

helping more than 46 million Americans put food on the table every day. Far too many hardworking Michiganders are struggling to feed their children. Nearly one in five Michigan households face food insecurity each and every day.

Having met with many of the good folks working in our food banks, they're already stretched too thin. I'm appalled that Republicans think that it's a good idea to kick millions of children, seniors, and families off of food assistance so they can provide massive, taxpayer-funded subsidies for wealthy agribusinesses.

I call on my Republican colleagues to join me and stand up for those who are most vulnerable in our society. We need to send a clear message that we will never vote to take food away from hungry children. No one in our country should go hungry.

I urge my colleagues to say "no" to cuts in food assistance.

THE WORST IS YET TO COME

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, Republican attacks on lifesaving access to contraceptives in the health care act is one in a series on women's reproductive health this term. The worst is yet to come in the planned markup of H.R. 3803, to ban abortions after 20 weeks. Cloaked as a restriction on D.C. women, the bill merely uses them for a frontal attack on *Roe v. Wade* that guarantees abortion rights until viability, as determined by a physician.

The Franks bill picks on D.C. women because anti-choice opponents lack the courage of their own convictions, or they would have made the 20-week abortion ban a nationwide bill. That, of course, would bring on the wrath of the American people who support choice. Judging by their reaction even before markup, women see through the cynicism and are poised to protect their constitutional rights.

□ 1240

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4402, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 726 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 726

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. 4402) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the

Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources 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 112-26. 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.

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 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. I ask that all Members 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 consideration of H.R. 4402, which is the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, and provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, and makes in

order seven specific amendments out of ten which were filed at the Rules Committee. Five of the seven are Democratic amendments and two are Republican. So this is a fair and generous rule and will provide for a balanced and open debate on the merits of this important piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today in support of this rule, and especially the underlying legislation, which is H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2012.

I appreciate the hard work of the bill's chief sponsor, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), who understands this situation very well and has put a great deal of time and effort into coming up with a rational and legitimate solution to a problem which we face. Mr. AMODEI, as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), are to be commended in forwarding this bill to the full House for our consideration today.

Our Nation has been blessed with tremendous natural resources, and over the last century these abundant resources are one of the key reasons that has allowed our Nation to emerge as a leading world economic and industrial power. In many aspects, we have only scratched the surface with regard to the development of these abundant natural resources, whether it be in energy, such as coal or oil shale or natural gas deposits, or whether it be in various natural minerals.

One of the cornerstones of manufacturing in the United States includes the access to a stable and steady supply of these types of resources. Unfortunately, in recent decades, much of the development and mining of these domestic mineral resources has been hampered or shut down entirely by a combination of special-interest politics by certain self-appointed environmental groups and by bureaucratic red tape here in Washington. Often these two factors seem to go hand in hand, particularly under the current administration.

We have all felt the pain of seeing what these failed policies have done to energy production in our country. We are more dependent than ever on foreign sources, increasing our trade imbalance, sending our dollars overseas, often to areas of the world that do not have our best interests at heart. It has led to escalating gas prices and escalating price spikes for energy and other commodities, and has made our economy more vulnerable to external international forces largely beyond our immediate control. These failed policies have also led to job losses in the United States in the energy and mining sector, which historically and ironically have been some of the highest paying jobs that middle class work has available.

The bureaucratic delays and regulations regarding the mining of strategic and critical minerals is the exact same

thing. By their very nature, these minerals are absolutely essential to manufacturing in electronics, metal alloys, ceramics, glass, magnets, and catalysts used in countless commercial and, especially, defense applications.

Procurement of certain strategic and critical minerals is so crucial that the Department of Defense and the Defense Logistics Agency manage stockpiles of such materials which are deemed so critical that an adequate supply must be maintained at all times to ensure national military preparedness and readiness.

More and more, we have seen that these materials are unfortunately being purchased from overseas and not from U.S. producers, making us wholly dependent upon other countries to ensure our own national security. Critical weapons visions, such as night vision equipment, advanced lasers, avionics, fighter jet canopies, missile guidance systems, and many, many others could not be built without these rare Earth minerals.

The primary duty of Congress under the Constitution is to provide for the common defense. This bill takes us in the right direction for helping to restore U.S. domestic production of critical and strategic minerals by facilitating a more timely permitting process review for mineral exploration projects and to ensure that such essential mineral mining projects are not delayed unnecessarily by frivolous litigation.

Let me be clear, this bill does not predetermine the outcome of agency review of such permit applications. It merely brings clarity to the process and ensures that the appropriate agencies will not unreasonably delay consideration but will, at the conclusion of 30 months, issue either a “yes” or “no” decision based on the merits of each individual application.

This bill will also help cut the flow of frivolous lawsuits, which are often filed simply as delay tactics.

It’s a good bill. It’s a fair rule and a good underlying bill, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1250

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. Much of what the gentleman from Utah said I agree with in terms of the strategic need for critical minerals for our industrial and military production. However, that’s only a teeny part of what this bill does.

Now my colleague, Mr. TONKO, offers an amendment that would in fact limit this bill, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production. In addition, it’s my understanding that bipartisan legislation has emerged from the

Natural Resources Committee that would address the strategic need for critical minerals. However, that is not the bill that is being brought forth under this rule. Instead, we essentially have yet another rollback of public health, of water and environmental protections for the mining industry, which is our Nation’s top toxic polluter.

So I’m very disappointed that the House majority has chosen to bring forward this bill instead of the bipartisan bill that passed committee. It shuts out several sensible amendments that have been offered by Democratic Members. And the underlying legislation doesn’t limit itself to strategic and critical minerals. In fact, it’s so broad that, despite the bill’s title, it would expand mining companies’ ability to mine on public land for nearly all minerals, including plentiful minerals like sand and clay and even coal. So this really is not a discussion of strategic and critical minerals if we’re talking about sand and clay.

In fact, yesterday, in our Rules Committee, Chairman HASTINGS admitted during the Rules Committee hearing when questioned by Mr. MCGOVERN that this bill applies to a lot more than strategic and critical minerals. In fact, Chairman HASTINGS, when asked on this issue, said:

We talk about a form of minerals as being rare Earth. There’s no question they are rare. But to say that some minerals aren’t critical to our well-being I think defies logic.

Chairman HASTINGS went on to cite the use of sand and gravel to build our interstate system as an example of a critical use.

A lot of what the gentleman from Utah said is true and is important. However, when we’re talking about sand and gravel, they don’t fit the commonsense definition of the Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act that were cited by the gentleman of being of national importance.

So the chairman of the committee has made clear this bill isn’t about rare Earth minerals at all. It’s not the kind of bipartisan bill that’s targeting critical resources. Rather, it’s about giving mining companies a blank check to take anything they want out of the ground anywhere, anytime.

Under the bill, the mining sponsor is handed control over the timing of the permitting decision, irrespective of the project’s impacts on natural, cultural, historic resources, its local impact, taking into account the effect on the economies of our counties, and jobs. Rather, it gives the mining companies a blank check. It permits nearly all mining operations to circumvent meaningful public health and environmental review processes. And when you consider the large and complex mining operations covered under this bill, it’s even more inappropriate to reduce or eliminate the public comment or review process because of the sheer size of some of these projects.

The actual harm that this legislation would produce is far-reaching. As draft-

ed, the legislation threatens to increase pollution of water in our Western United States. For States already dealing with the extreme drought conditions like my home State of Colorado, also the site of several deadly fires, the last thing we need is to jeopardize our already scarce water resources. We can’t afford to affect our water quality and quantity with additional mining operations without understanding their impacts on our water supplies.

Democrats and Republicans agree that we should be crafting a strategy to develop our rare Earth and other critical minerals. In fact, a year ago in this very same Congress the Natural Resources Committee marked up H.R. 2011, a bill supported by the National Mining Association and a bill that had strong bipartisan support that would help develop our rare Earth and other critical minerals. So why aren’t we considering that bill on the floor today? Instead, we’re considering an ideological bill that will go nowhere and has a statement of opposition from the President as well.

Why the House majority sees a need for this legislation to promote mining is somewhat mystifying, considering that under President Obama’s administration the average time it takes to approve a plan of operation for a mine has decreased substantially. According to BLM data, plans of operation for hardrock mines are being approved 17 percent more quickly under the Obama administration than the Bush administration. Eighty-two percent of plans of operation were approved within 3 years under the Obama administration. According to the BLM, it takes, on average, 4 years to approve a mining plan of operations for a large mine—more than a thousand-acre mine—on public lands. There’s a lot of issues—county issues, civic issues, economic issues—around a thousand-acre mine. And there needs to be a thoughtful process about how it affects communities where it is located and how it affects air and water.

Mining companies already extract billions of dollars of minerals from our public lands. This bill would continue to line the pockets of an industry that already has significant profit margins, and actually this bill jeopardizes jobs and our economic recovery by failing to take into account the local economic impact of mines—and not mining for strategic and critical mineral production but mining for nearly everything under the sun, including clay and gravel, again.

So I think, again, while we can be grateful that President Obama has accelerated the approval process, there’s certainly work to continue. I urge my colleagues to bring forth a bipartisan bill that would specifically look at real strategic and critical minerals. But this bill and this rule are unduly restrictive, and I encourage my colleagues to vote “no.” I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), who understands this issue very directly with his experience both on the Resources Committee as well as in his home State of New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. The gentleman from Utah has stated it right: It's a fair rule, it's a good bill. All it does is simply defines a critical mineral as any related to national security or the Nation's energy infrastructure. That clarity is needed. But additionally, it affects one thing that the people are constantly clamoring about in my particular district: Where are the jobs?

This bill understands what the President began to hint at in his March 22, 2012, executive order. The President in that executive order said:

Our Federal permitting and reviews processes must provide a transparent, consistent, and predictable path for both project sponsors and affected communities. They must ensure that agencies set and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of reviews, set clear permitting performance goals, and track progress against these goals.

The President has moved toward the problem that we see in this country—that many of our mines are moving outside this Nation. New Mexico used to be the home for 11 rare Earth mineral mines. Today, it's the home of zero. Those mines have relocated over in China.

As we look at the rare Earth minerals, those are strategically important. That's one thing that this bill attempts to get at—the definitions that will really give teeth to the President's executive order from March 22.

People in New Mexico constantly ask: Why don't the two parties work together? I think there are many opportunities for the parties to work together. The President has begun the process, and we're simply adding the reverse piece to it that would make it a completed argument. The President has said in the past, for instance, that we're not working together, and he has stated in both the last two States of the Union that we must reform corporate taxes.

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

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

Mr. PEARCE. I requested the President work with us to affect those taxes. Let's lower those corporate taxes. Let's get companies back here. But the President has at this point kept those discussions at arm's length. This bill is simply another attempt to reach out to the President and say we all want to create jobs. We want commonsense solutions to the problems that we face. Work with us to define the strategic and critical minerals. And let's do it in this act.

So I think it's something that the President should be reaching out to this body and saying, "Yes, good, go." I would thank the sponsor for bringing the bill. Let's work together to create jobs and get those mining industries back here in America.

□ 1300

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

We are just hours removed from House Republicans' voting to take away health care for 30 million Americans and put the insurance companies back in charge of our health care system. And it's back to business as usual for the GOP-controlled House.

Yes, it's time to get back to more giveaways to the Nation's wealthiest companies. Because when House Republicans aren't voting to take away health care from ordinary Americans, from poor Americans, they're voting for "wealth care" for the most profitable industries in the history of the United States of America. In fact, the majority continues to bring largely the same legislation to the floor over and over again, only the name of the industry reaping the windfall changes.

Two weeks ago, the Republican majority voted to give away nearly all of our onshore public lands to the oil and gas industry. The majority has passed bills to put rigs off our beaches in California, off our beaches in Florida, and off our beaches in New Jersey without passing any new safety requirements after the BP oil spill just 2 years ago. They have passed legislation to allow old-growth forests to be clear-cut and to hand over land to a multinational mining company without protecting Native American sacred sites or local water quality.

In fact, this Republican majority has cast so many votes to give away our public lands to the oil, the gas, the mining, and the timber industries, it's almost hard to remember which industry is getting a special giveaway each week.

So I have a suggestion that I think could help everyone out there keep track. Each week, we can consult this handy-dandy chart, the "GOP Wheel of Giveaways," to figure out which industries are going to get their turn benefiting from handouts from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the same day they're going to take away health benefits from the poor, the sick, the elderly, and ordinary families in America.

Let's see who the big winners are on the House floor today as they take away the health care benefits for ordinary people. Let's give it a spin here. Let's see what happens as we look at what is happening out there in this great land of ours this week.

This week, it's the mining industry, ladies and gentlemen. Come on down. You are this week's big winner in the GOP giveaway game. The mining industry is the big winner on this giveaway show here today on the House floor. That's because the bill that the majority is bringing to the floor tomorrow, despite being entitled the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Act, has absolutely nothing to do with developing these minerals. In fact, this bill is all about gutting the environmental safeguards and the proper review of large mining projects on public lands for virtually all minerals, including coal.

Under this legislation, sand apparently could be considered as rare. Gravel could be a critical mineral. Crushed stone or clay could be a strategic resource. Even abundant minerals like gold, silver, or copper could potentially qualify as a rare Earth product under this bill and have lower environmental standards as a result in drilling for them that would endanger ordinary families again and their health. But of course they would never provide any health care benefits for them because that's the other bill we're going to be having out here on the House floor and gutting here today.

Indeed, the only rarities created under the Republican bill would be environmental protections or public input.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MARKEY. And while this bill provides new giveaways to large multinational mining companies, it does nothing to change the Mining Law of 1872—1872, ladies and gentlemen—which allows mining companies to pull taxpayer-owned hard rock minerals out of our public lands without giving Americans a fair payment. In fact, under the 140-year-old law, mining companies can extract gold, silver, uranium, copper, and other hard rock minerals without paying taxpayers one cent in royalties for the minerals on the public lands of the United States of America. This law isn't just outdated, it's outrageous.

These are the same people here who are saying we can't afford to pass the law which protects against preexisting conditions in health care of ordinary Americans. These are the people here saying we can't pass a bill to protect against discrimination against women in our society.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. This law isn't jut outdated, it is outrageous.

On the game show "The Price is Right," a \$1 bid is strategic. But under the Republican giveaway game show, it is an actual price that these huge industries can continue paying for the rights to our public lands. The Republicans want to continue giving away

grazing rights for a little more than \$1 per acre and allow oil companies to warehouse public lands for \$1.50 an acre.

And after more than 250 votes against the environment and more than 110 votes to benefit the oil and gas industries, the American people are going to look at the record of this Republican majority and say, "No deal."

I urge a "no" vote on the Republican proposal.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would stay here a second, I understand from the Congressional Quarterly that it is your birthday today. In which case, to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I wish you a happy birthday.

I appreciate the visual that you had. Unfortunately, as you tried to spin it, we realized it didn't work. So hopefully that is for your birthday party because nothing else works. But I appreciate and I wish you a happy birthday.

I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 30 seconds.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman.

And if it were possible to retard the aging process, that would be something that I think all of us could agree upon. But in the absence of that breakthrough medically, I thank the gentleman for his bipartisan wishes of a happy birthday.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. And as someone with whiter hair than you have, I understand what you're talking about.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who does indeed have some of these industries in his district and understands full well what this bill is actually attempting to accomplish.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I rise in support of the rule and rise in support of H.R. 4402.

Tomorrow, we will be considering H.R. 4402, that takes significant steps towards making much-needed reforms to our Nation's mineral exploration and mineral permitting process. H.R. 4402 will force the hands of unyielding bureaucrats who seem intent on obstructing any and all mining, despite the detrimental effects that their actions have on the American people.

At a time when China threatens to hamstring our military capabilities and cripple American health care, telecommunications, and renewable energy markets by controlling or reducing our access to rare Earth minerals, we must take responsible action to ensure our access to minerals that are vital to our prosperity and security. In short, the timely licensing of mineral applications is critical to our Nation's survival and to preserving the American way of life, which is opportunity for all to live a decent life.

While investigating this issue, the Natural Resources Committee found that it often takes over 10 years for agencies to license mineral projects. This is simply unacceptable. But the forces that arrogantly stand in the way

of these permits should be of no surprise to us. They are the same gang who routinely stand in the way of technological and scientific advancement. That's right, extreme environmentalists—I remember Ronald Reagan said that some of these people would rather live in a bird nest—some of whom are Federal bureaucrats and some of them, of course, belong to activist organizations that seem to sue for sport and constantly stand in the way of any development of natural resources that were put here by God not to be sitting in the ground, but to help ordinary people live well.

□ 1310

The people who are stopping us from getting those minerals are standing in the way of ordinary people having a decent life, which is so important and we're so proud of here, that every American should have those opportunities.

This mindset that puts the well-being of insects above the health, safety, and quality of life of human beings has contributed to the 8.2 percent unemployment rate—and that's a low figure, as far as I'm concerned. The real unemployment is far beyond that. But the restrictions that we've had on our people that would like to use these natural resources for the well-being of our people has contributed to that unemployment.

Fortunately, however, we are here today to say that we've had enough.

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

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I would say that luckily we are coming to our senses and having courage enough to stand up to this obstructionism by setting reasonable time limits for litigation and by setting a total review process for the issuing of permits to 30 months; 30 months is a very reasonable time.

The reforms that we put in place will ensure that American mineral mining projects are not indefinitely delayed by frivolous lawsuits or by unwilling bureaucrats, or by activists who, as I say, care more about the habitat of insects and lizards than they do about the well-being of the American people.

I come from California. I am a surfer, and I am in the water a lot—anytime I can get out there. We have had offshore oil and gas reserves in the hundreds of billions of dollars available to us, but denied the people of California. Even as we cut the programs that our seniors and our children need, these radicals will not let us get to those oil and natural gas resources. That is a sin against those older people in California and the young people.

We need to clean up that situation. Whose side are we on? We're on the side of ordinary Americans leading a decent life, and that's what this bill is all about.

Mr. POLIS. Well, in briefly addressing the gentleman from California, I

would encourage him to support President Obama's proven track record of success in accelerating the access to public lands, a 17 percent improvement in speed of access over the Bush administration.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I rise in opposition to this rule. There is no reason we could not have an open rule on this legislation—well, unless there are amendments the majority does not want the Members to vote on. Obviously, my colleague, Representative HOLT, has offered one such amendment. The Rules Committee did not make his amendment to require companies that earn a profit mining on public lands to disclose their public donations in order. Why not? Vast amounts of secret money are ruining our democracy.

It is the ultimate irony that free speech now has such a high cost. Our democracy has truly become the best that secret money can buy. That's not good news for the average voters who do not have tens of thousands of dollars to shower on their preferred candidates.

Representative HOLT's amendment would shine some light on this practice and ensure that the entities profiting from public resources are accountable to the electorate. The public, I believe, has a right to know, a right to know who is funding our elections. Apparently, under this rule, they don't even have the right to know where Members of this House stand on this issue.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Could I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado how many additional speakers he has.

Mr. POLIS. We have one remaining speaker at this point. We might have one other, but we have one currently here.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Then, Madam Speaker, let me yield myself just 1 minute.

To try and put things in parameter of what we're actually doing in this bill, in the sixties to the eighties, the United States was actually the leader in the production of most of these minerals. Today, 97 percent of the rare Earth oil, or 97 percent of the rare Earth oxide, 89 percent of the rare Earth alloy, 75 percent of—I can't pronounce the words—and 60 percent of the small cobalt magnets all come from China. We have lost that to them. The reason for doing that is actually part of bureaucratic delay.

Once again, unlike a lot of comments that have been made about this bill, it doesn't pick winners or losers. It doesn't even change the process. All it does is tell the bureaucracy in Washington to do it, to do it within 30 days, making sure that we have now sped up the process so that we now can do something. Instead of in 7 years, in 4 years, does not help reality. That's the point of this bill. It has nothing to do with other issues. It's only trying to

get the process to be sped up so decisions are made in a timely fashion.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, it's my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Frankly, I would say to my good friend on the other side of the aisle that there probably could be, in many instances, common ground about the exporting of mineral exploration. Many of us would look to this as a positive strategy for creating jobs.

I think it is important to say to my friends that, in fact, this bill is not even coming to the floor of the House today. It is not even going to be debated today. So that is one fracture, if we talk about creating jobs.

But another fracture is, of course, that we are substituting this legislation—that might, if it was bipartisan, be able to move forward on creating jobs—for wasting time and casting votes and debating on the Affordable Care Act, an act that has already proven that it has saved lives, provided coverage for small businesses; exempted businesses under 50 persons, allowing them to have insurance; closed the doughnut hole on the prescription drug benefit; and saved billions of dollars.

Here in this legislation, of course, one of the challenges that I have is that even though one would call this a bureaucracy, in actuality it is expediting and overlooking the National Environmental Policy Act, and therefore expediting necessary environmental review. It is being called an "infrastructure project" for purposes of the executive order entitled Improving Performance of Federal Permitting that was designed to reduce permitting time. But more importantly, there are environmental impacts that should be considered.

There is no opposition to creating jobs. There is no opposition to the value of our minerals. But I do believe there is opposition to expediting the process and excluding an environmental review and, more importantly, limiting this debate—that might create jobs, might have opportunities for more amendments, might have more time on the floor—by what we're going to do today, which is frivolity, again, for those of us who believe that we can come together in a bipartisan way to work on the underlying premise of the Affordable Care Act of saving lives, expanding opportunities, and adhering to the Supreme Court's decision that this is the right law of the land that works for all people.

I'd ask my colleagues on the underlying rule to oppose it, and maybe we can get down to the work of the people of the United States of America.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of this particular piece of legislation, who will do a couple of things, I hope, as he gets up there. One,

he will remind us all that no environmental laws are waived by this process; it's about timing. And, number two, he will clarify that when I said 30 days, I meant 30 months. That's why I don't talk well without a script in front of me.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), who has clearly understood this issue and put it together.

Mr. AMODEI. I thank my colleague from the Beehive State.

I want to start out with, obviously, support for the rule. I think the rule is very open in the context of the legislation.

For those that haven't reviewed the legislation, it's about 1½ pages long. It's available out here; it's available online. I recommend you to do it. Because when we talk about what it really does, it's not a wheel of giveaways. When you talk about strategic and critical minerals, here are some words from the bill: "Strategic and critical minerals means minerals that are necessary."

Here's some thoughts to ponder: national defense and national security. Now, do you know what those minerals were 10 years ago, and do you know what they're going to be 10 years from now? It's not meant to be as specific—and my colleague from Colorado is absolutely right, these are broad definitions because, you know what, we don't do this every day. We're not going to check this every year and spend time like this on it. So when you talk about some flexibility there, it's not an accident; it's supposed to be broad.

Here's another thing: strategic and critical. How about the Nation's energy infrastructure? Kind of important if you care about things like energy, regardless of what side of the fence you're on.

A couple other things. Strategic and critical, those minerals, to—here it is out of the bill—support domestic manufacturing. Oh, my goodness. How about support agriculture? Don't care about that.

□ 1320

How about support housing, telecommunications? There was a mention of health care. Are those strategic and critical for the lifestyle or the health and welfare of this Nation?

Strategic and critical. Transportation infrastructure. Oh, and the last couple of things, the Nation's economic security and balance of trade. God forbid that we think about those things when we talk about the minerals industry. Are those broad? They absolutely are.

But here's the part that nobody mentions. There is nothing in those 1½ pages that say that a Federal land manager can't, in response to an application, say, my first finding is that it is not a critical and strategic mineral.

So if somebody comes in for sand and gravel, and it's not that important, then guess what? Under the regulations

that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior are doing, I assume they'll give them the ability to make that finding. And if somebody doesn't like it, under this bill they've got 60 days to sue them on it. But we don't want you to know that because we're going to spin wheels and talk about the giveaway of the day.

By the way, while we're giving stuff away, please show me in the bill where it says that you get a certain result?

And when we talk about reducing the time, this says, both sides can execute agreements that say 30 months. Okay? Guess what? It also says, oh, by the way, if both sides agree, you can extend the 30 months. Now, for those who are familiar with the process and how that works, tell me how an applicant is benefited by a nice, crisp 30-month "no."

So if there's an issue about water quality, or there's an issue about anything that is being talked about—oh, and can I see the repeal sections on NEPA? I don't see that language in here.

You know, I don't envy Federal land use managers. It's a tough job. And when you look at this, see the red? That's federally-owned property. This is to talk about the time it takes to process a permit request to mine on federally-owned property.

So, with all due respect, and plenty of respect for my colleague from Colorado, who's in this, knows it, 36 percent of his State is federally owned, no disrespect to the birthday boy who's somewhere south of 1 percent.

When you talk about economic development, regardless of whether you're riding an elephant or a donkey, guess what? This complicates it. So, when you talk to those Federal land use managers locally and you talk about things, just a couple more things here, because we can't have this. I mean, this is awful stuff. If we talk about enhanced government coordination, permitting review, engage other agencies and stakeholders early in the process, coordinate and consult with project proponents and opponents. I mean, I'm sorry.

And by the way, where's the part in the NEPA bill that was enacted in 1969 that said what we're really trying to do here is see how long you can wait with that application pending?

So guess what? If you get a "no," you get it in 30 months. Or if there are legitimate issues that aren't taken care of in 30 months, why wouldn't you, as an applicant, say, you know what? We'll execute something, as provided in this bill, to say you get six more months. Going off to court is not the optimal thing for anybody.

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

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

Mr. AMODEI. We talk about additional giveaways or whatever. Nobody gets anything out of this other than they get a time certain in the review

process. And if there's more time needed, then guess what? It provides for that.

What's the idea here? Collaboration between Federal land managers and stakeholders, all stakeholders. If you're an applicant, you want a "yes," but there's no magic in getting a 30-month "no."

My final point is this. When you talk about the changes that have been made by the present administration in permitting time, I find it incredibly interesting to hear in committee that that permitting time was actually less than what this proposes.

This cuts nobody off. It's a good place to talk, and it gets rid of the part that is never in NEPA, which is, we're going to outwait you and hope you go away.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to close. Bad bill, bad idea, bad rule. I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Great bill, fair rule. I urge adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPEAL OF OBAMACARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6079) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding, and say to my colleagues, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6079, a legislation that would repeal the President's health care law.

When this bill passed, we were promised that the health care law would lower costs and help create jobs. One congressional leader even suggested it would create 400,000 new jobs.

Well, guess what? It didn't happen. This bill's making our economy worse, driving up the cost of health care, and making it harder for small businesses to hire new workers.

The American people were told that they'd come to like this bill once it was passed. Well, that didn't happen ei-

ther. Most Americans not only oppose this law, but they fully support repealing it.

The American people were told that taxes on the middle class wouldn't go up if this bill passed. Well, guess what? There are 21 tax increases in this health care law, and at least a dozen of them hit the middle class.

And let me just give you a glimpse of the damage that all these tax hikes will do to our economy. A tax on health insurance providers will end up costing up to 249,000 jobs, according to the National Federation of Independent Business.

A tax on health care manufacturers will put as many as 47,000 jobs in jeopardy, according to one nonpartisan estimate. Then you've got the employer mandate, which will affect every job creator with 50 or more employees.

Let's take White Castle, a company in my home State. They say that the employer mandate would eat up most of their net income starting in 2014. And that's on account of just one provision in the law.

And then there's the individual mandate that the Supreme Court has now ruled is a massive tax. The Congressional Budget Office says that roughly 20 million Americans will either have to pay this tax or be forced to buy insurance that they wouldn't have purchased otherwise.

You add it all up, the tax increases in this health care law will take at least \$675 billion out of our pockets over the next 10 years. All this at a time when employers are just trying to get by.

Listen, I think there's a better way, and that's why we're here today. Americans want a step-by-step approach that protects the access to care that they need from the doctor they choose at a lower cost. They certainly didn't ask for this government takeover of their health care system that's put us in this mess that we're in today.

At the beginning of this Congress, the House voted to repeal this health care law. It was our pledge to America, and we kept it. Unfortunately, our colleagues in the Senate refused to follow suit, and since then, we've made some bipartisan progress on repealing parts of this harmful health care law, including the 1099 paperwork mandate.

But this law continues to make our economy worse, and there's even more resolve to see that it is fully repealed.

Now, I think this is an opportunity to save our economy. And for those who still support repealing this harmful health care law, we're giving our colleagues in the Senate another chance to heed the will of the American people. And for those who did not support repeal the last time, it's a chance for our colleagues to reconsider. For all of us, it's an opportunity to do the right thing for our country.

□ 1330

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our Democratic leader, the gentlelady from San

Francisco, California, without whom there would not be an Affordable Care Act, and we greatly appreciate her efforts.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, more than 2 years ago, we put forth a vision for America's middle class to ensure health care would be not a privilege for a few but a right for all Americans.

Today and yesterday—for the past 2 days—as they've done more than 30 times in this Congress, the Republicans are set to take away that right. Over the past 2 days, we have heard the talking points of the health insurance industry. They're trying to drown out the facts, and the facts are these:

What is the takeaway from this debate? The takeaway is the protections House Republicans are voting to take away from America's families:

Today, up to 17 million children have the right to health care coverage even if they have diabetes, asthma, leukemia, or any other preexisting medical condition. Put an "X" next to that. Republicans want to take away protections for children with preexisting conditions;

Today, all young adults have the right to get insurance on their parents' policies. Republicans want to take away that right from America's students and young people. Where we have that coverage for young adults, put an "X" next to that;

Today, 5.3 million seniors have saved \$3.7 billion on their prescription drugs. Republicans want to take away prescription drug savings for seniors;

Today, small business owners have used tax credits to help them afford insurance already for 2 million additional people, and the bill is not fully in effect. Republicans want to take away the tax credits for businesses to help their entrepreneurship and job creation;

Today, nearly 13 million Americans are set to benefit from \$1.1 billion in rebates from health insurance companies. Republicans want to take away those cost savings from America's families;

Today, American women have free coverage. They have a right to free coverage for lifesaving preventative care like mammograms. Starting in August, women will gain free access to a full package of preventative services. No longer will a woman be a preexisting medical condition, but Republicans want to take away those protections from women and all Americans.

Many across the country have heard our Republican colleagues claim that very few people are affected by the preexisting condition provision of the law. The fact is: The Republicans are wrong. The fact is—you be the judge—138 million Americans have preexisting medical conditions.

I ask our friends on the other side of the aisle: Do you know anybody with breast cancer? with prostate cancer? with asthma? with diabetes? people