter
DeFazio	Maloney	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Markey	Speier
DeLauro	Matsui	Stark
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Dicks	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McGovern	Tierney
Doyle	McIntyre	Tonko
Edwards	McNerney	Towns
Ellison	Meeks	Tsongas
Engel	Michaud	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Farr	Miller, George	Vislosky
Fattah	Moore	Walz (MN)
Filner	Moran	Wasserman
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Schultz
Fudge	Nadler	Waters
Garamendi	Napolitano	Watt
Grijalva	Neal	

Waxman  
Welch

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishke  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chafetz  
Chandler  
Chandler  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Costa  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner

Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
NOES—251  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Hinojosa  
Holden  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarl  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)

Wu  
Yarmuth  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

□ 1832

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 183, noes 240,  
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

AYES—183

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Oliver
Altmire	Green, Al	Pallone
Andrews	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Baca	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Paul
Bartlett	Hanabusa	Payne
Bass (CA)	Hanna	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Berkley	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Higgins	Polis
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Hochul	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Hoit	Reyes
Capps	Honda	Richardson
Capuano	Hoyer	Richmond
Cardoza	Inslee	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Cassidy	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Johnson (IL)	T.
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Jones	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kissell	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Cohen	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Connolly (VA)	Serrano
Conyers	Conyers	Sewell
Cooper	Cooper	Sherman
Costello	Costello	Shuler
Courtney	Courtney	Sires
Critz	Critz	Slaughter
Crowley	Crowley	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Cuellar	Speier
Cummings	Cummings	Stark
Davis (CA)	Davis (CA)	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Davis (IL)	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	DeFazio	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	DeGette	Tierney
DeLauro	DeLauro	Tonko
Deutch	Deutch	Towns
Dicks	Dicks	Tsongas
Dingell	Dingell	Van Hollen
Doggett	Doggett	Velázquez
Donnelly (IN)	Donnelly (IN)	Vislosky
Doyle	Doyle	Walz (MN)
Edwards	Edwards	Wasserman
Ellison	Ellison	Schultz
Engel	Engel	Waters
Eshoo	Eshoo	Watt
Farr	Farr	Waxman
Fattah	Fattah	Welch
Filner	Filner	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Frank (MA)	Woolsey
Fudge	Fudge	Wu
Garamendi	Garamendi	Yarmuth
		Neal

NOT VOTING—7

Young (AK)

Giffords  
Gingrey (GA)  
Lummis

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There are 2 minutes remaining in this  
vote.

Pelosi  
Stivers  
Tiberi

## NOES—240

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Amash  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishke  
Berg  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Costa  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs

Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Hinojosa  
Holden  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lance  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent

## NOT VOTING—8

Butterfield  
Giffords  
Gingrey (GA)

Lummis  
Meeks  
Pelosi

Stivers  
Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1838

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 242, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

## AYES—180

Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Cardoza  
Carmahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Tiberi  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gibson

Gonzalez  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayworth  
Heinrich  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Insee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
Carney (TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Cohen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeback  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver

Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paul  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

## NOES—242

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash

Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett

Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm

Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hinojosa  
Holden  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen

Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Witman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—9

Capuano  
Giffords  
Gingrey (GA)

Granger  
Lummis  
Lynch

Pelosi  
Stivers  
Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1845

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. HOCHUL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOCHUL) on which further proceedings



were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 238, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—186

Ackerman	Gibson	Neal
Andrews	Green, Al	Oiver
Baca	Grijalva	Owens
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barrow	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Bass (CA)	Hanna	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Berkley	Heinrich	Perlmutter
Berman	Higgins	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hinchev	Polis
Blumenauer	Hirono	Price (NC)
Boswell	Hochul	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Holden	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Holt	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Honda	Reyes
Butterfield	Hoyer	Richardson
Capps	Inslee	Richmond
Capuano	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Johnson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Clarke (MI)	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clay	Keating	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kildee	Schiff
Clyburn	Kind	Schrader
Coble	Kissell	Schwartz
Coffman (CO)	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Costello	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Critz	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Crowley	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Speier
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Sutton
Davis (IL)	Luján	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Maloney	Tierney
DeLauro	Markey	Tonko
Deutch	Matsui	Towns
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Dingell	McCollum	Van Hollen
Doggett	McDermott	Velázquez
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Visclosky
Doyle	McIntyre	Walz (MN)
Edwards	McNerney	Wasserman
Ellison	Meeks	Schultz
Engel	Michaud	Waters
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Watt
Farr	Miller, George	Waxman
Fattah	Moore	Welch
Finer	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Fudge	Nadler	Wu
Garamendi	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NOES—238

Adams	Barton (TX)	Bono Mack
Aderholt	Bass (NH)	Boren
Akin	Benishek	Boustany
Alexander	Berg	Brady (TX)
Altmire	Biggert	Brooks
Amash	Bilbray	Brown (GA)
Austria	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Bachus	Black	Buerkle
Barletta	Blackburn	Burgess
Bartlett	Bonner	Burton (IN)

Calvert	Herger	Platts
Camp	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Campbell	Hinojosa	Pompeo
Canseco	Huelskamp	Posey
Cantor	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Capito	Hultgren	Quayle
Cardoza	Hunter	Reed
Carter	Hurt	Rehberg
Cassidy	Issa	Reichert
Chabot	Jenkins	Renacci
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Chandler	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Cole	Jordan	Rivera
Conaway	Kelly	Roby
Costa	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Cravaack	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	Kline	Rohrabacher
Davis (KY)	Labrador	Rokita
Denham	Lamborn	Rooney
Dent	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
DesJarlais	Landry	Roskam
Diaz-Balart	Lankford	Ross (AR)
Dold	Latham	Ross (FL)
Dreier	LaTourette	Royce
Duffy	Latta	Runyan
Duncan (SC)	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (TN)	Long	Scalise
Ellmers	Lucas	Schilling
Emerson	Luetkemeyer	Schmidt
Farenthold	Lungren, Daniel	Schock
Fincher	E.	Schweikert
Flake	Mack	Scott (SC)
Fitzpatrick	Manzullo	Scott, Austin
Flores	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Marino	Sessions
Flores	Matheson	Shimkus
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Shuler
Fortenberry	McCaul	Shuster
Fox	McClintock	Simpson
Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Galleghy	McKeon	Southerland
Gardner	McKinley	Stearns
Garrett	McMorris	Stutzman
Gerlach	Rodgers	Sullivan
Gibbs	Meehan	Terry
Gohmert	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Gonzalez	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Tipton
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Turner
Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Graves (MO)	Myrick	Walberg
Green, Gene	Neugebauer	Walden
Griffin (AR)	Noem	Walsh (IL)
Griffith (VA)	Nugent	Webster
Grimm	Nunes	West
Guinta	Nunnelee	Westmoreland
Guthrie	Olson	Whitfield
Hall	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Harper	Paul	Wittman
Harris	Paulsen	Wolf
Hartzler	Pearce	Womack
Hastings (WA)	Pence	Woodall
Hayworth	Peterson	Yoder
Heck	Petri	Young (FL)
Hensarling	Pitts	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Giffords	Lummis	Young (AK)
Gingrey (GA)	Pelosi	
Granger	Stivers	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1851

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.  
The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 262, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

AYES—160

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Pallone
Andrews	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bass (CA)	Heinrich	Payne
Becerra	Herrera Beutler	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Higgins	Polis
Berman	Hinchev	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Blumenauer	Hirono	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Holt	Rangel
Braley (IA)	Honda	Reichert
Brown (FL)	Inslee	Richardson
Butterfield	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Cardoza	Jones	Rush
Carnahan	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Keating	T.
Chu	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kind	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kissell	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Schrader
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Coble	Levin	Serrano
Cohen	Lewis (GA)	Sevell
Connolly (VA)	Lipinski	Sherman
Conyers	Loeb sack	Sires
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Crowley	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lujan	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Stark
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Sutton
DeFazio	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Deutch	McCollum	Tonko
Dicks	McDermott	Towns
Dingell	McGovern	Tsongas
Doggett	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Donnelly (IN)	McNerney	Velázquez
Doyle	Meeks	Wasserman
Edwards	Michaud	Schultz
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Waters
Engel	Miller, George	Watt
Eshoo	Moore	Waxman
Farr	Moran	Welch
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Finer	Nadler	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Wu
Fudge		Yarmuth
Garamendi		

NOES—262

Adams	Bono Mack	Conaway
Aderholt	Boren	Cooper
Akin	Boswell	Costa
Alexander	Boustany	Costello
Altmire	Brady (TX)	Cravaack
Amash	Brooks	Crawford
Austria	Broun (GA)	Crenshaw
Baca	Buchanan	Critz
Bachmann	Bucshon	Cuellar
Bachus	Buerkle	Culberson
Barletta	Burgess	Davis (KY)
Barrow	Burton (IN)	Denham
Bartlett	Calvert	Dent
Barton (TX)	Camp	DesJarlais
Bass (NH)	Campbell	Diaz-Balart
Benishek	Canseco	Dold
Berg	Cantor	Donnelly (IN)
Biggert	Capito	Dreier
Bilbray	Carter	Duffy
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (GA)	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	Ellmers
Black	Chandler	Emerson
Blackburn	Coffman (CO)	Farenthold
Bonner	Cole	Fincher

Fitzpatrick	Lamborn	Richmond
Flake	Lance	Rigell
Fleischmann	Landry	Rivera
Fleming	Lankford	Roby
Flores	Latham	Roe (TN)
Forbes	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)
Fortenberry	Latta	Rogers (KY)
Fox	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Frelinghuysen	Long	Rokita
Gallely	Lucas	Rooney
Gardner	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Garrett	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam
Gerlach	E.	Ross (AR)
Gibbs	Mack	Ross (FL)
Gibson	Manzullo	Royce
Gohmert	Marchant	Runyan
Gonzalez	Marino	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	Matheson	Scalise
Gosar	McCarthy (CA)	Schilling
Gowdy	McCaul	Schmidt
Graves (GA)	McClintock	Schock
Graves (MO)	McCotter	Schweikert
Green, Al	McHenry	Scott (SC)
Green, Gene	McKeon	Scott, Austin
Griffin (AR)	McKinley	Sensenbrenner
Griffith (VA)	McMorris	Sessions
Grimm	Rodgers	Shimkus
Guinta	Meehan	Shuler
Guthrie	Mica	Shuster
Hall	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Hanna	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Harper	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Harris	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)
Hartzler	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Southerland
Hayworth	Neugebauer	Stearns
Heck	Noem	Stutzman
Hensarling	Nugent	Sullivan
Herger	Nunes	Terry
Himes	Nunnelee	Thompson (PA)
Hochul	Olson	Thornberry
Holden	Owens	Tiberi
Hoyer	Palazzo	Tipton
Huelskamp	Paul	Turner
Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen	Upton
Hultgren	Pearce	Visclosky
Hunter	Pence	Walberg
Hurt	Perlmutter	Walden
Issa	Peters	Walsh (IL)
Jackson Lee	Peterson	Walz (MN)
(TX)	Petri	Webster
Jenkins	Pitts	West
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Westmoreland
Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)
Jordan	Posey	Wittman
Kelly	Price (GA)	Wolf
King (IA)	Quayle	Womack
King (NY)	Reed	Woodall
Kingston	Rehberg	Yoder
Kinzinger (IL)	Renacci	Young (FL)
Kline	Reyes	Young (IN)
Labrador	Ribble	

## NOT VOTING—9

Carson (IN)	Granger	Pelosi
Giffords	Jackson (IL)	Stivers
Gingrey (GA)	Lummis	Young (AK)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LATHAM) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1858

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATHAM, 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. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities, and, pursuant to House Resolution 316, reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I am opposed to it in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Keating moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2021 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

After subsection (d) of section 328 of the Clean Air Act, as proposed to be added by section 4 of the bill, insert the following:

“(e) DETERMINATION OF LOWER GAS PRICES AT THE PUMP.—In conducting analyses relating to requirements for pollution controls pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall determine whether the controls under review will result in lower gasoline prices in the United States, including the retail price charged at service stations.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer this final amendment that I believe will greatly increase economic and job safeguards for the American people.

Simply put, the underlying legislation is about risk versus reward. We know what the reward is: trillions of dollars of profit over the last decade for oil companies and preferred stock buybacks and bonuses for executives. We know what the proponents of this bill say the reward will be: lower gas prices at the pump.

Now, what is the risk that we're looking at?

The risk is existing jobs: existing jobs in the marine industry, the fishing industry, the tourism industry—industries that are among the most job-producing in my State and in the States of so many other people in this Chamber.

My amendment requires the administrator to determine whether or not this will lower gas prices for American citizens. I believe we need a safeguard for the American public, who should not bear the burden of the risk with no guarantee of the reward. I'm sure the many small businesses in the gulf and in my district which rely on the marine economies and tourism would agree with this. This final amendment is a commonsense compromise, and regardless of how the Members feel about the underlying legislation, this is something that we should all be able to support.

When I offered my amendment earlier, my colleague from across the aisle

said it was irrelevant because it dealt with exposing executive bonuses and that it, thus, did not deal with the heart of what this bill is supposed to do, which, according to him, was to increase domestic oil production that would translate into decreased gas prices at the pump. Now, if it's not for lower gas prices for consumers, then the only rationale for this must be that it's for higher profits for oil companies. All day, proponents have said the reason for the bill is to lower gas prices.

This amendment, simply put, asks them to mean what they say. I ask all of my colleagues to please support this final amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Energy security and job creation, that's what the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act is about. The amendment, the motion to recommit that has been offered, is something that we talked about today: whether or not a study actually results in lower prices at the pump.

Colleagues, I don't think our constituents will appreciate it if we put a big sign on the pump at the gas station that reads “you're going to pay \$3.50 a gallon for gas; you're going to pay \$4 a gallon for gas” while we study it, while a blue ribbon commission proceeds.

This bill will allow our domestic resources to be accessed in a responsible manner, in a timely manner to help relieve the price at the pump. Americans are tired of overregulation. Americans are tired of job-killing regulations. Americans are tired of the pain at the pump that they face each and every day. This bill presents an opportunity to create 54,000 jobs. In the time that it has taken to get a permit approved in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, 400 wells have been drilled around the world. They created jobs in other countries; they created energy in other countries, but they didn't do it in our own backyard. This is our opportunity to get American resources online in a responsible manner.

This amendment is one more stall, one more study, one more way to tell the American people that we're not interested in helping relieve the pain at the pump. We're going to study it. We're going to commission it. Then we're not going to do anything. This is 54,000 jobs and 1 million barrels of oil a day brought online from Alaska, creating jobs not just there but throughout the 48 States.

The other day, I heard people talking about making it in America. “Make It in America.” Do you know what we need to make it in America? We need an energy policy that allows an abundant, affordable energy resource. To make it in America, we need opportunities to secure policies that don't overregulate and kill jobs. If you want

to make it in America, reject this motion to recommit; develop American resources; put America back to work; and vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 245, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—177

Ackerman Grijalva Pallone  
 Altmire Gutierrez Pascrell  
 Andrews Hanabusa Pastor (AZ)  
 Baca Hastings (FL) Payne  
 Baldwin Heinrich Perlmutter  
 Barrow Higgins Peters  
 Bass (CA) Himes Pingree (ME)  
 Becerra Hinchey Polis  
 Berkley Hinojosa Price (NC)  
 Berman Hirono Quigley  
 Bishop (GA) Hochul Rahall  
 Bishop (NY) Holden Rangel  
 Blumenauer Holt Reyes  
 Brady (PA) Honda Richardson  
 Braley (IA) Hoyer Richmond  
 Brown (FL) Insee Rothman (NJ)  
 Butterfield Israel Roybal-Allard  
 Capps Jackson (IL) Ruppersberger  
 Capuano Jackson Lee Rush  
 Carnahan (TX) Ryan (OH)  
 Carney Johnson (GA) Sánchez, Linda  
 Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B. T.  
 Cantor (FL) Kaptur Sanchez, Loretta  
 Chu Keating Sarbanes  
 Cicilline Kildee Schakowsky  
 Clarke (MI) Kind Schiff  
 Clarke (NY) Kissell Schrader  
 Clay Kucinich Schwartz  
 Cleaver Langevin Scott (VA)  
 Clyburn Larsen (WA) Scott, David  
 Cohen Larson (CT) Serrano  
 Connolly (VA) Lee (CA) Sewell  
 Conyers Levin Sherman  
 Cooper Lewis (GA) Shuler  
 Costello Lipinski Sires  
 Courtney Loeb sack  
 Critz Lofgren, Zoe Smith (WA)  
 Crowley Lowey Speier  
 Cuellar Luján Stark  
 Cummings Lynch Sutton  
 Davis (CA) Maloney Thompson (CA)  
 Davis (IL) Markey Thompson (MS)  
 DeFazio Matsui Tierney  
 DeGette McCarthy (NY) Tonko  
 DeLauro McCollum Towns  
 Deutch McDermott Tsongas  
 Dingell McGovern Van Hollen  
 Doggett McIntyre Velázquez  
 Doyle McNerney Vislosky  
 Edwards Meeks Walz (MN)  
 Ellison Michaud Wasserman  
 Engel Miller (NC) Schultz  
 Eshoo Miller, George Waters  
 Farr Moore Watt  
 Fattah Moran Waxman  
 Finer Murphy (CT) Welch  
 Frank (MA) Nadler Wilson (FL)  
 Fudge Napolitano Woolsey  
 Garamendi Neal Wu  
 Green, Al Oliver Yarmuth

NOES—245

Adams Gibbs Nunes  
 Aderholt Gibson Nunnelee  
 Akin Gohmert Olson  
 Alexander Gonzalez Owens  
 Amash Goodlatte Palazzo  
 Austria Gosar Paul  
 Bachmann Gowdy Paulsen  
 Bachus Graves (GA) Pearce  
 Barletta Graves (MO) Pence  
 Bartlett Green, Gene Peterson  
 Barton (TX) Griffin (AR) Petri  
 Bass (NH) Griffith (VA) Pitts  
 Benishek Grimm Platts  
 Berg Guinta Poe (TX)  
 Biggert Guthrie Pompeo  
 Bilbray Hall Posey  
 Billrakis Hanna Price (GA)  
 Bishop (UT) Harper Quayle  
 Black Harris Reed  
 Blackburn Hartzler Rehberg  
 Bonner Hastings (WA) Reichert  
 Bono Mack Hayworth Renacci  
 Boren Heck Ribble  
 Boswell Hensarling Rigell  
 Boustany Herger Rivera  
 Brady (TX) Herrera Beutler  
 Brooks Huelskamp Roby  
 Broun (GA) Huizenga (MI) Roe (TN)  
 Buchanan Hultgren Rogers (AL)  
 Bucshon Hunter Rogers (KY)  
 Buerkle Hurt Rogers (MI)  
 Burgess Issa Rohrabacher  
 Burton (IN) Jenkins Rokita  
 Calvert Johnson (IL) Rooney  
 Camp Johnson (OH) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Campbell Johnson, Sam Roskam  
 Canseco Jones Ross (AR)  
 Cantor Jordan Ross (FL)  
 Capito Kelly Royce  
 Cardoza Pascrell Runyan  
 Carter King (IA) Ryan (WI)  
 Cassidy King (NY) Scalise  
 Chabot Kingston Schilling  
 Chaffetz Kinzinger (IL) Schmidt  
 Chandler Kline Labrador Schmitt  
 Coble Lamborn Schweikert  
 Coffman (CO) Lance Scott (SC)  
 Cole Lankford Scott, Austin  
 Conaway Latham Sessions  
 Costa LaTourette Shuster  
 Cravaack Latta Shimkus  
 Crawford Lewis (CA) Smith (NE)  
 Crenshaw LoBiondo Smith (NJ)  
 Long Lucas Smith (TX)  
 Davis (KY) Luetkemeyer Southernland  
 Denham Lungren, Daniel E.  
 Dent DesJarlais Stearns  
 Diaz-Balart Mack Stutzman  
 Dold Manzullo Sullivan  
 Donnelly (IN) Marchant Terry  
 Dreyer Marino Thompson (PA)  
 Duffy Matheson Thornberry  
 Duncan (SC) McCarthy (CA) Tiberi  
 Duncan (TN) McCaul Tipton  
 Ellmers McClintock Turner  
 Emerson McCotter Upton  
 Farenthold McHenry Johnson (GA)  
 Fincher McKeon Johnson (IL)  
 Fitzpatrick McKinley Johnson (OH)  
 Flake McMorris Johnson, Sam  
 Fleischmann Rodgers Jordan  
 Fleming Meehan Kelly  
 Flores Mica Westmoreland  
 Forbes Miller (FL) Whitfield  
 Fortenberry Miller (MI) Wilson (SC)  
 Foxo Miller, Gary Wittman  
 Mulvaney Mulvaney Wolf  
 Murphy (PA) Murphy (PA) Womack  
 Myrick Neugebauer Woodall  
 Noem Noem Yoder  
 Nugent Nugent Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Dicks Granger Pelosi  
 Giffords Landry Stivers  
 Gingrey (GA) Lummis Young (AK)

□ 1923

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 166, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

AYES—253

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

Terry	Walden	Wolf
Thompson (PA)	Walsh (IL)	Womack
Thornberry	Webster	Woodall
Tiberi	West	Yoder
Tipton	Westmoreland	Young (FL)
Turner	Whitfield	Young (IN)
Upton	Wilson (SC)	
Walberg	Wittman	

NOES—166

Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Andrews	Heinrich	Peters
Baldwin	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Bass (CA)	Himes	Polis
Becerra	Hinche	Price (NC)
Berkley	Hirono	Quigley
Berman	Hochul	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Rangel
Blumenauer	Honda	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Inslee	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Jones	Rush
Carnahan	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Kildee	T.
Chu	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kissell	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Schiff
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Levin	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Conyers	Lipinski	Sewell
Cooper	Loeb	Sherman
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Shuler
Courtney	Lowe	Sires
Crowley	Lujan	Slaughter
Cummings	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Speier
Davis (IL)	Markey	Stark
DeFazio	Matsui	Sutton
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McCormack	Thompson (MS)
Deuth	McDermott	Tierney
Dingell	McGovern	Tonko
Doggett	McIntyre	Towns
Doyle	McNerney	Tsongas
Duncan (TN)	Meeke	Van Hollen
Edwards	Michaud	Velázquez
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Engel	Miller, George	Walz (MN)
Eshoo	Moran	Wasserman
Farr	Murphy (CT)	Schultz
Fattah	Nadler	Waters
Filner	Napolitano	Watt
Frank (MA)	Neal	Waxman
Fudge	Olver	Welch
Garamendi	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva	Pallone	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Pascrell	Wu
Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Carson (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Cole	Granger	Pelosi
Dicks	Lummis	Stivers
Giffords	Moore	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1930

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 against:  
Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 477 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROUN of Georgia) laid before the

House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, I am writing to notify you of my resignation from the Armed Services Committee, effective June 22, 2011. I look forward to continuing to serve the Tampa Bay area and the State of Florida from the Energy and Commerce and Budget Committees in the 112th Congress.

Sincerely,

KATHY CASTOR,  
United States Representative,  
Florida District 11.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.  
There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 321

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Ms. Castor of Florida.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2219, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–113) on the resolution (H. Res. 320) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1380, the New Alternative Transportation to Give Americans Solutions Act of 2011.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1249.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICA INVENTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316 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. 1249.

□ 1933

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. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform, with Mr. GRAVES of Georgia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

An initial period of general debate shall be confined to the question of the constitutionality of the bill and shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) or their designees.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, individuals who raise questions about the constitutionality of this legislation perhaps should review the Constitution itself. The Constitution expressly grants Congress the authority to “promote the progress of science and useful arts.” That is precisely what this bill does. H.R. 1249 improves the patent system, ensuring the protection and promotion of intellectual property that spurs economic growth and generates jobs.

The bill’s inclusion of a move to a first-inventor-to-file system is absolutely consistent with the Constitution’s requirement that patents be awarded to the “inventor.”

A recent letter by professors of law from across the country—from universities including Emory, Indiana, Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, NYU, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Albany, Stanford, Chicago, Georgia, Richmond, Vanderbilt, and Washington—states that claims of unconstitutionality “cannot be squared with well-accepted and longstanding rules of current patent law.” And