

United States Attorney that takes an oath of office would lie.

We can find a resolution to the facts of Fast and Furious, started under the Bush administration, that have been reinvestigated and reinvestigated. But we do not have to malign Attorney General Holder for doing his job. And I would ask this Congress to ultimately reject any contempt charge against the chief law enforcement officer, and to denounce lying.

□ 1230

OPTION ACT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, ObamaCare has not taken full effect yet, but it is already crippling our country and our economy: premiums are rising; businesses are shedding jobs; doctors and patients are constantly dealing with a third party making health care decisions—and that's the Federal Government.

Fortunately, the Supreme Court has some of these same concerns about ObamaCare; and, hopefully, they will strike down both the individual mandate and the entire law. However the Court rules, though, ObamaCare must go.

In the GOP Doctors Caucus, we know that the American health care system needs some serious surgery. We have brought forth many ideas to do just that. For example, my OPTION Act will revitalize American health care, not through government interference but by giving doctors and patients full control over their dollars and their decisions. When ObamaCare falls, my bill stands ready to provide the health care relief that Americans both want and need.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will look to the OPTION Act as the example of what real reform looks like.

REJECT THE DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I grew up in Los Angeles in the fifties, which was when the smog was so bad that we actually had to stay inside the classroom during recess; and when you tried to inhale deeply, the pain in your chest was so severe from the pollution and the smog.

Thanks to government intervention, we have made huge strides, not only in Los Angeles but throughout this country, in cleaning our air for the health of our children. We've made progress, but we need to make a lot more. Unfortunately, to continue to combat this problem, Congress should take bold steps to invest in clean-energy tech-

nology, including in new electric vehicles and in the infrastructure to charge them.

But with H.R. 4480, my Republican friends are denying not only Los Angeles but all cities in this country the tools they need to continue to improve our air and improve our health. This bill would rob the EPA of the ability to effectively enforce clean air laws, and it would deepen our dependency on dirty fossil fuels.

15TH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY EXPO AND FORUM

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam Speaker, tomorrow is the 15th Annual Congressional Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency EXPO and Forum from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the Cannon Caucus Room as well as in room 340 Cannon. It features more than 50 exhibitors, including six from Maryland; and it features 30 speakers, including Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the private sector.

Come and learn the present status and near-term potential of how the cross-section of renewable energy—that is biofuels-biomass, geothermal, solar, water, wind—and energy efficiency technologies are creating jobs and meeting 11.7 percent of domestic U.S. energy production and 12.7 percent of net U.S. electrical generation.

I encourage Members, staff and visitors to attend tomorrow's 15th Annual Congressional Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency EXPO and Forum.

DISCLOSE ACT

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, Justice Brandeis said that sunlight is the best disinfectant. Sadly, in Citizens United, the Roberts' Court has turned its back on this wisdom, and it has given corporations the power to influence our government from the shadows.

To say that these are not dark days for our democracy is not an understatement. Millions upon millions of dollars are flowing into our political system through super PACs, but the identities of the donors who supply this money remain hidden.

Let's not fool ourselves. Let's not fool ourselves into thinking that the identities of these donors are a secret to the politicians whose campaigns are being helped by their money. To ignore the potential for unseemly influence here is truly naive. When one donor can decide the fate of a legislator's reelection, they clearly wield a great deal of power.

We should come together to pass the DISCLOSE Act, which allows the pub-

lic to see who is making these mega-donations, and together we can let sunlight back into our democracy.

CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION

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

Mr. COSTA. Since 1982, the Congressional Art Competition has recognized the special power that the arts have had in our Nation's classrooms.

Today, I have the pleasure of recognizing my district's Art Competition winner, Sarah Fanucchi, who credits the arts for helping her overcome her learning challenges.

From an early age, Sarah struggled with reading and math, but she excelled with a sketchbook and a pencil in hand. Once her teachers at Bakersfield's South High tapped into that talent, Sarah's life changed. She became excited about school, and her grades improved. Sarah's mother, Carrie, said, "Art was and, I suspect, always will be her refuge. It was her place to begin to shine, her place in school to belong." Carrie and Sarah are more than mother and daughter; they are best friends.

As I welcome her and her family to Washington this week, I applaud Sarah's artistic feat. More importantly, her perseverance through her challenges is what I find most impressive about this young lady. The art and life she has created is something any parent or teacher can and should be proud of as she continues to add value to our Nation's fabric.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4480, DOMESTIC ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 691 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 691

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. 4480) to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas exploration, development, and production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in response to a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. 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 amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-24. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

□ 1240

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS). Pending that, 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. I also ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 4480, the Strategic Energy Production Act of 2012, and it makes in order 27 individual amendments that are specified under the rule, two-thirds of which are Democrat amendments.

The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of both the Committee on Energy and Commerce as well as the Committee on Natural Resources. So this structured rule is very fair, and it will provide for a balanced and open debate on the merits of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I'm actually pleased to stand before the House today in support of this rule as well as the underlying legislation, H.R. 4480. The lead sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), is to be commended for his hard work and leadership in putting this piece of legislation together. I also commend the chairmen of both the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Natural Resources Committee for their support and hard work, as well, on this particular act and on other important pieces of legislation aimed at making our Nation more energy independent.

Madam Speaker, this bill is yet another reminder that this administration is not doing enough to develop our own domestic energy resources, which are plentiful in many parts of our public lands. In my home State of Utah, for example, there are vast amounts of oil and oil shale reserves that remain untapped, largely due to special interest group politics that keeps these lands locked up, even as we go abroad and increase our dependence on foreign sources as well as increasing our trade deficit.

Energy is an absolute prerequisite to our economic engine and creates jobs. If this administration ever hopes to get unemployment down during its tenure, then helping to develop more domestic energy is the key.

This bill, H.R. 4480, stands for a very commonsense proposition. The proposition is that, whenever the President of the United States authorizes a release of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the Secretary of Energy will be required to develop a plan to increase the percentage of Federal land oil production by a commensurate percentage to that released from the reserve. The reserve is a reserve. It is reserved for emergencies. Unfortunately, this administration is using our reserve to accommodate common daily life.

It is important and the purpose of this legislation is:

Number one, to develop our resources;

Number two, to make sure that we can streamline the process so that we do not delay the development of our resources;

Number three, to keep the reserve for real emergencies;

Number four, organize a plan to make sure that will be in effect; and

Number five, recognize clearly that energy is needed for job creation. Without that energy, we will not create the jobs that are necessary for this country to move forward.

This bill would actually limit the total amount of Federal lands to be leased, which is only 10 percent of the total of all public lands. Ten percent is very reasonable. The bill also excludes national parks, obviously, and congressionally designated wilderness areas from consideration of this bill.

It's a good bill. It's a commonsense bill. When passed, it will be a key part

of our effective and comprehensive national energy strategy.

I urge adoption of the rule, which is a fair rule, and the underlying bill, which is a commonsense bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4480, the so-called Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, what is really a death and destruction act, an act that will directly lead to the death of American citizens from various health-related causes—including cancer—and destruction. It is the destruction of not only our environment, but of our quality of life, including our quality of life in my home State of Colorado that is such an important part of driving our economy forward and creating jobs.

Here we are where several controversial, highly partisan bills have been packaged together. There are seven bills. While there is an attempt to dress this up as a jobs package, it's really a wish list for the oil industry that has no chance of becoming law. It's a huge giveaway to the oil industry at the expense of the health of American families, the health of our environment, and our enjoyment and recreational opportunities and economic opportunities on public lands.

Instead of allowing improvements to this drastic death and destruction bill, the House majority has blocked many amendments offered by Republicans and Democrats alike. Under this restrictive rule, commonsense amendments were blocked, including an amendment I offered that would have directed a study on the impacts of oil shale development on agricultural and municipal water usage. My colleague from California, Representative NAPOLITANO, offered a similar amendment in committee.

Those of us in the West, where farmers, ranchers, and community leaders consistently keep us abreast of water issues—and water is our most precious resource—know that we need some commonsense and objective data with regard to how energy production impacts resources, particularly our most precious resource: water.

What lies at the heart of this death and destruction bill today is simply a false premise. It's the false premise that somehow the United States is failing to make good on its natural energy resources.

The fact is, as a result of President Obama's all-of-the-above energy strategy, our Nation's dependence on foreign oil has fallen drastically, and crude oil production in the United States is at an 8-year high. President Obama has increased production of crude oil substantially over the Bush administration lows. The President's policies are demonstrating that we can have an approach to energy in the United States that boosts oil and gas

production and invests in the next generation of cleaner, job-creating, renewable energy technologies, such as wind, solar, and geothermal.

In contrast to the President's all-of-the-above approach, which will lead to reductions in gas prices and a sustainable energy future for our country, this death and destruction bill before us today is an oil-above-all approach. This death and destruction bill hands public lands that we all value over to the oil and gas industry and undermines the laws and rules that have made our air and water cleaner and safer over the past 40 years.

One of the scariest provisions in this package would gut important health-based standards provided for in the Clean Air Act established on a bipartisan basis in 1970. The Clean Air Act-based standards are especially important for protecting children, the elderly, and others who are susceptible to harmful air pollution.

Many nonpartisan public health and medical organizations have recognized that this bill would override clean air standards that have protected American people and families from harmful pollution in the past 40 years. That is why on this bill, which the majority purports deals with energy, we've heard from pediatricians, we've heard from doctors, we've heard from health care providers that this would lead to death, as well as the destruction of jobs, as well as the destruction of our environment and recreational opportunities.

Another controversial partisan provision in this bill would open up vast quantities of public lands to drilling. The bill sets an arbitrary requirement on the Department of the Interior to offer oil companies at least 25 percent of onshore areas that industry nominates each year. Let me say that again. The Department of the Interior wants to open up more lands to industry, even though oil and gas companies hold more than 25 million acres of public lands on shore where they're not producing oil and gas. In addition, these companies are sitting on 6,700 drilling permits that have been approved that they are not using. They need to explore lands where they already hold energy leases.

This is not a sensible energy policy. It's called an old-fashioned land grab and an old-fashioned water grab. They're coming after our land in the West, and they're coming after our water in the West. We're not going to take it sitting down.

Another extreme provision is that this bill would overturn the Federal Land Policy and Management Act to elevate energy production above other public land uses. My constituents in Colorado are tremendously concerned that somehow oil production would trump job-creating activities, including hunting, fishing, recreation, grazing, conservation, mainstays of jobs and the economy in my district that would be overridden in the name of oil,

which would destroy jobs and destroy the health of Colorado families and families across the United States.

Another provision in this bill turns the review of applications to drill into nothing more than a rubber stamp. The bill says that if the Secretary of the Interior doesn't make a decision within 60 days, it's automatically approved. It will be automatically approved with no process.

At the same time, many of the proponents of this bill are attempting to gut the budget of many of the agencies that need to review these applications, effectively ensuring that no application can properly be dealt with and evaluated within 60 days, and therefore they would all be automatically approved regardless of the impact on people's health or economic opportunities and jobs.

□ 1250

Now there are so many troubling provisions in this bill. Another one—and this one would likely violate our Constitution, which we began this session of Congress by reciting very publicly in this body—it would limit a citizen's right to participate in the discussion of leasing and drilling by making all dissenters pay a \$5,000 fee.

Now imagine you are a Coloradan, an Arizonan, a Pennsylvanian, a Texan who's concerned about drilling near your home or near your school or near your ranch. Now under this death and destruction bill, opening your mouth would cost you \$5,000. Free speech would no longer be free, if this bill passes.

Madam Speaker, public lands are just that, public. We all own a share of them. We all benefit from them. They're not the private playground of oil and gas companies. They're owned by all Americans. And all Americans should have a say in how they're used, not just Americans who cough up \$5,000.

Well, this bill would grant the oil and gas industry's wish list by opening up public lands and rolling back public health safeguards, hurting health and killing American families. But one thing this bill will not do is lower the price of gasoline. Economists agree: this bill has no impact on the price of gasoline.

There are actually now more drilling rigs in operation in the United States, thanks to President Obama's leadership today, than the rest of the world combined. In addition, the number of drilling rigs has doubled, doubled since 2009. President Obama's leadership has doubled the number of drilling rigs since 2009.

Now research going back more than three decades shows that there is very little correlation between the volume of domestic oil and the price of gasoline at the pump.

Go ahead and tell the American people that we want oil and gas companies to drill anywhere they like with no regard for public health. Is that the mes-

sage that we want to send? This bill, this death and destruction bill, would not only lead to the deaths of Americans but would destroy jobs, destroy economic opportunities, and destroy recreational opportunities. It's nothing short of a Federal land grab and a Federal water grab.

Representing my constituents in Colorado, I encourage my colleagues to say, "Heck, no," on both the bill as well as the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. BERG), the gentleman whose home State has provided a program of death and destruction which has led to a 3 percent or less unemployment rate, through jobs in energy production.

Mr. BERG. I thank the gentleman for recognizing me today.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying bill, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act. In my home State of North Dakota, we're seeing unprecedented growth. As it was mentioned, at 3 percent, North Dakota has the lowest unemployment rate in the country. We have a nearly \$2 billion budget surplus. We have stabilized our finances, and we've created certainty. And I couldn't be more proud of our State.

A large part of our economic success is due to a comprehensive energy policy and a commonsense regulatory environment which, in North Dakota, is known as EmPower North Dakota. In North Dakota, we know that all energy production is good energy production. Rather than picking winners and losers in energy, this EmPower act creates a stable, business-friendly climate. It does this by encouraging all energy production.

North Dakota embraces all forms of energy production and natural resources capabilities across our State. And North Dakota is really proof that "all-of-the-above" really does work, and there's no reason why we should not be taking this proven approach to developing energy and domestic energy production and applying it nationwide. That's really the goal of this legislation that's being considered here in the House today.

I am proud to offer my strong support for this legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same by supporting this rule.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, I rise to oppose the rule and the underlying bill for three primary reasons. First, the package is very poor public policy. Second, I offered a commonsense amendment, and the Republican majority blocked it from being debated, so it will not be heard today, unfortunately. And third, the House of Representatives shouldn't be wasting its time on a

package that's not going anywhere. Instead, we should be focused on job creation, especially passage of the transportation bill, through which we could create thousands and thousands of jobs across the country.

But first, as we marked up part of this package in the Energy and Commerce Committee, it became apparent that this package is chock-full of detrimental policy decisions for America. It creates new bureaucracies when it comes to energy policy and undermines the Nation's energy security. It rolls back policies that support the continued growth of safe and responsible energy production in the United States. And it improperly removes protections that we enjoy under the Clean Air Act that protect the health of American families all across this great Nation.

Second, if my colleagues recall, following the BP Deepwater Horizon blowout in the Gulf of Mexico, a major flaw in the law came to light: that the Department of Interior's maximum penalty for companies violating offshore drilling laws is limited to \$40,000, and for major onshore drilling violations, it's only \$5,000. So these amounts are not enough of a deterrent for bad behavior. That's why I offered an amendment to give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to increase civil fines against oil companies that violate the law while drilling. But unfortunately, my Republican colleagues have once again blocked sensible policy in order to protect Big Oil.

The Deepwater Horizon disaster was a major economic blow to my home State of Florida. If our laws do not establish appropriate deterrents, then you put our jobs at risk. Our tourism industry, small businesses, restaurants, fishermen, and the military rely on clean water and clean beaches. And our laws should protect American families and businesses, and not just Big Oil.

Finally, I strongly disagree with the Republican majority's decision to block the transportation bill and the thousands and thousands of jobs that are dependent on it. The Republican inaction on a bill that passed the United States Senate in a bipartisan way with over 70 votes is being blocked here on the floor of the House, and people should be up in arms. At a time when we've got to make greater progress when it comes to putting people back to work, that's the best path forward. I think the Republican inaction is causing great economic harm across the country, and that is what we should be debating today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY, a State that truly understands what it means to have an all-of-the-above policy for energy production, and what energy means to job creation.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, the sad fact today is that this country does not have a co-

herent energy strategy, pure and simple.

Now I can tell you, I come from Louisiana, where we know firsthand, probably more than any other State, that good energy policy can march hand-in-hand with good economic policy and good environmental policy. We've lived that life. We know that the energy sector, American energy production, creates good-paying jobs. Many of these jobs go to people from families that have never had anyone attend college, and through these jobs, they have been able to pay for college for the next generation. These are good-paying jobs, better paying than most.

The first step in energy policy is, number one, don't punish your current energy production. Don't punish American energy production. And that's what we've seen from this administration. Four straight years of proposing high taxes, new taxes on independent small energy companies, small oil and gas companies. New taxes at a time when we ought to be developing our energy production makes no sense at all. Secondly, what's our transition strategy? We clearly have an abundance of oil and gas, new reserves, new technology.

□ 1300

We have led the world in this. We ought to be developing it. And we can achieve energy security for this country and create good-paying American jobs.

This administration proposed a moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. And now, yes, they lifted the moratorium, but they still continue to slow-walk the permits. This bill would go forward and help us to streamline that process so we can get American energy production back up online in the Gulf of Mexico and to develop our energy security needs. We have the reserves. We have the opportunity.

The American energy production sector from upstream, midstream, downstream is accountable for 6 million jobs in this country; and we can grow more jobs. We can grow more jobs beyond that—good-paying jobs—if we do this—and meet our energy security needs.

The bottom line is this: I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to take a look at that plaque up there near the ceiling just above the Speaker's chair. Read the first sentence. It says: "Let us develop the resources of our land," a quote from Daniel Webster. We should heed that advice. We should develop the resources of our land.

Let's develop our American energy production in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska. Let's develop it in the shale plays. Let's create jobs. Let's create a secure energy future for this country, and let's move this country forward.

Mr. POLIS. If we defeat the previous question, I'll offer an amendment to this rule that will allow the House to consider the Stop the Rate Hike Act of 2012, legislation that would keep the

student loan interest rate low and reduce the deficit. If Congress fails to act, more than 7 million students across this country will see their student loan interest rate double come July 1, just around the corner. It's outrageous that at this time of slow and painful economic recovery the majority continues to refuse to work on this issue in a bipartisan way.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. POLIS, for yielding and for, again, bringing this issue back to the floor, which, as my chart indicates, we're now down to 10 days.

When this chart was first created, it was 110 days, and it coincided with the delivery of 130,000 petition signatures from college campuses all across America, pleading with Congress to listen to President Obama's challenge on January 25 right from that podium that we should block the increase from going through.

My legislation, which was introduced at midnight the same night, had 152 cosponsors to lock in the lower rate. For 3 months, nothing happened. A bill was rushed to the floor by the majority without any consultation with the other side. It took money out of a fund to pay for cervical cancer screening and diabetes screening, a hyperpartisan measure which the President indicated he would veto even before the vote was taken.

The good news is Mr. BOEHNER has already moved away from that proposal. He sent a letter with Senator MCCONNELL to the Senate leadership offering new pay-fors and moving off the House bill. Again, that was rushed through with absolutely no consultation on any bipartisan basis.

There are 7 million college students who are waiting for an answer in the next 10 days to this issue. The rates will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Senator REID has talked already about a proposal which is a pay-for that, again, there appears to be some willingness to move forward on. We should be focused on that issue right now, not this measure on the floor which is going nowhere. It's another bill which will never see the light of day in the Senate.

This issue, helping students pay for college at a time when student loan debt now exceeds \$1 trillion, is the issue that America is watching and waiting. And editorially, from Florida all the way to the west coast, newspapers are demanding bipartisan compromise, not the kind of measure which was rammed through this House a month and a half ago.

The building blocks are there, but we have to focus on that, not the measure that's before us here today. And the Tierney bill is a perfect opportunity for us to do something which, again, has a balanced approach and which will protect students from the doubling of their student loan interest rates.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a Member who is really a great and wonderful Member of this body, the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly appreciate the gentleman for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, our economy is struggling, the American people need jobs, and too many families are struggling under the burden of ever-rising energy prices. It's certainly long past time for the Federal Government to act; and, today, this House will act.

This Nation, Madam Speaker, has been blessed with so many vast energy resources that if we actually advantaged ourselves, we could actually meet all of our Nation's energy needs. We could create countless good-paying jobs right here at home. We could provide needed funding for our Federal Treasury, expand our economy, and make our Nation more secure.

But, unfortunately, we don't do that. Instead, in fact, we are nearly the only Nation I think on the face of the planet, really, that does not take advantage of its own natural energy resources. Instead, we, unfortunately, have made the choice to rely on foreign sources of energy to meet many of our needs—many from unstable or unfriendly nations to whom we export literally hundreds of billions of dollars of our national wealth each and every year and we bypass the opportunity to create needed jobs right here at home. This absolutely needs to change.

While President Obama talks about an all-of-the-above energy strategy, his actions tell a different story, really. While exploration of oil and other energy resources is up overall, it's been reduced on lands under Federal control under this administration. And this administration's EPA has made the coal industry public enemy number one, even though it's the cheapest and most abundant source of electric generation that we have here in our Nation.

Today, this House will act on a true all-of-the-above energy strategy. This legislation will streamline and remove government red tape as a hurdle to energy production. It will require our Nation to put forward goals for production of all energy sources, including oil, natural gas, coal, renewables, of course, on Federal lands. And it will make the permitting process much easier, and it will open up new areas to exploration and development both onshore as well as offshore. This legislation will lower energy prices for hard-pressed consumers, it will create good-paying jobs here at home, and it will enhance our economic security and national security as well.

I certainly urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical legislation, and I support the rule as well.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. We all know that high oil and gasoline prices take their toll on American consumers. Understandably, they want their elected officials to take action. But what the American people don't want is empty promises, and they don't want more political posturing designed to score cheap political points in an election year. And that's all this bill gives us.

H.R. 4480 blocks and delays EPA air-quality protections—protections that haven't even been proposed yet. It includes a radical proposal that damages the Clean Air Act goal that air should be clean enough to breathe safely. And it gives the Energy Department the job of developing a new drilling plan on Federal lands, even though this is not an area of expertise at all.

Madam Speaker, the idea behind this bill is just not thought out. It's not a solution to high oil and gasoline prices, nor will it create any immediate jobs. It is really nothing more than a transparent attempt to use this issue as an excuse for advancing an agenda in order to hurt our precious resources of lands and our own health.

And that's why I had sent to the Rules Committee a straightforward amendment that would have protected my State's coastline from new offshore drilling. My Republican colleague from California, Mr. BILBRAY, had a similar amendment on the same issue; but this Rules Committee is not allowing either amendment even to be debated, even to have its say on the House floor. A State where offshore drilling has been protected in State waters will now, because these amendments were not made in order, have to allow the Federal Government to work its will in contradiction to the State. And that's wrong. That's why Members from both sides should use their good sense and oppose this rule and oppose the underlying bill.

□ 1310

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Chairman HALL, who has probably heard many of these arguments before.

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, a proactive piece of legislation that encourages and expands production of our vast domestic resources to help put Americans back to work.

I strongly believe that, other than prayer, energy is the most important word in the dictionary for our young people. It's the foundation upon which our Nation has prospered and key to our quality of life and standard of living.

America is blessed with a wealth of natural resources and energy reserves, leading Citigroup to predict that we could soon become the world's largest oil producer. The recent shale gas revo-

lution has driven production to new heights and prices to new lows. It has created hundreds of thousands of new jobs and stimulated a resurgence of domestic manufacturing in this country. In 2010, unconventional natural gas production alone supported approximately 1 million American jobs.

Simultaneously, shale oil production has led to rapid and dramatic economic growth and job creation in places not typically known for energy production, such as North Dakota. Workers are flocking to the State to pursue the abundant opportunities in the Bakken shale. While the Nation suffers unemployment rates in excess of 8 percent, unemployment in North Dakota is the lowest in this country at just 3 percent.

The only thing preventing us from reaping the benefits of being a world leader in energy production is bureaucratic red tape. Permitting delays, declining production on Federal land, restricted access, and stifling regulations all stand in the way. H.R. 4480 would free us from these barriers put forth by the administration and, instead, set us on the right track to unleash the full energy potential of this Nation.

This bill addresses numerous issues the Science, Space, and Technology Committee has examined, including, for example, costly Tier 3 regulations that would increase the price of fuel at a time when families can least afford to pay more for their commute. Not only would this standard place a burden on household budgets, but the EPA ignored the law by failing to complete a study on the detrimental effects of RFS prior to beginning work on these standards. Quite simply, again the EPA failed to do its homework, instead barreling forward with regulations without a sufficient foundation.

Regulations like this one are far too often based on shaky science, devoid of adequate peer review, and rely on secret data EPA refuses to share with the public. The EPA ignores the scientific method in order to overstate the economic benefits of its rules in an attempt to justify their sizeable costs.

H.R. 4480 takes a timeout from EPA's activist regulatory agenda and seeks to put our country on track to pursue a genuine all-of-the-above energy strategy that would expand opportunities for production rather than stifle them.

I urge Members to support this rule as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, this is a rare time when we are talking about energy, when we are hearing from the Academy of Pediatrics, the Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the Public Health Association, the National Association of City and County Health Officials, and a number of other signatories on this letter which says, very simply, that we should make sure that the EPA can determine whether our air is safe to breathe and not do it based on how much it costs to reduce air pollution.

JUNE 18, 2012.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned public health and medical organizations

write to express our strong opposition to H.R. 4480, which includes dangerous provisions that would block and delay important public health safeguards under the Clean Air Act. Gutting the Clean Air Act will not address rising gas prices, but it will needlessly weaken the Clean Air Act's life-saving protections and delay much-needed air pollution safeguards.

Title II of H.R. 4480 indefinitely delays three overdue air quality safeguards, including standards for tailpipes emissions and gasoline sulfur content (Tier 3), air emissions standards for petroleum refineries and ground level ozone standards. Most egregiously, H.R. 4480 also repeals the health premise of the Clean Air Act.

In 1970, an overwhelming bipartisan majority in Congress agreed that to adequately protect public health, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) must set air quality standards to protect health with an adequate margin of safety. These standards are based on the best available health science. This system has worked for more than 40 years to let people know if the air is safe to breathe, and motivate action to improve air quality when it is not safe. EPA must retain this authority to establish health-based ambient air quality standards.

The Clean Air Act fully considers cost and feasibility in determining how to meet air quality standards. States and EPA consider these factors during the implementation process as strategies are implemented to meet air quality standards. Just as a doctor does not diagnose a patient based on the cost of treatment, EPA should not determine whether the air is safe to breathe based on how much it costs to reduce air pollution.

The Clean Air Act is one of the nation's premier public health laws. Since its establishment in 1970, the aggregate emissions of criteria air pollutants decreased 71%, while Gross Domestic Product increased 210%. Given the enormous contribution of the Clean Air Act to public health, we urge you to reject all efforts to weaken and delay it. Please vote NO on H.R. 4480.

Sincerely,

American Academy of Pediatrics.
American Heart Association.
American Lung Association.
American Public Health Association.
American Thoracic Society.
Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America.
Health Care Without Harm.
National Association of City and County Health Officials.
National Environmental Health Association.
Trust for America's Health.

Madam Speaker, I'm proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

This bill represents the latest Republican attempt to give away our public lands to the wealthiest oil companies in the world. This bill is the culmination of the Republican oil-above-all agenda. Instead of approving this legislative love letter to Big Oil, the majority should be sending a thank-you note to President Obama for his actions to increase domestic energy production and decrease our dependence on foreign oil.

The truth is that oil production from Federal lands on shore today is higher than it was under President Bush. And across the United States, oil production from all public and private lands

is unbelievably now at an 18-year high. Obama is drilling, baby; he's drilling.

The Obama administration's all-of-the-above strategy has also been successful in creating jobs. Since 2008, 14,000 new jobs have been created in oil and gas extraction. Thank you, President Obama. And 50,000 new jobs have also been created in wind and solar, but Republicans don't want a real all-of-the-above energy strategy.

At the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment, along with Mr. WELCH, that would have established a national renewable energy standard. That amendment would have created wind and solar all across our country as a standard. That amendment was germane to this bill and had no budgetary impact, but the Republican majority refused to even allow us to debate an amendment so that Members could have a chance to vote on an actual all-of-the-above package that wasn't just oil and gas.

And President Obama is about as good a President as you can have on that issue; but wind and solar and biomass and geothermal and all of these technologies of the future, they refused to even allow the Democrats to have a vote on that on the House floor this afternoon. They are not all of the above; they are oil above all. They don't want wind and solar because the oil industry doesn't want it, and the coal industry doesn't want it because it's real competition for the future.

The renewable electricity standard that I would have offered would have created 300,000 new jobs and saved consumers billions of dollars on their electricity bills.

In 2007, 32 Republicans joined 188 Democrats in overwhelming support of a similar renewable electricity standard. In 2009, the House again passed that policy on a bipartisan basis. It died in the Senate both times. Today, it dies here on the House floor because the Republicans don't want 32 Republicans to even have the right to vote for wind and solar and biomass and geothermal. They're afraid Republicans might vote for it, so there's a gag here, a gag order to the House floor saying no debate on the renewables because oil and coal don't want it debated. There will not be a vote on this.

The majority has voted more than 100 times in this Congress to help the oil industry, but they have not voted once in favor of clean energy in the year and a half that they have controlled the United States Congress.

Moreover, because they will not extend the production tax credit for wind, 40,000 jobs are going to be lost in the wind industry in the first 6 months of 2013. This is the Big Oil dream act. This is the dream act of the Republicans. This is something that should be opposed.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Ironically, I do agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts in one element of what he said, that this administration, President Obama, is drilling on permits that

were granted by Bush and Clinton. The unfortunate side is that this administration is not permitting any new drilling permits for the future growth of this country.

With that, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) who has been working diligently for many years on this particular issue and has a clear understanding of it.

□ 1320

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding the time.

I am so pleased, Madam Speaker, that we are pushing forward on some bills that are going to actually create the environment for jobs growth to take place. Of course we know that that is needed by the American people. We hear about it every single day.

We are at the longest streak that we have had since the Great Depression, the longest streak with unemployment being above 8 percent. If you look at underemployment, it's at 14.8 percent. Clearly, the American people are speaking out that they want action and they want to get back to work. The Domestic Energy and Jobs Act will do that, helping to create the environment for jobs growth to take place and helping to create the environment where we take actions to fuel this economy.

Our unemployment and underemployment numbers should be a wake-up call to the President, should be a wake-up call to the Senate. They can't continue to sit on their hands and play the blame game while 13 million Americans remain out of work.

As I said, this legislation will help create the jobs that are needed in our Nation's energy sector. What we want to see is more American-made energy, more American exploration. We want to see American innovation and end our dependence on foreign oil. Those are worthy goals, and these are steps in the right direction.

We also hear a lot about the price at the pump. I have many friends who are the mom in the minivan and are getting children back and forth, to and from activities. And at \$3.50 a gallon as the new normal, if you will, gas having doubled, the price of gasoline as a transportation fuel having doubled since this President was sworn in, this is something that women talk to us about regularly. There are deep concerns about this.

The greatest potential for economic growth in this country can be found in this Nation's precious natural resources, in our energy resources. While the President is clearly preoccupied with telling Americans what we won't do on energy, what he will not take steps to do, the economy and jobs and what he isn't going to do there, House Republicans are laying out a pathway for what we can do.

By working hard, we can empower those innovators to harness our domestic energy capabilities using so many

of those new technologies that are out there, new innovations that have been brought forward by so many of the petroleum engineers and the innovators in this country.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentlewoman 1 minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I have to say this: with every new discovery of American energy and every new technology advancement, we are able to put more into the marketplace for our Nation's manufacturers, engineers, our leasing specialists, our rig operators, and much more.

I recently had the opportunity to be back in south Mississippi, where I grew up. I had the opportunity to talk with some of the men and women who are involved and working and innovating in the oil and gas industry every single day. What I heard from them was the degree of advancement and the number of opportunities that exist if the Federal Government will get out of the way and return our focus to creating the environment for energy exploration and jobs growth to take place in this great Nation.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, it's my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, the gentlelady was quite correct about worrying about the price of gasoline. And as you sit around talking about that, you ought to be concerned about the 24 million gallons of gasoline that's exported from the United States every day. You might also want to consider that the price of natural gas has plummeted by more than 60 percent during the Obama administration, providing us with an extraordinary opportunity for growth.

But what I'd really like to talk about is, this bill is not a Strategic Energy Production Act. It does not deal with the renewable energy. In fact, the wind energy industry in the United States is about to come to a screeching halt. Seventy-five thousand jobs are presently in this industry. We are already beginning to see the downsizing—17,000 are now being laid off because the production tax credit is not being extended. If we were to extend the production tax credit, we could probably find another 37,000 people working next year.

If we added to this my piece of legislation, H.R. 487, which requires that our tax dollars—in this case, the production tax credit—be spent on American-made equipment, we could see, perhaps, even more manufacturing in the United States.

Bottom line: the Strategic Energy Production Act is an act for the oil and coal industry. It is not for America. We need to change that. We need to look at all of the above, not just oil and coal.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, a package of seven bills that, taken together, will create jobs and make America more energy independent.

There are a number of provisions, but among them the bill reforms and streamlines the energy permitting process by setting firm timelines for legal challenges and limiting the duration of injunctions. This provision is critical because it addresses all the red tape, the Washington red tape, and the constant wave of lawsuits by radical environmentalists that have prevented many American energy projects from ever getting off the ground. Some of them have been stalled for decades. Too often, activist Washington lawyers come between the American people and abundant affordable energy. With this bill, we are fighting back.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Project No Project report, energy permitting reform could unleash investment to the tune of \$3.4 trillion in economic benefits and over 2.6 million jobs created.

All you've got to do is look at the State of North Dakota for the benefits of producing American energy. Oil and gas production is booming, the State has a 3 percent unemployment rate—wouldn't we like to have that nationally? Good grief. And workers are sleeping in their cars, many of them, because the housing supply can't keep up with the demand.

In my home State of Arkansas, we've got our own success story. Production in the Fayetteville shale and the Brown Dense Formation has and will continue to create jobs and American energy, but we can't afford to let up. We have talked way too long about job creation and energy independence. We need less talk and more action.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important bill to create jobs and increase American energy independence.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for your tremendous leadership on this issue. Of course I rise in strong opposition to the rule and also the bill.

This so-called Domestic Jobs and Energy Act is yet another example of how the Tea Party-led House is wasting the American people's time by passing legislation that will never become law.

This unconscionable wish list for Big Oil contains dangerous provisions that would irresponsibly expand drilling on public lands, roll back policies to provide for safe and responsible energy production in the United States, and it will endanger our public health by blocking important public health safeguards under the Clean Air Act. Gutting the Clean Air Act will not lower gas prices, but it will hurt the health of millions of Americans.

Madam Speaker, we need a real jobs agenda, not another massive giveaway to Big Oil. We must pass the American Jobs Act, invest in our infrastructure, increase job training efforts, and strengthen our safety net. We should support the economy and create jobs by investing in the American people.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. In conclusion, this Congress must ensure that our Nation's safety net is a bridge that is strong enough to deliver us all—even the most vulnerable—over these troubled waters. This giveaway to Big Oil will not do that. We need to protect the public health of the American people.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another member of the Resources Committee here who understands this issue very well, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, this act removes the obstacles that are blocking our efforts to achieve greater American energy production and job creation by providing more certainty and clarity to the public lands leasing and permitting process.

In particular, my part of this legislation will ensure that Federal oil and natural gas lease sales occur on a consistent basis and provide the necessary lease certainty so production is made easier.

□ 1330

Currently, there are roughly 1,631 outstanding projects on Federal lands, including lands in Colorado, which have been delayed over 3 years. Federal regulatory delays to these projects prevent the creation of over 60,000 jobs.

We have endured several years of over 8 percent unemployment. Over 12 percent of our veterans who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan are still out of work. The fact that we are not fully benefiting from the employment and financial potential of our energy resources is simply wrong.

The President often boasts about his energy record, but this administration regularly delays and blocks leases. In fact, BLM only approved 11 oil and gas leases in Colorado in 2011 where, in 2006, there were 363 approvals.

We in Colorado understand the importance of harnessing our own resources and the value it provides our economy. The oil and gas industry in Colorado directly employs 50,000 people and supports over 190,000 jobs in our State. This industry is responsible for roughly 6 percent of total employment in Colorado. We have an opportunity with this legislation to create jobs by developing our own resources right here at home.

Opponents of domestic energy exploration claim that the industry already has thousands of acres but are not producing the wells. These critics point to recent Department of the Interior reports that this report represents the

reasons for nonproducing wells. More often than not, the factors that cause our production are delays instituted by the Interior Department itself by requiring redundant reviews of projects, one example being the newest Master Leasing Plans instituted by the Secretary.

Delays also occur because exploration companies do not have full information as to the capacity of production on the land until after the lease sale is finalized. Therefore, some leases prove to be noncommercial and go unused. Although industry has already paid the government thousands of dollars in fees for the opportunity to explore, many times they receive no economic benefit, and the risk is entirely on them.

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

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Let me also be clear, because this fact is largely missed by the opponents of this legislation. Only lands that are already approved by BLM for exploration can be nominated by industry. This bill is not a green light for immediate production on all Federal acres. Rather, it grants access to a very small percentage of the total of Federal lands.

As a Coloradoan, I respect the need to preserve our wilderness areas, but I also understand the need to responsibly capitalize on our vast resources in order to get people back to work.

As a Marine Corps combat veteran who has served multiple tours in the Middle East, I fully understand the need to reduce our reliance on foreign oil, and this legislation will help do that.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on certainty, "yes" on jobs, and "yes" on the final passage of the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act.

Mr. POLIS. Madam 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. And here we are. While we're debating this death and destruction, oil above all bill, the clock is ticking on student loan payments that will cost middle class families millions and millions of dollars.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

At the end of this month, the student Federal loan interest rate is set to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. It's an urgent deadline for more than 7 million American students and more than 177,000 students across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It's an urgent deadline for students that I met with

at Middlesex College all the way through to Endicott College in my district and elsewhere. These students are working many jobs. They're still carrying thousands of dollars in student debt, and they're deeply concerned about the doubling of the rate that will occur on July 1.

Madam Speaker, this is urgent deadline for House Democrats. We've been on top of this issue for many, many months. Our colleague, Mr. COURTNEY of Connecticut, introduced legislation establishing a permanent fix back in January. Our colleagues, Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. HINOJOSA of Texas, sent a letter to Education and the Workforce Committee Chairman Mr. KLINE in February asking that the question be taken before the committee to prevent the student loan interest hike.

It's unfortunate, Madam Speaker, that the majority in the House of Representatives does not appear to understand or share this urgency. There are 10 days left in June, and we're only scheduled to be in session for 5 of them. As of right now, taking action to stop the doubling of the student loan interest rates is still not on the House's legislative agenda between now and the end of the month. In fact, addressing the issue was not part of the majority leader's summer legislative agenda, and it was reported that Speaker BOEHNER privately called the issue a phony issue.

So let's make no mistake about it. This is nothing phony for the millions of students who will be impacted and will see their rates double in July.

Madam Speaker, since the House majority doesn't appear willing to move forward on this issue, we have to take this action today to defeat the previous question so the rule can be amended to allow for consideration of my bill, the Stop the Rate Hike Act of 2012. That bill continues the current need-based Stafford loan rate at 3.4 percent for 1 year and offsets the cost by closing a tax subsidy for the oil industry, just one tax subsidy, one that they weren't originally intended to benefit from at any rate. I think that's a fair and reasonable plan for eliminating an unjustified giveaway to a hugely profitable industry so millions of our constituents do not see an increase in their student loans.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so the House can consider that bill and stop the student loan interest rate hike.

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

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire of the other side if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. No; I think I'm it.

Mr. POLIS. Very good. Then I'm prepared to close, and I will yield myself the balance of the time.

Now, this rule only provides for consideration of certain amendments. Why are the Republicans so concerned with

letting the House work their will on such an important bill?

Now, a number of these measures have been brought forward by Representatives from Colorado. I want to be clear that these are policies that are not universally supported in Colorado and that many of us believe that the policies contained in this set of bills would destroy jobs as well as the quality of life and health of not only Colorado and the West, but the entire country.

In Colorado, we've created a balanced approach to energy policy that's worked. In some areas we lease, some areas we use for other purposes, some areas we protect. Many Colorado small business owners agree, our parks and public lands are critical not only to the economy and job growth, hiking, fishing, hunting, the outdoor industry, but also to our quality of life and our health.

This job-destroying Federal landgrab, Federal water grab bill would put tens of thousands of Coloradoans out of work and destroy the quality of life for our entire State. This bill puts the wish list of the oil and gas industry above all the other users of public lands, above the interest of hunters, above the interest of fishermen, above the interest of hikers, above the interest of tourism, above the interest of skiers, above the interest of conservationists. This bill is out of touch with the citizens of Colorado and will destroy jobs in Colorado and throughout the country.

Look, companies are able to drill. They've been drilling the last 40 years. President Obama's leadership has led to twice the number of drilling wells. Our energy production is at an 8-year peak from oil and gas, and we continue to increase our energy production on public lands, and there's a responsible way to do it.

But we need a balanced approach that doesn't throw out the safeguards and protections that protect the health of children and the health of families, to protect our jobs in the outdoor industry, that protect our jobs in the recreation industry and protect our quality of life across the Western United States, and laws that protect our water and laws that protect our air.

This bill, this series of omnibus death and destruction bills, simply fails that test. The American people deserve more than the death and destruction, oil above all omnibus package that's being offered here today. While millions of Americans are waiting in the unemployment lines, we need a bill that creates jobs rather than destroys jobs.

□ 1340

An increased concentration of toxic chemicals can harm the health of American citizens and Coloradans. Now there is great promise and opportunity in technology that will allow companies to drill with less of an impact on

human health and the environment. That's why we have a regulatory framework. It is to ensure that there is incentive to make sure that American families are safe.

This package of job-destroying bills that has been brought before us today would harm our sensitive lands and constitute a Federal land grab and Federal water grab, all without lowering the price at the pump and destroying tens of thousands of jobs in the process.

This death-and-destruction bill is simply not what this country needs to move forward. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and to oppose the bill. I urge a "no" vote on the rule and to defeat the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In the 111th Congress, when the other side was in charge, H.R. 2454 was brought forth from the floor. It was called the American Clean Energy and Security Act. There were 224 amendments submitted, and one was made in order. In our bill today, 27 amendments are made in order, two-thirds of which are Democrat amendments. This is a very fair rule, and it will provide for an open and clear debate on the particular issue.

Let's face it, Madam Speaker. The United States has a lot of untapped areas on public lands that are involved not only in oil and oil shale but in natural gas and coal. We are an energy-rich country. We are an energy-producing country. It's about time we recognized that fact and developed the energy that we have for the betterment of our people and for job creation.

We need an all-of-the-above strategy that is not just a rhetorical exercise in an election year but an all-of-the-above strategy that, actually, really creates something without hidden delays disguised as procedural practices and processes.

This bill will create jobs. This bill will keep American dollars at home. This bill will provide economic growth instead of sending our money abroad. This is a good bill, and it is an incredibly fair rule. I urge its adoption.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 691 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4816) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans, 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minor-

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

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 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 pre-

vious 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. With that, 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered, and the motion to instruct conferees offered by Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—242

Adams	Campbell	Fleming
Aderholt	Canseco	Flores
Akin	Cantor	Forbes
Alexander	Capito	Fortenberry
Amash	Carter	Fox
Amodel	Cassidy	Franks (AZ)
Austria	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Bachmann	Chaffetz	Galleghy
Barletta	Chandler	Gardner
Bartlett	Coble	Garrett
Barton (TX)	Coffman (CO)	Gerlach
Bass (NH)	Cole	Gibbs
Benishek	Conaway	Gibson
Berg	Cravaack	Gingrey (GA)
Biggart	Crawford	Gohmert
Bilbray	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Culberson	Gosar
Bishop (UT)	Davis (KY)	Gowdy
Black	Denham	Granger
Blackburn	Dent	Graves (GA)
Bonner	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Bono Mack	Diaz-Balart	Green, Gene
Boren	Dold	Griffin (AR)
Boustany	Dreier	Griffith (VA)
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Grimm
Brooks	Duncan (SC)	Guinta
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Guthrie
Buchanan	Ellmers	Hall
Bucshon	Emerson	Hanna
Buerkle	Farenthold	Harper
Burgess	Fincher	Harris
Burton (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Hartzler
Calvert	Flake	Hastings (WA)
Camp	Fleischmann	Hayworth

Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre

McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rogers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan

Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—183

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette

DeLauro
Deuth
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Kissell
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman

Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen

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

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus
Jackson (IL)
Lewis (CA)

Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Reed

Sánchez, Linda
T.

□ 1408

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. MCINTYRE and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The question is on the resolution.

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. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 178, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]
YEAS—245

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishak
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchanan
Buehler
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)

Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eillers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)

Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
LoBiondo
Long

Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence

Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence

Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran

NAYS—178

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barber
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette

Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran

Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Watt Welch Woolsey
Waxman Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bachus Lewis (CA) Sánchez, Linda
Becerra Miller (FL) T.
Dreier Miller, Gary
Jackson (IL) Reed

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1415

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 for:

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 2012, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 390. If present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 390.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 4348 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 34, answered "present" 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—386

Ackerman Braley (IA) Costello
Adams Brooks Courtney
Aderholt Brown (FL) Cravaack
Akin Buchanan Crawford
Alexander Bucshon Crenshaw
Altmire Buerkle Critz
Amodi Burgess Crowley
Andrews Burton (IN) Cuellar
Austria Butterfield Cummings
Baca Calvert Davis (CA)
Bachmann Cantor Davis (IL)
Baldwin Capito Davis (KY)
Barber Capps DeFazio
Barletta Capuano DeGette
Barrow Cardoza DeLauro
Bartlett Carnahan Denham
Barton (TX) Carney Dent
Bass (NH) Carson (IN) DesJarlais
Becerra Cassidy Deutch
Benishek Castor (FL) Diaz-Balart
Berg Chabot Dicks
Berkley Chaffetz Dingell
Berman Chandler Doggett
Biggert Chu Dold
Bilbray Cicilline Donnelly (IN)
Bilirakis Clarke (MI) Doyle
Bishop (GA) Clarke (NY) Duffy
Bishop (NY) Clay Duncan (SC)
Black Cleaver Duncan (TN)
Blackburn Clyburn Edwards
Blumenauer Coble Ellison
Bonamici Coffman (CO) Ellmers
Bonner Cohen Emerson
Bono Mack Cole Engel
Boren Connolly (VA) Eshoo
Boswell Conyers Farenthold
Boustany Cooper Farr
Brady (PA) Costa Fattah

Filner Larson (CT) Rivera
Fitzpatrick Latham Roby
Flake LaTourette Roe (TN)
Fleischmann Latta Rogers (AL)
Fleming Lee (CA) Rogers (KY)
Forbes Levin Rogers (MI)
Fortenberry Lewis (GA) Rohrabacher
Frank (MA) Lipinski Rokita
Franks (AZ) LoBiondo Ros-Lehtinen
Frelinghuysen Loebsock Roskam
Fudge Lofgren, Zoe Ross (AR)
Gallegly Lowey Ross (FL)
Garamendi Lucas Rothman (NJ)
Gardner Luetkemeyer Roybal-Allard
Gerlach Luján Royce
Gibbs Lummis Runyan
Gibson Lungren, Daniel Ruppertsberger
Gonzalez E. Rush
Goodlatte Lynch Ryan (OH)
Gosar Mack Ryan (WI)
Gowdy Maloney Sanchez, Loretta
Graves (GA) Manzullo Sarbanes
Graves (MO) Marchant Scalise
Green, Al Marino Schweikert
Green, Gene Markey Schiff
Griffin (AR) Matheson Schilling
Griffith (VA) Matsui Schmidt
Grijalva McCarthy (CA) Schrader
Grimm McCarthy (NY) Schwartz
Guinta McCaul Schweikert
Guthrie McCollum Scott (SC)
Gutierrez McCotter Scott (VA)
Hahn McDermott Scott, Austin
Hall McGovern Scott, David
Hanabusa McHenry Sensenbrenner
Hanna McIntyre Serrano
Harper McKeon Sewell
Harris McKinley Sherman
Hartzler McMorris Shimkus
Hastings (FL) Rodgers Shuler
Hastings (WA) McNerney Shuster
Hayworth Meehan Simpson
Heck Meeks Sires
Heinrich Mica Slaughter
Hensarling Michaud Smith (NE)
Herger Miller (MI) Smith (NJ)
Herrera Beutler Miller (NC) Smith (TX)
Higgins Miller, George Smith (WA)
Himes Moore Southerland
Hinchev Moran Speier
Hinojosa Mulvaney Stark
Hirono Murphy (CT) Stivers
Hochul Murphy (PA) Stutzman
Holden Myrick Sullivan
Holt Nadler Sutton
Honda Napolitano Terry
Hoyer Neal Thompson (CA)
Huelskamp Noem Thompson (MS)
Hultgren Nugent Tiberi
Hunter Nunes Tierney
Hurt Nunnelee Tipton
Israel Olson Tonko
Issa Oliver Towns
Jackson Lee Owens Tsongas
(TX) Palazzo Turner (NY)
Jenkins Pallone Turner (OH)
Johnson (GA) Pascrell Upton
Johnson (IL) Pastor (AZ)
Johnson (OH) Paul Van Hollen
Johnson, E. B. Paulsen Velázquez
Jones Pelosi Visclosky
Jordan Perlmutter Walberg
Kaptur Peters Walden
Keating Peterson Walz (MN)
Kelly Petri Wasserman
Kildee Pingree (ME) Schultz
Kind Pitts Waters
King (IA) Platts Pingree (ME)
King (NY) Polis Price (GA)
Kingston Price (NC) Quigley
Kinzinger (IL) Kissell Rahnall
Kissell Kline Rangel
Kline Kucinich Rehberg
Kucinich Labrador Reichert
Labrador Lamborn Renacci
Lamborn Lance Landry Reyes
Lance Landry Richardson
Landry Langford Richmond
Langford Laneff Rigell
Larsen (WA) Rigell

NAYS—34

Amash Campbell Fincher
Bishop (UT) Canseco Flores
Brady (TX) Carter Foxx
Broun (GA) Conaway Garrett
Camp Culberson Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert Poe (TX) Thompson (PA)
Granger Pompeo Thornberry
Huizenga (MI) Posey Webster
Long Quayle Westmoreland
McClintock Rooney Young (AK)
Neugebauer Sessions
Pearce Stearns

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ribble

NOT VOTING—11

Bachus Lewis (CA) Sánchez, Linda
Bass (CA) Miller (FL) T.
Dreier Miller, Gary Schock
Jackson (IL) Reed Walsh (IL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1422

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4348.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to recede from disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4348, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012, PART II

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4348.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mrs. BLACK moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4348 be instructed to reject section 31108 of the Senate amendment (relating to distracted driving grants), other than the matter proposed to be inserted as section 411(g) of title 23, United States Code (relating to a distracted driving study).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are