

This legislative session in Indiana has also produced real education reform that was passed to usher in real choice for students and parents. Governor Daniels led the charge for full funding for kindergarten, the Nation's most expansive voucher program, more charter schools, and rewarding our teachers based on their effectiveness. We can do the same here in Congress.

As we discuss tax reform and how to do it here in Washington, Indiana's already done it. They have done it by lowering corporate tax rates, lowering property taxes to give a great place for businesses to do work. We can do the same here in Congress.

As a former State legislator in Indiana under the Daniels administration, I rise today because, in the midst of despair and partisan bickering, I know we can do the same here in Congress. We must do better.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1229, PUTTING THE GULF OF MEXICO BACK TO WORK ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1230, RESTARTING AMERICAN OFFSHORE LEASING NOW ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 245 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 245

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1229) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to facilitate the safe and timely production of American energy resources from the Gulf of Mexico. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are

waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. In the engrossment of H.R. 1229, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 1230, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1229;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 1229 to reflect the addition of H.R. 1230, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

□ 0920

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 245 provides for the consideration of two very important bills, H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act, and H.R. 1230, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, both under a structured rule. With many amendments, all of which are Democrat amendments having been made in order, this is a very fair rule.

I commend the sponsor of the two bills, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, for his leadership in bringing both of these bills to the House.

H.R. 1229 is a bill that goes to the heart of the bureaucratic delays, which are preventing the approval of drilling permits within the Gulf of Mexico; and it modifies the standards and procedures governing Federal leases and permits in order to streamline the process, making the development of these domestic resources a reality instead of the status quo of paying lip service to drilling and then stifling drilling through bureaucratic inaction.

H.R. 1230 is a bill that would direct the sale of oil and gas leases within the Outer Continental Shelf, reversing a failed administration policy of canceling and delaying those processes.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 years, many Republicans have come to this floor and have sung the same refrain of "show us the jobs." It was, indeed, a nice song and a catchy tune—so catchy that the minority of today seems to have been picking up on that kind of song as well. I don't expect to hear that today, or at least we ought not to hear it today, because the two bills before us under this rule are real bills that create real jobs for people.

Unlike the bills we have seen over the past couple of years which have led us to a situation where today there are twice as many workers in the government as there are in all of manufacturing in this Nation, which is an exact reverse of the situation this Nation was in in 1960, these are not going to be government jobs which attack the taxpayers and suck the money out of their wallets to fund them. These are going to be real jobs that grow the private sector, that expand the economy, that provide wealth, and that will provide, actually, millions of new government revenues coming into this country.

The situation we find ourselves in today with regard to energy is one that is detrimental to everybody. Everyone who goes to the pump to fill their cars recognizes the cost is increasing and will continue to increase. They recognize that the situation we are in puts all our jobs in jeopardy, and it is because of the inaction of this particular administration. The President has continually said that he wants to do action, to move forward, to develop American energy, but the actions of his administration have, quite frankly, failed to meet the rhetoric of the administration.

The problem has always been a fundamental flaw in our Nation's energy plan. Last May, the Deepwater Horizon accident occurred, which was a tragedy; and we must thank all of those who helped to solve that particular problem; but, unfortunately, the administration's response to that tragedy has turned it into a catastrophe and one which destroys jobs.

Immediately, a moratorium on all sorts of development was put into place. Prior to that moratorium being put into place, there were 52 approved and pending permits, and that moratorium was lifted in October; but of those 52, only 10 permits have been issued since that time. Two of them are new in deepwater and are eight of the 52 that were originally done. That means there are over 40 still approved and still stalled in what has become a de facto moratorium, caused by a foot-dragging of this administration that, what one columnist said, is moving at a glacial pace. More rigs have left our shore—12—to go to other places in the world where they are welcomed and where they are developing energy sources, where they don't have to face the red tape and the foot-dragging than have actually been approved by this administration.

A perfect example is Seahawk Drilling, a company that had over 500 jobs and 20 rigs that went into chapter 11 bankruptcy. The president of that company stated only one reason for that bankruptcy and that loss of jobs, which was the de facto moratorium of inaction done by this administration in this area in 2008 in a response to an arbitrary drilling ban that was lifted by both the President and Congress. It created a 5-year plan. Virginia was supposed to start the exploration process in 2011, but the Secretary of the Interior delayed that until 2012 and then later delayed all exploration on the Atlantic coast until after 2017.

In the Gulf of Mexico, two other sales were canceled and moved out from this year, which was when they were supposed to begin, once again into next year. It became so bad that a judge in New Orleans gave the administration 30 days to start moving on these projects, saying that what was happening by this administration was increasingly inexcusable and that not acting at all is not a lawful action.

The result of this has simply been catastrophic for jobs in America. The Obama administration has admitted in its official memorandum that, for those days of its official moratorium, 12,000 jobs were lost; but what is more significant is the de facto moratorium there. An LSU study simply said, if this were sustained for 18 months in the gulf area, there would be 24,532 jobs lost and in the Nation 36,137 jobs lost simply because of what we are not doing in the Gulf of Mexico.

It is very simple to understand how this works. Each platform that is out there drilling has 90 to 150 employees. If you add the production team as well

as the exploration team, you can multiply that by a factor of four. So you have almost per every drilling up to 1,400 jobs that are tied to that particular project with \$1,800 a week as the average wage.

That means for every one of those drills that is not put back into production, it is \$5 million to \$10 million per month per platform that is lost to this economy; and the ripple effect within the economy for our energy uses as well as jobs is, once again, staggering as this administration is, indeed, going at a glacial pace. In Virginia alone, 2,000 jobs will be estimated to be lost if the de facto moratorium that pushes everything to 2017 is allowed to take place.

Now, this action, or inaction, by the administration costs every American. It costs us at the gas pump as we see the cost of running our cars increasing almost daily, and this hurts the poor worse than anyone else. It is estimated that every American will pay \$700 more this year for gasoline than last year. Obviously, those at the lower end of the economic scale are the ones who are hurt the most. For every cent that is increased in gas at the pump, that is \$1 billion that is taken out of household incomes in this country; and it makes sure that Americans are then put at the mercy of foreign oil development and foreign energy sources, which may not necessarily like us, and sometimes they're just flat out bad guys.

It also has other areas in which it has affected everyone—once again, those at the lower end of the income scale the most. For every dime that diesel goes up, that is \$400 million that is added to the agricultural industry, which is what we eat, which is tacked onto our food prices. You have to have oil for fertilizer. As that goes up, the cost of fertilizer goes up; the cost of running machinery goes up; the cost of food goes up; the cost of pharmaceuticals, plastics. If you go into the emergency room, everything that is not metal has some element of oil that developed it, and all of those are increasing.

Now, there are only two ways that we can handle this situation. First, you can go with the old concept of supply and demand and simply increase production, which is what these two bills are trying to do; or you can go to the approach that this administration seems to be asking us to do, which is to cut our standard of living, accept gasoline prices at the European level, and beg Saudi Arabia to be nice to us—to put our futures in the hands of OPEC and then amazingly say we can also solve these problems simply by taxing oil companies at a higher rate.

Since 2010, the domestic production of energy in this country has decreased 16 percent. In this year, next year and the year after that, we estimate, unless we make changes, that a quarter of a million barrels of oil will be decreased in our production rate in each of those years. The only area in which any energy production has been increasing is

on private property. Unfortunately for this country, almost all of the energy that we have, most of the energy that we can develop, is on public lands, which is controlled by the government, which is doing nothing now to help develop that.

This is a time where pragmatism is much better than a failed ideology of restrictions. Now, what these two bills do is to simply reverse the job-killing delays that have been taking place. In H.R. 1229, it reforms the law to require leaseholders to receive permits to drill before they start drilling; and it will do it for the first time by law, not simply by a regulation. It demands that the Secretary of the Interior conduct and approve safety revenues, once again, for the first time in history.

More importantly, it ends the de facto moratorium by demanding prompt guidelines and action. It says that the Secretary of the Interior will have 30 days in which to deal with these issues and then can have up to two 15-day extensions—a total of 60 days to do the review.

Now, while that may seem to some as a quick path, it's not when you look at the history of what has been done. Before the moratorium went into effect, it was taking 5 to 15 days to do the drilling leases and permits.

□ 0930

One company was done in nine days just recently. What the problem is is that most of these are simply not being done simply because of inaction. It also says for those that were approved prior to the May 27 moratorium, you've got 30 days to get them going again. This is plenty of time to do the work.

It also does something else for the first time. It provides an expedited hearing process so that legal rights are not lost—they are protected—but you will not go back into a concept of a never-ending lawsuit moratorium.

In 1230, the bill recognizes that this year will be the first time since 1958 that we have a possibility of no offshore lease sales. And it wants to reverse that action to proceed promptly with the 5-year plan so that things, for example, in Virginia will be in effect within 1 year, and those that were scheduled in the gulf can be done within 1 year of the passage of this bill.

This bill simply will create billions in Federal Reserve revenues coming in, and it will create billions in our economy, and it will create jobs.

I hate to say this, but under President Obama, the cost of energy has skyrocketed. The administration has actively blocked and delayed energy production. It's cost jobs. It's raised energy prices. It's made the United States more reliant on unstable foreign countries for our energy. Through the American Energy Initiative, this House is actively working to increase American energy production to lower gas prices, to create American jobs, to generate revenue to help reduce the deficit, and to decrease our dependence on foreign energy.

The United States Government has had a long history of sporadic attempts to respond to oil and gas prices. Usually, we have missed the mark. But, unfortunately, oil is still the lifeblood of the world and will be for most of our lives. That is why 70 countries and 31 States in the United States are involved in the process. Prices are influenced by the signals that are given by worldwide circumstances and also by government policy.

These two bills are the first of several signals that this House wants to send to the world and to the economy that says our goal should be to come as close to economic and energy self-sufficiency and independence as possible. We are not an energy-poor Nation; and we need to be developing the resources in every way possible, including in the gulf, including in the Outer Continental Shelf, and including on our land sources. That is our future if we want to do anything to create jobs and help the American people. That is specifically what these two bills are aimed to do.

With such, Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule and a fair rule; and the underlying piece of legislation is entirely worthy of our support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today the House considers the BP respill bills. That might not be what they are officially called, but it's a much more accurate title for this legislation. It's clear that the authors of these BP respill bills did not learn any lessons from the Deepwater Horizon disasters. These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for offshore workers, 11 of whom died on the Deepwater Horizon. These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for the environment, which was coated with 4.1 million barrels of oil along the Gulf Coast and is killing fish and wildlife in the area to this day as a result of BP's recklessness.

These bills would make offshore drilling more dangerous for our national security because they reinforce the complete myth that America can somehow drill our way out of dependence on oil. And these bills are more dangerous for the economy, risking destroying fishing and tourism jobs in affected areas.

But one thing these bills do not do is make filling up at the pump any more affordable at all for American families. According to the American Petroleum Institute itself, the main advocacy group for oil interests, even if we opened all Federal land to oil drilling, including offshore areas, including Alaska's wildlife refuge and all Federal land that is in the national parks, they can't even say that it would reduce gas prices or oil prices. In fact, the cheap oil analyst at the Oil Price Information Service, which calculates gas prices for AAA, the motorist organization, said: "This drill, drill, drill thing is tired. It's a simplistic way of looking for a solution that doesn't exist."

So if this legislation isn't about reducing the price at the pump, what is it about? It's about exploiting our legitimate concerns about high gas prices to deliver another huge giveaway to Big Oil, an industry that made over \$35 billion in profits in the last quarter alone. Meanwhile, the majority refuses to end Big Oil's nearly \$50 billion of special interest tax breaks.

Yesterday in the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN brought forth a bill that would have ended the giveaway of tax revenue to Big Oil. Unfortunately, the Republican majority chose not to allow that amendment in this rule.

Had that been allowed under the open rule that Mr. MCGOVERN proposed, I would have brought forth an amendment on the floor to use those \$50 billion of revenue to reduce the corporate tax rate to help create jobs in America. Instead, the Republican majority is continuing to seek to keep American taxes high, to keep corporate taxes high, and this is another example of a job-destroying bill that keeps taxes high while picking winners and losers in the economy and using government subsidies to aid an industry that is one of our most profitable industries.

We should allow American businesses of all sizes to compete. The America corporate tax rate of 35 percent is higher than most of the rest of the world, which is why many companies continue to engage in operations overseas. If we can reduce it from 35 percent to 30 or 28 or 26 percent—and we could have done had Mr. MCGOVERN's amendment passed in the Rules Committee yesterday, and that is one of the reasons I oppose this rule today—that would create an enormous engine of economic growth.

While frequently the Republicans give lip service to lower taxes, they continue to use special interest tax breaks to keep taxes high on small- and middle-sized American companies that don't have the same lobbyists here in Washington to lobby us for special interest tax breaks.

We know that Big Oil would rather do without the fuss of showing that they can drill safely; but that's what this bill, in fact, delivers. This legislation states that the Interior Secretary must act on any drilling permit within 60 days, or it's automatically approved. What should be a very serious process to ensure safe drilling, to ensure that there aren't further disasters, and to ensure that jobs are not destroyed turns into little more than a rubber stamp, a rubber stamp for the further degradation of our economy and of our environment.

The second bill this rule makes in order claims to restart the process, or issuing, of oil and gas leases. Now, what the majority is doing in this is essentially validating what the administration has already done. The administration has already restarted offshore drilling in February. In fact, the administration has announced plans to offer all three Gulf of Mexico lease

sales that are mandated in this bill this year or early next year. Again, this particular policy is one that I don't agree with fully with the administration, but I am glad to see that the Republican majority is validating President Obama's leadership on this energy issue.

Together, these bills will not relieve pain at the pump, but they will increase the chances of another Deepwater Horizon disaster, costing lives, livelihoods, and hurting some of our precious natural resources. Why? Because that's what Big Oil wants. If Big Oil wants to keep taxes high for American companies, if Big Oil wants to destroy jobs, then the Republican majority is giving them that. In fact, even the problem the majority purports to be addressing with these bills, the speed of permitting in the gulf and restarting offshore oil drilling, doesn't even exist.

Here are the facts: Following the temporary pause on deepwater drilling last year, what Secretary Salazar listed in October, the oil industry wasn't able to demonstrate that it possessed the capacity to contain a deepwater blowout until February 2011. Once oil companies demonstrated that they had the capability to contain a blowout, the first permit was issued 11 days later, February 28, 2011. There have now been a total of 10 deepwater drilling permits issued since that time. In addition, there have been 39 shallow water permits approved since last October, matching the number from before the spill. Let me repeat that: matching the number of permits from before the spill. If anything, the majority, by acting through this bill, is effectively congratulating the administration on its leadership for speedily approving permits.

In addition, in the gulf region, the number of jobs that depend on tourism and fishing is five times the number of jobs related to the oil and gas industry. Gulf jobs related to oil and gas and other resource extraction total about 154,000. The total number of jobs for tourism and fishing are 777,000 jobs. So with this bill, the majority is putting at risk those 777,000 jobs for the benefit of 154,000. We should not put them at risk just to make the permitting process easier for Big Oil to exploit.

□ 0940

Passage of these bills is not good for the gulf coast's economy or its ecology, although it is best for Big Oil.

Again, while I appreciate the Republican majority's efforts to validate the leadership of President Obama on energy issues, this rule could be a lot better. Rather than keeping corporate taxes high, we could help make America more competitive by reducing corporate taxes and helping make American businesses more competitive, including the critical tourism and fishing industries in the gulf coast.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of very quick points, if I could.

Once again, the purpose of these two bills is to start our process going towards Americans having adequate energy supplies to live their lives. And it's one of the things that you either increase production or you try to cut back. Our goal is to increase the production.

The idea that what we are doing is in some way making safety less significant is silly. There are new safety rules that have been in place. They are ready. They are prepared. They are ready to go forward.

The myth of subsidies to Big Oil is one of the things also that we need to talk about because even my fellow Democrats have admitted that the President's plan to push a tax hike on energy taxes does result in the loss of American jobs and higher taxes on independent oil and gas companies.

I love the fact that we always spin things by talking about Big Oil. But the nonpartisan Politifact.com noted that a majority of the U.S. oil production comes not from the biggest multinational oil companies but from independent firms. American production activities are dominated by these independent producers who drill 95 percent of the Nation's natural gas and oil wells, accounting for as much as 67 percent of the total U.S. natural gas and oil production.

Often we try to find some kind of straw man which to attack, and the idea of Big Oil is one of those easiest ones to do. But in reality, if those tax hikes were to go into place on production, you would not be hitting the Big Oil companies; you're going to be hitting small companies which have 100 or fewer employees, not only offshore, but on the shore as well. That is the attack.

I'm sorry. I am not validating President Obama's leadership on this issue. To me, leadership means you do something. Inaction is not leadership.

It's not the government picking winners and losers. What this administration is doing by the de facto moratorium, the inability to move forward on this issue is simply picking losers, losers in the field, losers for America, losers in jobs, and that is wrong.

This tries to get us going ahead in an area and in a way in which we can do it, we should do it, we have the capability of doing it. All we simply need to do is do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule because my constituents in the State of Rhode Island can no longer wait for action to reduce the price of gas at the pump, and this bill does nothing at all to address this issue today.

Just last week the price of gasoline shot up to more than \$4 and, as we all know, this is an increasingly familiar story for States all across this Nation, hurting families and small businesses.

And it really underscores what I heard from my own constituents, hundreds of men, women, and families all throughout Rhode Island in recent weeks. We have got to find immediate solutions to lower the price of gas.

But the legislation before us this morning calling for domestic drilling will not provide the short-term relief that's needed right now. At the same time, it will make drilling more dangerous for our environment, for our economy, and for our national security.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have refused to take up the recommendations of the independent commission convened after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill and instead, continue to fight to protect Big Oil and continue to fight to protect subsidies while the American people are struggling with higher gasoline prices.

We've got to find solutions to lower the cost of fuel now. We've got to find solutions and ways to end the \$4 billion in tax breaks that pad the profits of Big Oil.

And the way to do that, Mr. Speaker, is to bring legislation already drafted, already introduced to the House floor for a vote immediately that would address the issue of the rising cost of gas. Legislation to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and legislation aimed at preventing Big Oil from engaging in price-gouging schemes which drive up the price of oil at the pump would go much further than anything that's in this bill and would help to ease the pain at the pump that American families are experiencing.

We need to do those two things. End the subsidies, and begin to address this urgent problem now. And stop taking measures that continue to advance the interests of Big Oil rather than the American people.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. For the moment I will reserve the balance of my time and enjoy the spin.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. We all understand the desire to do something about high gas prices, and we all sympathize with families in this economy who are struggling with \$4 a gallon gasoline.

But these bills will do nothing to provide American families with relief. They could threaten coastal ecosystems and the millions of Americans who rely on them.

It's been a year since we watched the horror in the gulf coast. We found that the agencies who oversee offshore drilling and the oil companies that engage in it were not prepared for the disaster. And Americans will be paying for that failure for years.

The administration has taken a number of steps to prevent future spills. Unfortunately, these bills undermine that process, making drilling less safe.

Instead of pretending as if one of these terrible environmental disasters never happened, Congress should implement the recommendations of the oil spill commission. We should be pursuing legislation that will reduce our dependence on oil by investing in things that give American commuters choices, in terms of more efficient vehicles, transportation alternatives, alternative fuels.

This bill, fortunately, will never be enacted into law. But I'm disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make in order any of the amendments to repeal unnecessary tax subsidies to the oil industry. At a time of record profits, it's adding insult to injury that billions of dollars are going to flow to the largest oil companies and make no difference to the consumer, no difference in the production of oil. It just adds to the bottom line of these international corporations.

I hope that at some point the House will be able to deal with these subsidies, which, even our Republican Speaker recently said, should be examined. And I've had legislation ready and ready to go for months now, and I hope it gets a chance to be voted on on this floor.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the subsidy issue, the simple fact of the matter is that the Republicans are not for free markets. But what they are for is Big Oil co-opting free markets. In fact, 70 percent of all energy-related subsidies go to fossil fuels like oil and coal. Less than 5 percent of subsidies go to renewable energies like wind and solar.

The gentleman from Utah pointed out that many of these subsidies help small drillers, and, in fact, that can be true. But it is easy to apply changes only to the Big Oil companies and not even affect independent producers.

There's simply no excuse not to end this corporate welfare which keeps taxes for all Americans who pay their taxes artificially high. In fact, at the same time that BP was reaping sizable tax benefits from leasing the Deepwater Horizon rig, it turned out that the company was using the tax break for the oil industry to write off 70 percent of the rent for Deepwater Horizon. That tax subsidy cost American taxpayers \$225,000 a day since the lease for Deepwater Horizon began. And that's just one example of many.

I also want to address some misperceptions regarding President Obama's policies regarding oil resources. The Obama administration is allowing, on average, more drilling than the Bush administration did. In fact, the Obama administration approved more leases in 2010 than the Bush administration did in any year except one of his presidency.

Again, in moving forward and reissuing permits, which the administration has already begun to do, this bill helps validate President Obama's leadership on this issue.

The real issues at hand are the subsidies that the industry continues to receive. As long as we continue a policy of using taxpayer dollars to artificially pick winners and losers in the economy, the winner here being Big Oil, the loser being American taxpayers, we will continue to hurt energy security, destroy jobs, and continue to put our environment at risk.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0950

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, Mr. BISHOP.

I am from Louisiana, and of course these leasing issues, the issues of drilling and oil production are very important to my State. And certainly any issue with regard to oil spills affects my State the most in the last year or so because of the Deepwater Horizon.

But here is the point I want to make: The President has said that oil production in the United States and offshore in the gulf is the highest it has ever been. When I asked Secretary Salazar in the Natural Resources Committee, he said the same thing. Then I asked Mr. Bromwich and he gave the same answer.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the oil production off the Gulf of Mexico peaked at 1.7 million barrels a day. It is now down to 1.5 million barrels a day, and in the next year it will decrease by another 225,000 barrels a day. And even if we restore drilling permits at the level they have been previously, it will continue to decline over the next several years.

So I think we can ill afford, Mr. Speaker, at a time when our gas prices continue to go up, to continue this activity that we have, this ruse, where we have a slowatorium off the Gulf of Mexico.

I think we are up to about 12 permits in the deep water at this point. And I was speaking with the gentleman, an expert on this, yesterday. He said that we normally pace about 40 or 50 permits a year. So that means that we are at a fraction of what the actual permitting process would normally be in the best of times.

Now, some would say, well, we haven't proven that it is safe. Well, if that is true, why is the administration releasing permits? Obviously that is proof that the administration is comfortable that we can again drill in the deep water off the Gulf of Mexico.

So I say today that with America being at gas prices that will soon approach \$5 a gallon and the USGS now saying that we now have more coal, natural gas, and oil than we have ever thought we would have, really more than any other country in the world, including Russia, and many more times than what Saudi Arabia has, 1.3 trillion barrels of oil equivalent if you add coal, natural gas, and oil, why in the world are we pulling back on the explo-

ration and production of these vital resources that we have?

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

I will say in summary, I am from the Fourth District of Louisiana where we have a veritable Saudi Arabia of natural gas in my district, the most natural gas in North America and the fourth largest deposit in the world, and we didn't even know about it 4 years ago. That just goes to show you how new technologies in the area of exploration and development are creating many more resources than we ever thought we had, and it will help stabilize our prices.

So I ask that we pass this bill today and that we finally get this country back onto stable footing.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that, immediately after the House adopts this rule, we will bring up H.R. 1689, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act of 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation, in its analysis of the administration's budget, stated that the repeal of oil and gas preferences are "likely to have no effect on the world price of fossil fuels, and any increase in prices for domestically consumed fossil fuels are likely to be attenuated."

Again, when we talk about ending the giveaway to Big Oil and Gas, it will have no effect with regard to actual energy prices.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this very important issue, important in having an immediate impact on America's families.

They are feeling the pain at the pump. Our families, our workers, our small businesses, every day it gets worse for them, the price at the pump. So what can we do about it? Well, we can do a number of things, and we will, that we have been advocating for.

Of course we must increase domestic production, and there is a way to do that. But that is not all that we have to do. The American people understand that their tax dollars are going to subsidies for Big Oil. If we ended those subsidies, we could save over \$30 billion for the American people.

To put it into context, my colleagues, for the first quarter of this

year, the Big Five oil companies made profits of over \$30 billion. Why are we, the taxpayers, subsidizing their drilling of oil when they are making huge profits, doing it in the free market?

President Obama has written to leaders in Congress asking to bring a bill to the floor to end these subsidies. I have written to Speaker BOEHNER asking him to do so. He has said the oil companies should pay their fair share. Mr. RYAN, the chair of the Budget Committee, has acknowledged that in his own district. And yet, in the budget that is proposed by the Republicans, Big Oil still gets a big subsidy from the taxpayer. It would mean a great deal to us, in a situation where we are saying to seniors, We are going to cut Medicare; you are going to have to pay \$6,000 a year more, at a minimum, for fewer benefits because we want to cut Medicare at the same time we are giving tax cuts, big tax breaks to Big Oil.

So here we are today. Just last week, ExxonMobil reported \$10.7 billion in profits during the first quarter of 2011. Over \$10 billion in profits, a 69 percent jump from last year. In fact, this quarter marked some of the largest oil profits since 2008.

Democrats are introducing comprehensive legislation. Mr. TIM BISHOP is going to be leading us on the previous question, which we urge our colleagues to vote "no" on so that we can bring up Mr. BISHOP's legislation.

Much of what that does is to eliminate tax breaks for the five largest oil companies, saving over \$31 billion over 10 years. Think of it. We are trying to just save \$31 billion over 10 years, when the oil companies made \$31 billion in profits in the first quarter of this year. That is so unfair to the taxpayer.

Legislation to ensure that oil companies are paying the royalties that are due the American taxpayer. Hold Big Oil and the industry accountable for price gouging at the pump. Use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to increase the oil supply and combat price hikes. In addition to that, we must end the harmful speculation which Wall Street tells us accounts for a large percentage of the increase in the price at the pump.

We also will have measures that increase American energy production. It is very important. We don't disagree that we have to have production, but we do agree that we have to do other things that have a more immediate effect on the price at the pump. And we can do that. And we must invest in our clean energy future, which will reduce our dependence on foreign oil, which is a national security issue, which will enable us to create new green jobs in our country, a jobs issue which is a moral obligation we have to the American people to create jobs.

But what the Republicans are proposing today has blinders on it. It does not recognize that what it is doing does nothing to reduce the price at the pump in the short term; that there are

many other avenues that we can proceed down in addition to increasing domestic production; and that the American people need something fresher and newer on this than being sabotaged every few years about the price at the pump while we, the taxpayers, are giving subsidies to Big Oil to drill while they are making profits in the first quarter of 1 year that are almost more than what we would save for the taxpayer.

□ 1000

They don't need a subsidy to drill. They don't need an incentive. They have the profit motive, and it has served them well.

We in this Congress have to be thinking about the future. How do we prevent this from happening again, but also how do we have the most immediate effect on the price at the pump? Congressman TIM BISHOP gives us that opportunity today, recognizing that we want to have the full diversity of energy possibilities available to us so that the American taxpayer and the American consumer are well-served.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, to allow Mr. TIM BISHOP to bring up an initiative that he will talk about that addresses concerns of the American people that they know about, that they want to end subsidies on Big Oil, especially when we are talking about it in the context of we must cut investments in Medicare, seniors must pay more, but don't ask us to cut subsidies to Big Oil. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who lives in this area and understands the situation firsthand.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't disagree more with the comments that were made by the minority leader from California. What we are talking about here are high gas prices that people are paying at the pump today and why we are in this situation. We are in this situation because of this administration's policies that have shut off the American energy supply.

This is supply and demand. Why do prices go up? Well, gee-whiz, if the President of the United States says by policy we are going to close off billions of barrels of known reserves in America, what do you think that does to prices? Do you think that actually lowers prices? Of course, as you are seeing prices skyrocket at the pump, it is because of these policies. That is why we have seen the price of gasoline more than double since Barack Obama has been in office.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are bringing today and what this rule addresses is the ability to start opening up some of those known areas here in America, because, again, our demand continues to increase for oil here in this country,

and while the President is out tilting at windmills, the prices at the pump continue to skyrocket because the President is saying run those jobs off to foreign countries, like Brazil.

He is bragging that he wants to create more energy jobs in Brazil. We are saying, Mr. President, we have thousands of jobs here in America that we can create today. We have got billions of dollars that are being sent to foreign countries, many of whom don't like us, by the way. We can bring those dollars back. And, by the way, that can also help us pay down the national debt that is out of control right now. And that is what this bill addresses.

And what's their answer on the other side? The President is talking about raising taxes on American energy, and the minority leader from California just emphasized it. She talked about a \$30 billion tax increase on American energy production. You want to talk about a warped policy? Look at what their plan is.

We're saying let's open up supply. Let's create jobs in America. I have seen it in south Louisiana. We have lost over 13,000 jobs in the energy industry just because of the President's policies in the last year, where he shut down production and said you can't go back to work drilling safely for known oil in America. But he wants to run those jobs off to foreign countries. So that is what is happening.

We saw one of the deepwater rigs go to Egypt just in the last few months. So an employer is saying, I want to take a thousand jobs and it's better to do business in Egypt because of these radical American policies on energy right now. So we are trying to turn that around and say let's actually explore for energy here in America, creating thousands more jobs in America and bringing in billions more dollars that pay down our deficit.

Their answer is raise \$30 billion in taxes and, you know, go talk about Big Oil. Big Oil is not going to pay that. Big Oil is leaving. They are going to foreign countries. It is our local energy producers here in America who will pay that tax. And you know what that ends up equating to? That means higher prices at the pump, \$30 billion in higher prices at the pump, because of their policy.

And they're bragging about it. They're saying, let's raise taxes on American energy. By the way, their bill doesn't apply to energy that is produced in Saudi Arabia. So what do you think is going to happen?

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Now more oil is going to be coming in from Saudi Arabia because of their policies.

We have got to reverse this radical approach and actually create jobs in America, create energy in America and bring down the skyrocketing price of gasoline at the pump, and it can all be

accomplished with this legislation here today that I strongly support.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

The oil companies are making windfall profits right now. Look at what just happened in the last 3 months: ExxonMobil made \$10 billion; Shell, \$8 billion; BP, \$7 billion; \$6 billion for Chevron; \$3 billion for Conoco. Yet the Republicans oppose allowing the Democrats to bring out here a motion that will take away tax breaks that are meant for companies that make toasters or aluminum foil, but not the oil industry.

The oil industry does not need a subsidy from the American taxpayer as they are tipping consumers upside down at the pump every single day. We need to take back those tax breaks and use them; use them to reduce the deficit, use them to help grandma with Medicare, use them for things that are important, but not for oil companies at this time.

So, what have the Republicans decided to do? The Republicans instead have decided to squeeze—to squeeze Medicare, to squeeze the program for grandma, so that they can find the revenues to give tax breaks for oil companies. I will tell you, the GOP has set up a legislative drill rig on top of the Medicare program to poke holes in our seniors' safety net. That is right, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are building a pipeline into the pocketbooks of our seniors so that they can pump them dry. No money for Medicare, but plenty of breaks for the oil companies. And they are going to deny the Democrats the ability to have a vote here on the House floor on those tax breaks for oil companies here today.

There is one thing that we can do in order to ensure that the speculators in the marketplace are told there is a cop on the beat, and that is to deploy the Strategic Petroleum Reserve right now. In 1991, Bush the First used it. The price went down 33 percent. In 2000, the President used the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, President Clinton. It went down 18 percent. Bush the Second used it in 2005 after Katrina. The price went down 9 percent. That is the weapon we can use right now, and send a message to Big Oil, to OPEC, and to the speculators that we mean business.

What the Republicans are saying here today is we are going to cut Medicare in order to have tax breaks for the wealthiest oil companies in the history of the world. That is not what the American people want to hear at this time of high energy prices in our country, with a dagger pointed right at the heart of the American economy, and that is what OPEC and the speculators and Big Oil are doing to our country.

Vote "yes" today on the previous question to give the American taxpayers the relief they need from these

gifts which we give to Big Oil. Vote “no” on the rule and “yes” on the previous question.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I rise to ask in particular that we have a reasoned debate on this question.

I come from the gulf region and was appalled at the horror of the BP oil spill. My constituents are still suffering from that spill. I recognize that we have a dual responsibility, and that is to ensure that those individuals are made whole—and I might add that a better compensation system needs to be in place—but also that we restore jobs.

A civil discussion is what is needed. As an oil and gas lawyer and also a member of the Homeland Security Committee which addresses the question of our own safety and security, we have to find a way to restore offshore deepwater drilling in a safe and secure manner.

□ 1010

I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not take an amendment that I offered that would have modified the processing procedures of H.R. 1229, to restart that leasing process to extend the time for the Department of the Interior to review safely and securely and to eliminate the deemed provision, though I am supporting the Holt amendment and, of course, the Moran amendment.

But, frankly, I think the issue is, energy at this time is multitasking, from nuclear energy to solar, to wind, to biofuels and fossil fuels (oil and gas). If we are in agreement with Brazil to do offshore deepwater drilling off the coast of Brazil, we need to restart that deepwater drilling here in the United States, safely and securely. As relates to the expanded lease sales, the question has to be whether States are prepared for that offshore drilling and whether or not we have secured the kind of technology that will allow us to do it safely and securely. I believe new containment processes are being put in place to help deepwater drilling to lower costs for the America people.

Energy companies have organized something called a containment group to develop that new technology. What I would say is that this discussion should not be captured by special interests where we try the “get you” politics for the Department of the Interior or “get you” politics for President Obama. This is the time to get the best politics for the American people, to bring down gasoline prices, invest in energy which includes deepwater drilling and oil and gas, and let’s get going on helping the American people to boost energy resource and to create jobs.

I ask for a reasoned discussion on this important issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we heard from our friend from Massachusetts the allegation that we over here on this side of the aisle were squeezing Medicare. Good grief. Even now has the gentleman from Massachusetts not read the ObamaCare bill? It cuts \$500 billion out of Medicare.

We heard from Minority Leader PELOSI that we have a moral obligation to create jobs. Then what this administration has done under her definition is immoral, because this administration has been killing jobs. We hear so much from the other side about the working poor. Coming from an area in Texas where we have lots of hardworking poor folks, that’s who is being hurt by this administration’s policies. When you shut off the jobs in the Gulf of Mexico, when you come out and say we’re going to tax these American companies even more, we’re going to take away their subsidies, they’re called business deductions, the cost of drilling, the cost of doing business.

And who will be taxed? American companies. We will be putting further tariffs on, not foreign products but American companies. We drive ourselves more and more to foreign oil, and that’s a mistake. Price controls is what President Carter did. He was going to show the energy companies, and as a result we had no gas, we ran out of gas, it was a disaster. Salazar has shut down leases that were let after a 7-year process that could have produced as many as a trillion barrels of oil.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOHMERT. You could have an immediate effect if you would encourage your party’s President to change course and start creating jobs. The energy industry would create a million jobs across the country if we opened up the OCS. We’ve heard the testimony a million jobs if ANWR is opened. A million jobs if the North Slope is opened.

What is more, we’ve also heard from people that know that a dollar out of four is most likely attributable to speculation. The speculators look at what we do. And we make it harder and harder to produce our own energy, the speculation keeps going up. You could turn around a dollar out of four overnight if we showed the world, we’re going to use our own energy.

This country has been blessed with more natural resources when you put them all together, and this administration and the former majority has done more to put them off-limits. It’s time to get back to what the former Speaker said was our moral obligation. You lower energy prices by using more of our own energy, you create jobs, and you bring down the price that is killing the working poor. And that’s a moral obligation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, a former member of the Rules Committee, Ms. CASTOR.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. In the State of Florida, we are still recovering from last year’s BP oil blowout disaster. We’re recovering economically and environmentally from the policies of the past that elevated oil company profits over safety.

To add insult to injury, every summer the price of gas goes up, and we see it in Florida because our economy is largely tied to tourism, and we see it and it pains us and consumers know that they are messing around with the American consumer. They understand that the Wall Street speculators are making a profit, maybe 20 percent in the price of gas, and that is not fair.

Why don’t we start with a meaningful energy policy that addresses those speculators? Instead of continuing oil company giveaways, why don’t we start with ending the taxpayer subsidies to the big oil companies? Just in the first quarter of this year, BP has made over \$5 billion in profit. Exxon has made over \$10 billion in profit. With the skyrocketing debt and deficit, why is it fair for the American taxpayer to be subsidizing the most profitable companies in the world? That is where we should begin this debate today, ending those oil company subsidies to bring down the price of gas and tackling the outrageous profits that go to the oil companies while the consumer is paying through the nose at the pump.

My Republican friends are on the wrong track when it comes to energy policy. We’ve got to prohibit Wall Street speculators from artificially inflating prices. We’ve got to adopt the oil spill commission’s recommendations to make drilling safe before we charge ahead and open up new areas to drill. There are millions of acres to drill. Millions of acres. All we’re asking is fairness and safety as they proceed in doing so so the American taxpayer will not have to pay any more.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LANDRY). He is a member of the Resources Committee that provides a great deal of insight from his personal background.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, what amazes me is that the gentlelady from Florida must have missed the AP report a couple of weeks ago when it said that Florida was getting ready to experience another oil crisis and it was in the fact that the price at the pump is going to impact tourism.

Tourism. That’s what I hear here all the time. Our tourism jobs. Jobs that normally pay minimum wage. When in my State, oil and gas jobs pay much better than that.

If we want to get this economy rolling, we have to provide that economy

with affordable energy, not make-believe energy, not energy that comes in possibly 40 or 50 years from now. We need to apply affordable energy to this economy now. It will not get any better in this country until we give middle class Americans affordable energy, so that they can get to and from their job.

Repealing section 199 will endanger 600,000 barrels per day, 10 percent of our domestic production by 2017. Boy, that's really going to lower the price at the pump.

They're concerned about Medicare and Medicaid. Well, where do you think those profits to shareholders go? Do you know who those shareholders are? They're the American people. Do you know how many pension plans hold those shares of Exxon and Chevron in their portfolio?

Why are we picking those winners and losers? As a freshman, it's hard for me to understand how we continue in this town to reward failure and punish winners. It just amazes me.

□ 1020

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, one thing we do know is that our constituents are paying about \$4 a gallon for gas. What they have to ask is: Where's all this money that they're paying going? Well, as you have seen, it's going in profits to the biggest oil companies. In fact, almost \$30 billion went just in the last 3 months to the top three oil companies—about \$11 billion to Exxon, about \$9 billion to Shell, and over \$7 billion to BP. Remember BP? And that's after they've taken \$5 billion in subsidies from the taxpayer and as in the case of ExxonMobil paid zero corporate taxes.

Well, what are they doing with that profit? What they're doing is spending 90 percent of it on stock buy-backs so that, of course, the remaining stock outstanding becomes even more valuable, thus enabling their executives to become even wealthier, and to stock dividends for their shareholders. And the remaining 10 percent goes to oil and gas exploration and to TV advertising so they can convince the American public otherwise.

What this bill will do is to enable those who own oil company stock and run oil companies to grab up our last remaining oil reserves at a cost of \$30 to \$40 a barrel so that they can then sell it at \$100 a barrel to make more profit. The motivation for this bill is more about scoring political points and currying favor with the oil and gas industry than the current House majority can't seem to coddle enough. And they're betting that the next oil spill disaster that this legislation could enable through a return to weaker regulation—weaker regulation than we had before the gulf oil spill disaster, will not occur on their watch. That oil spill disaster that spilled 200 million gallons into the Gulf Coast waters occurred at a time of even tougher regulation than this bill will create.

They are counting on the oil companies remembering and the consumers and taxpayers forgetting.

This bill should be defeated.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this rule brings forward two bills that are the first of the majority party's "amnesia acts," which ignore the safety and environmental concerns that were laid bare last spring and summer by the largest oil spill in United States waters. For the sponsors of this bill, it's as if the worst and most costly oil spill in history never happened. Last week, the Big Five oil companies reported \$32 billion in profits. That's just for the first 3 months of this year. Yet the majority's solution is to protect the billions of dollars of tax breaks each year for these companies.

Just to give you an idea, Exxon pays an effective tax rate of 0.4 percent. I imagine every person in America would like to have a tax rate of essentially zero. Yet the majority's solution is to protect these tax breaks. Furthermore, they deem the environmental and safety regulations that existed before this accident in the gulf as satisfactory. And let's be clear: How much will these bills reduce gas prices for the American people? Zero dollars and zero cents.

Scientists, engineers, and our best energy analysts say we cannot drill our way to lower gas prices. This won't do it. Let's address the financial speculation that we've heard about—the real cause of high gasoline prices. Exxon, with those huge prices, what do they do? They buy back their stock.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HOLT. These actions needlessly endanger the lives of offshore workers, imperil the resources and livelihoods of fishermen. This legislation is designed to give Big Oil more handouts. These companies are not being responsible citizens.

Vote "no" on the rule, vote "yes" on my amendment, vote "no" on the bills.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. I rise to oppose this rule.

Americans are feeling pain at the pump. Rising gasoline prices—and they're rising, folks—it's going to cost the average person another \$800 per year at the rate of these increases. That wipes out the tax breaks that most Americans have just received, and it's going to hurt our economy, and it's hurting our national security. These oil companies are making in-

creased profits as the money in our wallets flies right into the gas tanks.

Now is the time to consider a sensible energy policy and to strip subsidies from oil companies. It shocks every American taxpayer to know that they're required to fork over an additional \$40 billion-plus over the next decade to give tax subsidies and giveaways to these enormously profitable companies. What are they doing with that money? They're taking up to 90 percent of that and buying their stocks back, increasing their own personal wealth.

So let's be clear. Oil companies don't need it. If you don't believe me, ask them. The former CEO of Shell oil says, "With higher oil prices, the subsidies aren't necessary."

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say they're for the all-of-the-above strategy when it comes to oil. Let's be clear. They support oil above all—above Medicare, above putting police on the streets, above increasing reading teachers, and above protecting our coastal communities.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), another great new member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. This isn't about oil company profits. This is about supply and demand. We don't have the supply necessary to meet the energy needs in this country. But the American people know that we've got the resources here in this country, whether it's offshore, on the Outer Continental Shelf, or on Federal lands that have currently under this administration been taken off the table for energy production. Supply and demand drives the price. We are reliant on foreign sources of oil, and a foreign group known as OPEC determines the price of that oil they sell to us. We've got the resource in this country. This legislation will put the gulf back to work, meeting the energy needs for the American people.

I'm a small business owner. I doubt many people that serve in this body have ever run a business, met a payroll, and tried to meet their overhead. I can tell you what \$4.85 a gallon in August of 2008 meant to my small business only running two trucks on the road. I can only imagine what the loggers, what the truckers, what the farmers, and the other industries in the Third Congressional District of South Carolina are feeling today with the experience of rising oil prices.

The gentlelady from Florida said that in the summer, prices go up. We're not in summer yet. Prices are going up because of supply and demand. We have the opportunity to meet our demand right here by harvesting American resources for our American energy needs.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

With regard to the last comment, it is the oil cartels that drive prices, not the normal functions of the market and supply and demand.

With regard to the oil subsidies, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity here today to see where the Republicans and the Democrats in the House stand on deficit reduction. Mr. Speaker, by defeating the previous question, we can and we will reduce the deficit by over \$12.8 billion. We have the chance to have the discussion around the continuing resolution, around the budget, around deficit reduction. And here we have an opportunity, without impacting the price of oil, without impacting what consumers pay at the pump, to reduce the deficit by \$12.8 billion by defeating the previous question. I think that's what the American people want to see.

The American people spoke out in the last election. Let's reduce the deficit. Let's work across the aisle to see what we can do to cut unnecessary government expenditures, to make those decisions to help make sure that we can leave something other than a legacy of debt to the next generation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is an easy one. Let's defeat the previous question and reduce the deficit by \$12.8 billion.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a document from the Treasury Department which states that the manufacturing deduction for oil and gas effectively provides a lower rate of tax with respect to a favored source of income. In fact, it distorts the market by encouraging more investment in the oil and gas industry than would occur under a neutral system.

Again, by returning to the free market, we are able to reduce the deficit by over \$12.8 billion instead of having Big Government trying to pick winners and losers in the economy with regard to tax policy.

GENERAL EXPLANATIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL YEAR 2012 REVENUE PROPOSALS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, FEBRUARY 2011

REPEAL DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING DEDUCTION FOR OIL AND NATURAL GAS COMPANIES
CURRENT LAW

A deduction is allowed with respect to income attributable to domestic production activities (the manufacturing deduction). For taxable years beginning after 2009, the manufacturing deduction is generally equal to 9 percent of the lesser of qualified production activities income for the taxable year or taxable income for the taxable year, limited to 50 percent of the W-2 wages of the taxpayer for the taxable year. The deduction for income from oil and gas production activities is computed at a 6 percent rate.

Qualified production activities income is generally calculated as a taxpayer's domes-

tic production gross receipts (i.e., the gross receipts derived from any lease, rental, license, sale, exchange, or other disposition of qualifying production property manufactured, produced, grown, or extracted by the taxpayer in whole or significant part within the United States; any qualified film produced by the taxpayer; or electricity, natural gas, or potable water produced by the taxpayer in the United States) minus the cost of goods sold and other expenses, losses, or deductions attributable to such receipts.

The manufacturing deduction generally is available to all taxpayers that generate qualified production activities income, which under current law includes income from the sale, exchange or disposition of oil, natural gas or primary products thereof produced in the United States.

REASONS FOR CHANGE

The President agreed at the G-20 Summit in Pittsburgh to phase out subsidies for fossil fuels so that the United States can transition to a 21st-century energy economy. The manufacturing deduction for oil and gas effectively provides a lower rate of tax with respect to a favored source of income. The lower rate of tax, like other oil and gas preferences the Administration proposes to repeal, distorts markets by encouraging more investment in the oil and gas industry than would occur under a neutral system. This market distortion is detrimental to long-term energy security and is also inconsistent with the Administration's policy of supporting a clean energy economy, reducing our reliance on oil, and cutting carbon pollution. Moreover, the tax subsidy for oil and gas must ultimately be financed with taxes that result in underinvestment in other, potentially more productive, areas of the economy.

PROPOSAL

The proposal would retain the overall manufacturing deduction, but exclude from the definition of domestic production gross receipts all gross receipts derived from the sale, exchange or other disposition of oil, natural gas or a primary product thereof for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2011. There is a parallel proposal to repeal the domestic manufacturing deduction for coal and other hard mineral fossil fuels.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to submit for the RECORD a July 3, 2010, New York Times article regarding oil subsidies.

Again, this talks of the oil subsidies that continue to benefit this industry to the detriment of the American taxpayer and to the detriment of future generations of Americans who will continue to suffer under an increasing mountain of debt unless we defeat the previous question here today.

[From NY Times, July 3, 2010]

ON SUBSIDIES

But an examination of the American tax code indicates that oil production is among the most heavily subsidized businesses, with tax breaks available at virtually every stage of the exploration and extraction process.

According to the most recent study by the Congressional Budget Office, capital investments like oil field leases and drilling equipment are taxed at an effective rate of 9 percent, significantly lower than the overall rate of 25 percent for businesses in general and lower than virtually any other industry.

And for many small and midsize oil companies, the tax on capital investments is so low that it is more than eliminated by various credits. These companies' returns on those investments are often higher after taxes than before.

Efforts to curtail the tax breaks are likely to face fierce opposition in Congress; the oil and natural gas industry has spent \$340 million on lobbyists since 2008, according to the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics, which monitors political spending.

Some of the tax breaks date back nearly a century, when they were intended to encourage exploration in an era of rudimentary technology, when costly investments frequently produced only dry holes. Because of one lingering provision from the Tariff Act of 1913, many small and midsize oil companies based in the United States can claim deductions for the lost value of tapped oil fields far beyond the amount the companies actually paid for the oil rights.

Other tax breaks were born of international politics. In an attempt to deter Soviet influence in the Middle East in the 1950s, the State Department backed a Saudi Arabian accounting maneuver that reclassified the royalties charged by foreign governments to American oil drillers. Saudi Arabia and others began to treat some of the royalties as taxes, which entitled the companies to subtract those payments from their American tax bills. Despite repeated attempts to forbid this accounting practice, companies continue to deduct the payments. The Treasury Department estimates that it will cost \$8.2 billion over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year after the national tragedy of Deepwater Horizon, the majority party has decided not to address a single problem that led to this economic and environmental tragedy. Instead, the majority is pushing through these bills, simply rubber-stamping offshore drilling and maintaining taxpayer subsidies and giveaways to Big Oil, which increase the deficit.

During a Special Order speech just the other night, a Member on the other side of the aisle said all you need is an eighth grade understanding of supply and demand to understand why gas prices are high and how we can lower them by drilling more. Fortunately, for those of us who have more than an eighth grade education, like economists and other experts, we know that America cannot drill its way out of high gas prices. Even the American Petroleum Institute, the mouthpiece for Big Oil, is saying that we cannot drill our way out. "Drill, Baby, Drill" may look good as a bumper sticker, but it's not a serious energy policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill and to defeat the previous question so we can reduce the deficit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the minority is asking us to walk down a tangent issue by using negative cue words like "subsidy," so let me walk down that for 30 seconds.

Please realize the U.S. oil and natural gas industry does not receive subsidized payments from the government. The word "subsidy" is inaccurate. Tax deductions should in no way be confused with the concept of subsidies. There are, though, tax deductions that go to all industries. Section 199, which has been talked about by the Democrats, is the domestic manufacturers'

deduction. Every industry—manufacturing, producing, growing, extracting—gets a 9 percent of earned income deduction, not a credit, except for oil and gas; but they are limited to just 6 percent. There is similarity.

They've also asked us to try and walk down a tangent in talking about safety, but the ideas of safety are codified in the legislation before us. They then say let's increase our production by raising taxes. What a non sequitur. Even if you raise taxes against somebody else and try to create some kind of straw man to attack, that is simply a non sequitur, because we do not have a tax problem in this country. We have a production problem; we have a jobs problem. These two bills go directly to that problem. They increase production and increase jobs.

We are not trying to pick winners and losers. We want the Americans to be winners, and that's what our choice is to be. These are two good bills in a time of \$4 and \$5 gasoline prices that are devastating jobs and our economy. These bills surely should be something that every Member should support.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230.

We like to stand on this floor and talk about the things we can't agree on.

On this issue, there's more common ground than you might think.

We all seek to end our dependence on foreign oil because it endangers our environment, hurts our economy and weakens our national security.

Our disagreement lies in potential solutions.

In order to lower gas prices we can and must crack down on oil speculators, end big oil handouts, invest in public transit and electric vehicles and increase corporate average fuel economy standards.

The other side of the argument, the one that is presented today and that we will be voting on, would have you believe that all we need to do is increase our domestic oil resources and remove regulations.

Regulations that have purportedly forced us to look outside our nation's borders for oil.

Our answers do not lie in more oil—our answers lie in conservation and smart investments.

They do not lie in increasing our oil supply, because, let's face it, oil prices are based on a global market, and one nod from OPEC would make any increase in U.S. domestic supplies irrelevant.

Our answers cannot be found by damaging the ecosystems the industries along our coast rely on.

And, our answers will not be solutions that defy our military experts who are saying oil ain't the answer.

Earlier this week, I offered an amendment that was not made in order by the Rules Committee—an amendment that said we must look at the damage we could incur before we extract oil and gas.

This same common sense must be applied to our energy plan.

We can proactively move our nation toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil so that we take control of our energy future, protect our nation, our economy and our environment—and we must.

But, these are not our solutions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, H.R. 1229 and H.R. 1230.

Mr. Speaker, these bills aren't serious solutions to bring down high gas prices.

Instead, these are nothing more than a political exercise meant to keep the big oil companies happy.

Big oil companies have every reason to be happy these days.

Last week, ExxonMobil announced first-quarter profits of nearly \$10.7 billion.

Let me repeat that—\$10.7 billion. That's a 69% increase over the same three month period last year.

American taxpayers are paying nearly \$4 dollars a gallon for gasoline and we're still giving \$4 billion in subsidies to Big Oil?

Give me a break.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment—as a standalone bill—that would eliminate subsidies for big oil. My amendment would have done nothing to prevent these drilling bills from moving forward.

Ending subsidies for corporations that are making money hand over fist while gouging Americans shouldn't be controversial.

Apparently, my Republican colleagues on the Rules Committee didn't see it the same way. My amendment wasn't made in order.

Instead, here we are today debating legislation that would boost Big Oil's profits even more without doing anything to lower gas prices for American families.

More drilling won't lower gas prices. It's that simple.

Even with an expedited permitting approval process—that ignores any environmental impact assessment—we wouldn't see any of this additional supply in the market for years.

And the notion that we've run out of areas to drill because we've exhausted all current offshore drilling sites is ludicrous.

Oil companies currently have access to nearly 80 million acres to drill for oil, including 38 million acres offshore. But they produce oil on only 4 percent of those acres.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are so fond of saying these days that people should be able to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

I wish they would apply that same "tough love" to the record profit-making oil companies at a time when American families are being gouged at the pump.

I oppose this Rule and the underlying bills and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 245 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1689) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities with respect to oil and gas activities of major integrated oil companies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority

member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 4 of this resolution.

The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 171, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—241

Adams	Coble	Gohmert
Aderholt	Coffman (CO)	Goodlatte
Akin	Cole	Gosar
Alexander	Conaway	Gowdy
Amash	Costa	Granger
Austria	Cravaack	Graves (GA)
Bachmann	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Bachus	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Barletta	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Bartlett	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Griffith (VA)
Bass (NH)	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Benishkek	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Berg	DesJarlais	Guinta
Biggert	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Dold	Hall
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Hanna
Black	Duffy	Harper
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Bonner	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Bono Mack	Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Boren	Farenthold	Hayworth
Boustany	Fincher	Heck
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Heller
Brooks	Flake	Hensarling
Broun (GA)	Fleischmann	Herger
Buchanan	Fleming	Herrera Beutler
Bucshon	Flores	Hinojosa
Buerkle	Forbes	Huelskamp
Burgess	Fortenberry	Huizenga (MI)
Burton (IN)	Fox	Hultgren
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Hunter
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Hurt
Campbell	Gallegly	Issa
Canseco	Gardner	Jackson Lee
Capito	Garrett	Jones
Carter	Gerlach	Jenkins
Cassidy	Gibbs	Johnson (IL)
Chabot	Gibson	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Gingrey (GA)	Jones
		Jordan

Kelly	Neugebauer	Schock	Waters	Welch	Wu
King (IA)	Noem	Schweikert	Watt	Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth
Kingston	Nugent	Scott (SC)	Waxman	Woolsey	
Kinzinger (IL)	Nunes	Scott, Austin			
Kline	Nunnelee	Sensenbrenner			
Labrador	Olson	Sessions	Ackerman	Giffords	Pascarell
Lamborn	Palazzo	Shimkus	Bilbray	Gonzalez	Rangel
Lance	Paul	Shuster	Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Landry	Paulsen	Simpson	Clyburn	King (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
Lankford	Pearce	Smith (NE)	Crowley	Meeks	Van Hollen
Latham	Pence	Smith (NJ)	Emerson	Nadler	Weiner
LaTourette	Petri	Smith (TX)	Engel	Oliver	
Latta	Pitts	Southerland			
Lewis (CA)	Platts	Stearns			
LoBiondo	LoBiondo	Poe (TX)			
Long	Lucas	Pompeo			
Lucas	Luetkemeyer	Posey			
Lummis	Lummis	Price (GA)			
Lungren, Daniel	Lungren, Daniel	Quayle			
E.	E.	Reed			
Mack	Mack	Rehberg			
Manzullo	Manzullo	Renacci			
Marchant	Marchant	Ribble			
Marino	Marino	Rigell			
McCarthy (CA)	McCarthy (CA)	Rivera			
McCaul	McCaul	Roby			
McClintock	McClintock	Roe (TN)			
McCotter	McCotter	Rogers (AL)			
McHenry	McHenry	Rogers (KY)			
McKeon	McKeon	Rogers (MI)			
McKinley	McKinley	Rohrabacher			
McMorris	McMorris	Rokita			
Rodgers	Rodgers	Roose			
Meehan	Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen			
Mica	Mica	Roskam			
Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Ross (FL)			
Miller (MI)	Miller (MI)	Royce			
Miller, Gary	Miller, Gary	Runyan			
Mulvaney	Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)			
Murphy (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Scalise			
Myrick	Myrick	Schilling			
		Schmidt			

NAYS—171

Altmire	Filner	Murphy (CT)
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Baca	Fudge	Neal
Baldwin	Garamendi	Owens
Barrow	Grijalva	Pallone
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanabusa	Payne
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Berman	Heinrich	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hinchee	Pingree (ME)
Boswell	Hirono	Polis
Brady (PA)	Holden	Price (NC)
Brayley (IA)	Holt	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Honda	Rahall
Butterfield	Hoyer	Reyes
Capps	Inslee	Richardson
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Ross (AR)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Chandler	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kind	T.
Ciциlline	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Schakowsky
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Lipinski	Serrano
Costello	Loeb sack	Sewell
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
Critz	Lowe	Shuler
Cummings	Lujan	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Markey	Speier
DeGette	Matheson	Stark
DeLauro	Matsui	Sutton
Deutch	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McDermott	Tierney
Doggett	McGovern	Tonko
Donnelly (IN)	McIntyre	Towns
Doyle	McNeary	Tsongas
Edwards	Michaud	Velazquez
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Vislosky
Eshoo	Miller, George	Walz (MN)
Farr	Moore	Wasserman
Fattah	Moran	Schultz

Waters	Welch	Wu
Watt	Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth
Waxman	Woolsey	

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman	Giffords	Pascarell
Bilbray	Gonzalez	Rangel
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Clyburn	King (NY)	Rothman (NJ)
Crowley	Meeks	Van Hollen
Emerson	Nadler	Weiner
Engel	Oliver	

□ 1059

Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. HAYWORTH and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated against: Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. 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 245, noes 167, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—245

Adams	Crawford	Guinta
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Akin	Cuellar	Hall
Alexander	Culberson	Hanna
Amash	Davis (KY)	Harper
Austria	Denham	Harris
Bachmann	Dent	Hartzler
Bachus	DesJarlais	Hastings (WA)
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Bartlett	Dold	Heck
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Heller
Bass (NH)	Duffy	Hensarling
Benishkek	Duncan (SC)	Herger
Berg	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler
Biggert	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Hultgren
Black	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Blackburn	Flake	Hurt
Bonner	Fleischmann	Issa
Bono Mack	Fleming	Jackson Lee
Boren	Flores	Jones
Boustany	Forbes	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Johnson (IL)
Brooks	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Broun (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Jones
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Bucshon	Gallegly	Kelly
Buerkle	Gardner	King (IA)
Burgess	Garrett	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	Kinzing (IL)
Calvert	Gibbs	Kissell
Camp	Gibson	Kline
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador
Canseco	Gohmert	Lamborn
Capito	Goodlatte	Lance
Carter	Gosar	Landry
Cassidy	Gowdy	Lankford
Chabot	Granger	Latham
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	LaTourette
	Graves (MO)	Latta
	Green, Al	Lewis (CA)
	Green, Gene	LoBiondo
	Griffin (AR)	Long
	Griffith (VA)	Lucas
	Grimm	Luetkemeyer

Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
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
Pence
Peterson

Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
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
Simpon
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—167

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

Fudge
Garamendi
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinches
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone

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

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman
Bilbray
Cantor
Clyburn
Crowley
Emerson
Engel

Giffords
Gonzalez
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Meeks
Nadler
Olver

Pascrell
Rangel
Reichert
Rothman (NJ)
Van Hollen
Weiner

□ 1106

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 294, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1230.

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

There was no objection.

RESTARTING AMERICAN
OFFSHORE LEASING NOW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCALISE). Pursuant to House Resolution 245 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. 1230.

□ 1106

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. 1230) to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain offshore oil and gas lease sales, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK 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 Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, the national average price of gasoline has gone up 10 cents in just the last week, and is now about 1½ cents nationally from \$4 a gallon. By comparison, the price was \$1.84 a gallon when President Obama was sworn into office.

In my home district in Central Washington last week, I heard from farmers, the foundation of our region's economy, who are finding it harder and harder to pay these high energy prices. And I have no doubt that my col-

leagues from other parts of the country have heard similar stories from their constituents.

The pain being felt today has been exacerbated by the actions of this administration, this administration which, for the past 2 years, has repeatedly blocked, hindered, and raised the cost to access to our American energy resources.

The House Natural Resources Committee recently passed three bills, H.R. 1229, 1230, and 1231, with bipartisan support, all of which reverse specific actions taken by the Obama administration to block offshore energy production. These bills will increase American energy production. They will create jobs, and they will lower energy prices. These are the first of an array of bills that will be introduced by our committee as part of the American energy initiative that will focus on expanding renewable energy, onshore production, hydropower, coal, critical minerals, and address offshore drilling revenue sharing and other needed reforms.

Today we are debating H.R. 1230, the Restarting America Offshore Leasing Now Act. This bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore Virginia that have been delayed or canceled by this administration.

□ 1110

The Virginia lease sale, for example, was scheduled to happen this year; but due to the Obama administration actions, the earliest this lease sale could occur is now 2017.

This bill will create thousands of jobs and, according to CBO, it will generate \$40 million in new revenue to the Federal Government over the next 10 years.

I will note that very soon after this bill passed out of committee, with bipartisan support, the Obama administration announced that it would move forward on one gulf lease sale. Prior to this sudden action, the Obama administration was on course to make 2011 the first year since 1958 that the Federal Government would not have held an offshore lease sale.

Squeezing one conveniently timed offshore lease sale does not undo the Obama administration's long track record of blocking and delaying American energy production. This bill that we are considering today is necessary to hold their feet to the fire and to ensure that these lease sales move forward.

Americans instinctively understand the pain inflicted by rising gasoline prices, but yet we continue to hear the same excuses on why we shouldn't act. And let me give you several examples.

My colleagues across the aisle will say that expanding drilling will do nothing to lower gasoline prices. The truth is, and this is the important part, it will send a strong signal to the world markets that the U.S. is serious about