

Madam Speaker, Ava is right: ObamaCare is not good for seniors on Medicare. They will pay more for less care because of this expensive government takeover of America's health.

And that's just the way it is.

FOOD SHOULD BE OUT OF THE CONVERSATION

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. One of the most significant congressional accomplishments in 1965 was to create a program whereby American citizens could have the opportunity for nutritious foods. The SNAP program allows 46 million Americans to avoid being hungry. The benefits go to deserving individuals. Fifteen percent are elderly; 20 percent are disabled. The average gross monthly income for a food stamp household is \$731. The average net income is \$336.

Now we see an effort to roll back these benefits to these vulnerable populations. The Ryan House budget calls for \$35 billion in cuts. The Lucas-Peterson plan marked up last night calls for \$16 billion. That will result in 3 million Americans losing basic nutrition.

Madam Speaker, this proposal will hurt real people and literally take food off of their table. It's wrong, it's immoral, and it's irresponsible to take food away from deserving American citizens to balance a budget that is unbalanced because of reckless policies that have benefited the rich.

I urge my colleagues to develop a balanced approach to deficit reduction, to include cuts and new revenue. But food should be out of the conversation.

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2012

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4402.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 726 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4402.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0915

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mrs. CAPITO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Madam Chair, the United States of America is rarely last at anything. Unfortunately, that is not the case when it comes to permitting mining projects. In 2012, the U.S. was ranked dead last, along with Papua New Guinea, out of 25 major mining companies on the pace of mining permitting. Now I can't speak for Papua New Guinea, but the reason the U.S. is so slow to issue new mining permits is simple: government bureaucracy.

Burdensome red tape, duplicative reviews, frivolous lawsuits, and onerous regulations can hold up new mining projects for more than a decade. These unnecessary delays cost Americans jobs as we become more and more dependent on foreign countries for raw ingredients to fuel manufacturing and our economy. The lack of American-produced strategic and critical minerals are prime examples of how America has regulated itself into 100 percent dependence on at least 19 unique elements.

Rare Earth elements, a special subset of strategic and critical minerals, are often used as core components for the manufacturing of everything from national security systems to consumer electronics to medical equipment to renewable energy components and everyday household items. Even though America has a plentiful supply of rare Earth elements, our negative approach to producing these crucial materials has resulted in China producing 97 percent of the world's rare Earth elements. Just like the United States' dependence on foreign oil causes pain at the pump, Americans will soon feel the impact of China's monopoly on the rare Earth element market. Those impacts will be felt when they need a CAT scan or they want to buy a new computer for their small business or purchase an iPhone or install solar panels on their roof.

H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, introduced by our colleague from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) will help to end this foreign dependence by streamlining government red tape that blocks strategic and critical mineral production. First and foremost, this is a jobs bill, and

the positive impact of this bill's intent will extend beyond the mining industry. For every metals mining job created, an estimated 2.2 additional jobs are generated. And for every nonmetal mining job created, another 1.6 jobs are created. This legislation gives the opportunity for American manufacturers, for small business technology companies, and construction firms to use American resources to help make the products that are essential for our everyday lives, and in the process this will put Americans back to work.

As China continues to tighten global supplies of rare Earth elements, we should respond with an American mineral mining renaissance that will bring mining and manufacturing jobs back to the United States. The National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act will help supply our national security, high-tech, health care, agriculture, construction, communications, and energy industries with homemade American materials. This bill is the latest example of House Republicans' commitment to and focus on American job creation. The House has passed over 30 job creation bills that still sit in the Senate, where their leaders, unfortunately, refuse to take any action.

□ 0920

This includes several bills from the Natural Resources Committee to increase production of our all-of-the-above energy resources and to protect our public access to public land.

H.R. 4402 will enable new American mineral production. We must act now to cut the government red tape that is stopping American mineral production that furthers our dependence on foreign minerals.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for this underlying legislation; and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

It is really quite fitting that the Republican-controlled House of Representatives is taking up a bill today to weaken environmental regulations for the hard rock mining industry. Because just last night the Republican candidate for President held a lavish \$25,000-a-plate fundraising dinner out in Montana. For those who don't know, the Daly mansion where that event was held was owned by a famous guy, Marcus Daly, was one of the three "copper kings" of Montana during the Gilded Age. He was infamous for his epic battles with other robber barons for control over the copper industry in Montana and around the country.

In fact, the Supreme Court's recent 5-4 decision to invalidate the Montana election law of 1912 overturned a law that was originally enacted to respond to the very excesses of mining barons like Marcus Daly.

So here we are out here on the House floor embracing the Gilded Age. But here in the Republican House, we are

not in a Gilded Age; we are in a Give-away Age where every week the Republicans seek to hand even more giveaways to the oil, the gas, the timber, the coal, and the mining industries. The bill we are considering today is so broadly drafted where apparently sand, gravel, and crushed stone are considered rare and strategic that the majority actually appears to be trying to usher in a new stone age. Under this bill, the next time you go to the beach, you should put some sand in your pocket because the majority apparently believes that it is a rare element. That gravel in your driveway is protected because, under this bill, it is apparently strategic to America's national security.

Rare Earth elements are indispensable to a wide range of military, electronic, and industrial applications, as well as a variety of clean energy technologies. But this bill isn't giving us just the futuristic technologies of the Jetsons. It's giving us the prehistoric technologies of the Flintstones. Volumes of reports have been written about rare Earth minerals and other critical and strategic minerals; and none of them define things like gravel, sand, and clay as critical or strategic minerals.

What we could be doing and what we should be doing on this House floor is developing a policy to break China's grip on the rare Earth minerals that are important to our high-technology sector and to national defense. But we aren't doing that with this bill. No, what we are doing here is using strategic and critical minerals as a pretext for gutting environmental protections relating to virtually all mining operations.

Now, because the majority has cast so many votes to benefit these industries that it gets hard to keep track, we have created this chart to help everyone keep track of which industry is benefiting each week in the GOP giveaway game show. Yesterday, my colleague from Utah seemed extremely interested in making sure this chart functioned properly in order to aid the body. So I brought it back today so we can give it a spin and make sure we all remember who is getting a special giveaway today. But for the Republican Congress, this isn't the game show "Wheel of Fortune." This is the Wheel of Fortune 500 Companies where we can spin to see which large, multinational companies will get handouts.

In "Jeopardy," you state your answer in the form of a question. In the GOP House of Giveaways, answers are stated in the form of questionable policies. And the GOP's final answer in their running game of "Who Wants to Be a Millionaire" is always the same: it is the largest corporations in America at the expense of American taxpayers and the environment. In fact, the majority is bringing this bill chock-full of giveaways to the mining industry on the floor without addressing the 140-year-old loophole that al-

lows mining companies to extract gold, silver, uranium, and other hard rock minerals from public lands without paying taxpayers any royalty payments.

This rip-off is even worse when you see that every western State actually charges royalties of between 2 and 12 percent for companies to mine hard rock minerals on State lands; but on Federal lands, which might be right next door, the mining companies don't have to pay taxpayers a dime in royalties.

The robber barons are long gone, but mining companies can still operate under a law put in place during their heyday. Yet the majority's answer is not only to do nothing to end this free mining on public lands. They are trying to hand even more giveaways to this industry in this bill. This is a bad bill, and it should be defeated. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), who is the chairman of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee on the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman.

Madam Chairman, I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2012, introduced by my colleague, Representative AMODEI, of which I am a cosponsor. This bill was heard in our Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee on April 26.

Although Americans hear a lot about our dependence on foreign oil, they may not know about our dependence on foreign countries for minerals critical to our manufacturing, national defense, communications, and medical care needs.

Over the years, we have allowed frivolous lawsuits and unnecessary regulations to stifle our domestic production of these vital minerals. Today, the United States is nearly 100 percent reliant on countries such as China for rare Earth elements that are essential to our economy. We should all be troubled by China's recent policies restricting exports of these critical minerals. But rather than complain about that to the World Trade Organization, as the Obama administration is doing, we should simply support our efforts to allow production of and access to our own vast domestic supplies.

This bill is a bipartisan plan that cuts red tape by streamlining the permitting process for mineral development which will create jobs and help grow the economy. Under current laws and regulations, it could take a developer up to 10 years to get all the government permits in place. This bill would shorten that time down to just over 2 years.

These minerals are essential components of technologies in everyday items ranging from cell phones, computers, medical equipment, renewable

energy products, high-tech military equipment, and building supplies. They are vital to our country's manufacturing sector and our ability to create jobs. Every job in metals mining creates an estimated 2.3 additional job.

It's time for America to get serious about rare Earth and strategic minerals. We can start by opening up our \$6 trillion worth of untapped mineral resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey as much time as he may consume.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend, the ranking member.

Madam Chair, today we're considering the so-called National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2012. Now, despite the bill's title, it has almost nothing to do with national strategic and critical minerals production.

□ 0930

In fact, under the guise of promoting the development of minerals critical to the United States' national security, this legislation would reshape mining decisions on public lands for almost all minerals. You heard Mr. MARKEY talk about gravel and sand and other things that can fall under the definition here of critical minerals.

There's a list of problems with this bill that is long, and several of the amendments we'll consider today will attempt to address the egregious provisions that would truncate important environmental review.

Make no mistake, this is a giveaway. It is free mining, no royalties, no protection of public interest, exemption from royalty payments, near exemption from environmental regulations, near exemption from legal enforcement of the protections. And it's unnecessary.

Madam Chairman, the Natural Resources Committee has already reported out legislation, on a bipartisan basis, to lay the groundwork for developing critical and strategic mineral production. Nearly a year ago, July of 2011—yes, 12 months ago—the committee reported out H.R. 2011, on a bipartisan basis, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2011, by unanimous consent. That bill would improve our understanding of critical strategic mineral deposits and aid in their development.

That legislation is not only bipartisan, it's supported by the National Mining Association, for heaven's sake. The president and CEO of the National Mining Association, Hal Quinn, issued a statement when the bill was passed out of committee, saying, "The House Natural Resources Committee took important bipartisan action today to ensure U.S. manufacturers, technology innovators, and our military have a more stable supply of minerals vital to the products they produce and use."

He went on to say that legislation "will provide a valuable assessment of

our current and future mineral demands and our ability to meet more of our needs through domestic minerals production.”

Yes, a year ago we reported out a bill, on a bipartisan basis, that would do what this legislation purports to do. Instead, we’re taking up this legislation, which is a giveaway.

The legislation we could be dealing with actually deals with strategic and critical minerals. If the majority were to bring it to the floor, I’m sure it would pass in an overwhelming, bipartisan way and would likely be passed by the other body and signed into law.

We should be able to work in this fashion when it comes to improving our supply of rare earths and other strategic minerals and ensuring that we’re not dependent on China and other nations for their supply, but the majority is not interested, evidently, in working in a bipartisan fashion. Instead, they’re moving this bill, H.R. 4402, which has almost nothing to do with strategic minerals and is really about giveaways to the mining industry. This bill is a Trojan horse and has no chance of becoming law.

Why are we playing these games? Why are, I should say, they playing these games with our need to develop strategic minerals? We should be working in the kind of fashion that led to last year’s bill.

The majority should shelve this giveaway to the mining industry and bring up the other Critical Minerals Policy Act to the floor immediately.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

Mr. AMODEI. Madam Chair, I’m going to follow on the theme from my colleague from the Garden State: Why? Why an 11½-page bill that does two things; sets a 30-month—not rock-hard, no pun intended—time limit on Federal permitting decisions for mines and says, if you don’t like that decision, you’ve got to sue in 60 days?

Why are you not talking about what’s the problem with 2½ years to talk about the permit? What’s the problem with providing some predictability to the timing of the permitting process? What’s the problem with not stringing people out under NEPA for over a decade for mine decisions? Why are we not hearing about that?

The giveaway stuff is phenomenally entertaining. This does nothing to tax law. This does nothing to safety law. This does nothing to supplant NEPA, and this does nothing to supplant any State fix. This is an 11-plus-page bill that says you’ve got 30 months—and by the way, if you both agree, you can use more than 30 months. Now, what’s the translation of that? God forbid we have collaboration between an applicant and a Federal land use agency in this process.

Why are you afraid of collaboration? Why are you afraid of setting a time

limit? And where in the 1969 NEPA law—since we’re talking about old stuff—does it say this is a marathon, and if you can outwait them—forget about the facts, forget about the science, forget about the technology—we’re going to obfuscate and delay and hope that you will go away? Because, you know what—my hat’s off—it’s become a great weapon in this.

But when less than 1 percent of the surface area of Federal land in this Nation is impacted by mining, I think what it’s really about is we don’t want any predictability for this because we’re basically against an industry.

Everybody’s got a definition of “strategic.” When you talk about transportation, medical devices, national defense, the economy, I think those are strategic and critical things.

So I would urge your support on this, to bring some collaboration, truly, instead of making this an administrative marathon for purposes of permitting.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, the bill we are considering today isn’t about ensuring our supply of “strategic and critical minerals.” This bill is about deregulating the mining industry and the pipeline industry.

It’s misnamed. It should be renamed the Koch Brothers Mining and Pipeline Deregulatory Act of 2012. It’s consistent with everything that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been about during this 112th Congress. It’s been about deregulation; it’s been about tax breaks for the wealthy; and it’s been about cutting the ability of the government to do what it needs to do.

While they’re cutting the ability of the Federal agencies to assess the propriety of these kinds of activities—mining and gas line production—while they are cutting the ability to do that, they are reducing the time within which the remaining assets of the various agencies have to do the work that they are supposed to do. I’ll tell you, it’s important that we assess the environmental impact of various proposals on our environment, but my colleagues on the other side don’t care about the environment.

Almost a year ago, the Natural Resources Committee produced H.R. 2011, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act, a bipartisan bill that actually did address supply vulnerabilities for truly strategic and critical minerals policy. I was proud to work with Ranking Member MARKEY and Chairman HASTINGS to coauthor that legislation, and it was passed unanimously by their committee.

That bill, H.R. 2011, would have passed this body with broad bipartisan support and would probably have passed the Senate, too. It could have been a rare glimpse of actual governance in this totally politicized Tea Party House of Representatives. Unfortunately, I understand that bill was ob-

structed by Republican leadership. I wonder why.

Could it be the Koch brothers? Things go better with Coke. Could it be because the mining industry instructed them to attack environmental regulations instead? Did someone get a phone call from Rush Limbaugh with instructions?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Rather than bringing the bipartisan H.R. 2011, here we have a wolf in sheep’s clothing, a bill that purports to serve our national security interests but, in truth, just seeks to undermine environmental regulations that protect the health and well-being of Americans throughout this great country.

□ 0940

It’s just another episode in a long saga of misleadingly named Republican legislation, bills that claim to help the country, but really just help the special interests. What a shame.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, and I would yield to the gentleman from Georgia, if he can tell me, in this 11-page bill, where environmental laws are gutted, and I’ll yield to the gentleman if he can give me a specific, what page.

I’m asking you a question, and I’ll yield to you if you respond to my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. You asked me a question and I’m going to answer it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. What page?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. The overall scheme of this bill—

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. What page?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. The overall scheme of this bill is to take away—

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. What page? I asked the gentleman—I’m yielding to him to respond to me at what page. The gentleman cannot respond.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. You’re not interested in debate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The gentleman obviously can’t respond. I reclaim my time.

I am very pleased at this point to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4402.

My home State of Arizona is known for the five Cs: cattle, cotton, citrus, climate, and, lastly, copper. People have been digging in Arizona for precious metals like copper for centuries. In the 1850s, nearly one in every four people in Arizona were miners. Without a doubt, mining fueled the growth that makes Arizona the State it is today.

Today, the Arizona mining industry is alive, but it is not what it used to be.

A wide array of other critical minerals such as copper, coal, uranium, lime, and potash are mined throughout my district. These projects employ hundreds of my constituents with high-paying jobs, jobs that pay over \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year plus benefits. In rural Arizona, those types of jobs are few and far between—in fact, they are few and far between across this country.

But there is some potential, and there's so much more. As you can see from the graphic, rare Earth and other critical minerals have been discovered throughout rural Arizona and are suitable for development. These are minerals our country badly needs to meet the demands for production of everyday items like cell phones, computers, batteries, and cars.

So what is the holdup?

As I travel throughout rural Arizona talking with companies that do business throughout my State, the message is clear. The length, the complexity, the uncertainty of the permitting process is stymieing the development of and discouraging investors from committing to U.S. mining.

If you do not believe this, how about a real life example? I will give you an example right out of rural Arizona. Down here in Safford, in the southeastern part of my district, is the home of the real mine in North America. It took 13 years for all the necessary permitting. Imagine that. Time is money.

I was the first cosponsor of H.R. 4402 because the government has to work more efficiently. This legislation streamlines the process and sets benchmarks while ensuring continued environmental protection.

Let me be clear. Despite what the opposition says, this bill does not exempt the industry from complying with environmental regulations. It tackles the problems on the government approval process.

Let's restore some sanity into the permitting process.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GOSAR. If the current bureaucratic gridlock was in place 150 years ago, I do not believe Arizona could exist as it does today. Copper would not be one of our five founding Cs.

Let's restore some sanity to the permitting process and get American miners back to work. Vote "yes" on the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. Our economy deserves and depends on it.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

I just wanted to address the point raised by the committee chair. Where in the bill, he asks, are there exemptions from environmental review?

Well, section 102 is where they are, right at the front of this bill, page 4, if

he wanted to know the page number. Under section 102, the lead agency can determine whether the NEPA law, the National Environmental Policy Act, even applies to a particular project. The whole idea of the National Environmental Policy Act is that there would be an independent review that involves public input, input from all affected interests, and input from somebody who speaks for the land and somebody who speaks for the trees.

One of my colleagues a few moments ago said mining affects only a tiny, tiny fraction of the land. Well, that is, if you ignore everybody who's downstream and downwind.

Section 102 allows deferring and relying on data from reviews that have been performed not under NEPA standards. The majority says, well, State reviews should suffice.

Well, does anybody remember a State called Montana that was controlled by copper interests? Do you think that State's reviews of a copper mining environmental impact would suffice?

Well, that's the kind of thing that would be permitted under this legislation. It would be whether to prepare a document, the determination of the scope of any review, the submission and review of any comments from the public. They could say no public comments are permitted. I consider that a real abrogation of our responsibility and, yes, a real removal of environmental protection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend from New Jersey.

He talked about section 102. Section 101, which is the basis of all this really, talks about what the President did with his executive order, by improving performance of Federal permitting and review of infrastructure projects. Now, we are simply duplicating what the President has already said is okay in other areas.

With that, Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

It's nice to hear on the floor who it is that's speaking for the trees in New Mexico. We've just burned down 300,000 acres of those trees in New Mexico because of the voices coming from Washington saying don't cut a single one of them. Let the fuels build up in those forests until they burn down.

All this bill is doing is saying, let's hold our government accountable to some standard of performance. We want our government servants to do the same work they would do in 10 years in maybe 30 months. That is not an unreasonable assumption for us in America, who are looking for the jobs.

New Mexico used to be the home to 11 rare Earth mineral mines. Those are the ones that create cell phone batteries, the minerals that create techno-

logical things. And we now have pushed those out of New Mexico and the rest of the West, and we've pushed them over to China so that they have the jobs and we no longer have them in this country.

We have people here who are willing to scream foul on every single thing when we ask the government to simply do its job in a little bit more efficient manner.

We actually did that in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. An amendment placed in the Resources Committee actually improved the permitting process. It had categorical exclusions. It created pilot offices.

I just had a chance to visit with the State director of BLM last week. He said that our processes are so much better today because of that bill. That's all we're trying to do in this bill here today.

H.R. 4402 simply listens to the President. We were talking about, from the other side of the aisle, we should rename it. Well, why don't we rename it, We're Listening to You, Mr. President? You asked on March 22 that our Federal permitting and review processes must provide a transparent, consistent, and predictable path. The President is asking for it, and this bill simply gives it.

The reason that we don't have jobs in this country is because we're sending them to other countries. Companies cannot wait for 10, 12, 15 years. They can't invest in that permitting process to get to the point of where their process is finished.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PEARCE. They can't invest 10 to 12 years in a permitting process to be told at the end of it, we're sorry; we're not going to do it.

We could call this the Let's Reinvest in American Green Jobs. Green jobs require aluminum; 100 percent of that is imported. Green jobs require nickel; 100 percent of that is imported. Green jobs require platinum; 91 percent of that is imported.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle speak from both sides of their mouth. We want green jobs, but we don't want to have any of the productive assets here. We want to import them from other countries. Let's reinvest in America.

□ 0950

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chair, how much time remains on either side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman for giving me a chance to clarify further the point raised by the chairman that

this does not eviscerate environmental protections.

I talked about section 102, and the chairman came back and said, well, section 101 just refers to the Presidential order that allows certain infrastructure projects to move ahead with expedited environmental review. First of all, it is only expedited environmental review—it is not with removal of environmental review—and that was talking about specific critical construction projects.

What this would do would allow the exemption, essentially, from environmental review for any of the materials that go into the construction project, including gravel and sand. All of that would be exempt because the mining companies could negotiate a timetable for each step of the review process. The mining companies could enter into a negotiation for determining whether there would be public comment or whether partial previous reviews would suffice.

Furthermore, section 103 directs the agency overseeing this project to prioritize, to give the highest priority, to maximizing the production of the mineral resource. In other words, that relegates any review, any challenge to the regulatory process, to secondary, tertiary or nonexistent status. It says maximizing production has the highest priority. This is a giveaway to mining companies. This is not about providing strategic and critical minerals.

The other side has talked at length about the importance of these minerals to our modern technology today for batteries and cars and magnets and all sorts of other things. They're right, we should be ensuring a good supply of these things; but this bill does not do it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Before I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from New Jersey disparaged, I guess, sand and gravel. Madam Chairman, I would point out to you that I think, after the earthquakes in northern California, when roads collapsed, and after the earthquakes in southern California, when the roads collapsed, and when the bridge collapsed in Minnesota, I have to believe that those people felt that sand and gravel were very critical minerals at that time. That's why this bill is broad in its definition of "critical minerals."

With that, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I come to the floor today to express my support for H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. This bill will expedite responsible mineral production in the United States by reducing Federal red tape and by speeding up the Federal permitting process to create new mining jobs.

My northern Michigan district is blessed with abundant mineral re-

sources. From copper mines in Keweenaw and Houghton to the iron mines in Marquette and the western parts of the Upper Peninsula, mining has been the foundation of northern Michigan's economy. Currently, mining contributes over \$4 billion to Michigan's economy annually and employs over 30,000 people. Today, new mining operations in northern Michigan are being explored. These mines have the potential to create thousands of new jobs. In fact, just last week, I visited one of these new mine sites and was able to see firsthand the work that they are doing to responsibly utilize Michigan's vast copper resources.

Regrettably, the Federal Government and Washington bureaucrats have been standing in the way of new mines across this country. Due to lawsuits and government inefficiency, the current process of acquiring permits for a new mining project can take more than a decade. That's right, a decade. While our economy is struggling, we can not afford to wait 10 years while the Federal Government sits on its hands. We need to encourage the responsible use of our mineral resources to create jobs and keep America competitive with the rest of the world.

Madam Chair, I encourage all Members to support this commonsense legislation to speed up this process and create jobs. If we can get the Federal Government out of the way, I am confident areas like northern Michigan can flourish once again.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I have used the phrase "giveaway," as have others today several times. The ranking member spoke about the wheel of giveaways. One day, it's oil. Another day, it's timber. Today, it's mining. There is also a lot of concern about the special interests that are represented here by this.

I offered an amendment to this bill to ensure that the companies involved, the mining companies, could not continue to extract valuable minerals for free, minerals that belong to the American people, without accountability for their expenditures to obtain political influence. My amendment, which unfortunately was not allowed by the Rules Committee, would have simply required that mineral exploration and mining companies disclose their contributions for political influence over the previous 5 years in order to obtain new leases—perfectly legal and, I would say, perfectly reasonable.

The Supreme Court decision in Citizens United ruled that corporations may spend freely in elections, which I believe constituted a blow to popular democracy. It overturned a century-old doctrine going back to Teddy Roosevelt restricting corporate money in campaigns. The flawed decision opened floodgates on corporate spending to influence, maybe even to dominate, our elections. Because of that decision,

American democracy has come to be defined by super PACs and similar organizations.

The amendment I offered would have helped to restore some sanity and transparency to this process by requiring that mining companies disclose their campaign contributions over the previous 5 years in order to receive new leases for public lands.

As Speaker BOEHNER said on "Meet the Press" a few years back:

I think what we ought to do is we ought to have full disclosure, full disclosure of all of the money that we raise and how it is spent. I think that sunlight is the best disinfectant.

I agree. We should be doing that in this case as well. Promoting the development of minerals that are critical to core national priorities and that are genuinely susceptible to supply disruption, like rare Earth elements, should be an area where Democrats and Republicans can work together, not one where special interests advance one partisan interest over another. Unfortunately, the majority's hurry to give yet another handout to the mining industry means that we are not having that debate here today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the time.

I stand here today in support of the bill of my friend and colleague, MARK AMODEI.

I think it's really important that we use America's resources responsibly to grow jobs in this country. We need American jobs using American resources and not relying on foreign imports and driving our jobs offshore. This is especially important when it comes to our mineral resources. We've heard all the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, all that stuff. Let me just talk to you about the eastern Oregon miners.

They are individual men and women. They are very blue collar. They are not part of the wealthy class you hear talked about here. They've just been trying to work with this Federal Government for over a decade to be able to use the mining claims that they have. Back in 2001 and 2004, the Forest Service grouped together 49 mining plans of operations for analysis and approval. Then in 2005, the Forest Service decision to approve the plans was then litigated, and it resulted in the requirement that the Agency reduce some of its analysis.

□ 1000

Today, 11 years later, the Federal Government still can't get their work done. This is in an area that at one time in our history produced some of the most substantial gold, silver, and minerals that we need in the United States.

When we pull out all our little electronic gadgets—you know what?—if it weren't for the mining interests in

America, you wouldn't have those gadgets, because that's what goes into what we use. We need to be able to use America's resources. This allows us to do it.

The 42 mining operations in Baker County, if they were allowed to work—and these are just average Americans just trying to do what they're allowed to do under Federal law but held up because of the Federal agency's inability to get their work done or unwillingness to in the North Fork and the Burnt River and elsewhere. If they could just move forward, if they could just get an answer out of the Federal Government in something short of 10 or 11 years, they could be producing jobs. They could be producing mineral resources and wealth for this country, the United States of America. We can create jobs here using our mineral resources.

Some of these people have died waiting. You shouldn't have to die waiting for your Federal Government to get its work done. That's why we need this bill.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask once again how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. At this point, Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam Chair, I'm honored to rise in support of H.R. 4402, with my colleague MARK AMODEI, and to support this.

This is about setting a definitive timeline for permits, which creates certainty and encourages private investment. This is not about government investment; this is about private investment. This is not about taxpayer dollars, but taxpayers. This is about jobs and the American economy.

Everything from your automobile to your iPhone requires rare Earth minerals. Every solar panel, every wind turbine, every electric battery for every car, every fluorescent light bulb, your UV glass, audio speakers, fiber optics, precision guide munitions, metal alloys, magnets, and a whole lot more all require rare Earth minerals.

We need to understand that China now controls the international market of rare Earth minerals, not because they have beaten us in the market, but because we have beaten us. We have the resources, but we simply made the permitting process so long, complicated, and unpredictable that we've killed our supply and allowed other Nations to control our future.

In my district, there is a magnet manufacturing plant that creates high-tech magnets dependent on rare Earth minerals. Last year, they were able to purchase a certain rare Earth mineral for \$4 a pound. Now, with China as the only supplier, that is now \$55 per

pound. That drives up the cost of everything that we use those high-tech magnets for, and it's very difficult on the manufacturing industry.

We have allowed China to have the monopoly. We should have the ability to produce our own materials here.

You cannot turn on your car, your lights, your computer without China sending us the materials to do it. When we are fighting to get control of our energy future, we must not forget that it doesn't matter if we have our own energy future if we can't even turn on what we plug in because we don't have the rare Earth minerals to produce it.

We have a manufacturing future if we actually manufacture, and that means rare Earth minerals now in this modern economy. Jobs like mining, geologists, engineers, truck drivers, manufacturing, service industry, yes, even government regulators are all dependent on us getting moving on producing our own stuff.

Right now, as the price goes up, it's time for us to bring the price down with more mining.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from the great State of Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I thank the chairman from the great State of Washington for yielding, and I rise in strong support of Mr. AMODEI's important legislation, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, because if we want to build it in America, then we need to be able to mine it in America.

This legislation is important in identifying and promoting strategic and critical minerals here in America. It will make us more competitive by addressing permitting delays, improving the NEPA process, and revitalizing our domestic critical minerals supply chain.

Madam Chairman, it takes longer to receive a mining development permit in the United States than in any of the other 25 mining nations in the world. The average waiting period for a permit is 7 to 10 years, and in many examples, it's much longer. We can improve this process without changing our environmental standards.

The Kettle River-Buckhorn mine in eastern Washington that employs over 400 people in Ferry County knows this all too well. The EIS schedule and now the important exploratory permits to keep them operating have been delayed for years and was recently delayed for an additional year without much explanation.

This bill is important. It's important to bringing jobs to America, bringing job certainty to Ferry County and eastern Washington.

Right now, many foreign countries are requiring companies that buy raw materials from them to produce the

products those minerals are a part of in that foreign country. If you are concerned about American infrastructure, if you are concerned about American manufacturing, if you are concerned about American energy independence, American mining, or American jobs, I urge you to support H.R. 4402.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation is fundamentally a solution in search of a problem. According to the analysis of data provided by the BLM for hard rock mines on public lands for which we have complete data, the average time it takes to approve a plan of operation for a mine has actually decreased under the Obama administration.

According to the BLM data, plans of operation for hard rock mines are being approved roughly 17 percent more quickly under the Obama administration than under the Bush administration. Thank you again, President Obama, for the great job you're doing in changing the way in which the Bush administration held up those permits.

Despite the majority's claims, 82 percent of plans of operation for hard rock mines are 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. That's more than 1,000 acres on public lands.

My colleagues on the other side have asked repeatedly what the problem is with their legislation that would truncate and eviscerate proper review of all mines on public lands if the majority of plans are approved within 3 years. It is because a little more than 15 percent of hard rock mines take more than 4 years to approve. For these mines, where mining companies may not have submitted a complete application and may not have posted a sufficient bond to ensure the mine is cleaned up where additional environmental review is required because the mine is large or potentially damaging to our environment and public health, this bill would prevent proper review.

We're already approving hard rock mines more quickly under the Obama administration than under the Bush administration. We should not be eviscerating proper review of virtually all mining operations on public lands, as this Republican bill would do, and we should certainly not be doing it under the pretense of developing critical and strategic minerals.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

We're here talking about H.R. 4402 that's going to minimize the permitting process and the delays and streamline bureaucracy around mining.

I want to be clear that there is no conversation in this House that is saying we should do away with the permitting process or we should do away with the bureaucracy. We're here to say, Let's streamline it. Let's make it easier. Let's make sure that we don't have the bureaucracy and the permitting process stand in the way of good projects and good paying jobs.

In my home district in the northwest corner of Wisconsin, we had a similar issue come up that we dealt with in our State.

□ 1010

We have a great vein of iron ore up in Iron County and Ashland County. It's a vein that, if mined, would create 600 to 700 new, good-paying jobs in the northern part of Wisconsin, jobs that pay anywhere from \$60,000 to \$80,000 a year. Many of those jobs would be union jobs.

What we try to do in the State of Wisconsin is say let's streamline the permitting process so those who want to invest in that mine can get an answer in a reasonable amount of time. And if we go through a permitting process—any of us who live in northern Wisconsin who would have found information that would say that this mine would damage Lake Superior, which all of us love, we live up there because we love the outdoors, we love the lake—if it was going to damage the lake, we would all stand opposed to the mine.

If you can do it in a safe manner and if you can get a permit in a reasonable amount of time, why are we saying no to good-paying jobs? This is an area that has an unemployment rate of over 10 percent. They need good-paying jobs, and we have the permitting process standing in the way of these people going back to work.

We see more and more rules and regulations that stand in the way of job growth. That's wrong.

Let's stand together, let's streamline this process, make sure that we're environmentally safe and we're also creating jobs.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 1 minute again to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

Mr. AMODEI. Madam Chair, I would just briefly indicate—and I want to thank you for finally looking at section 102 and talking about the bill. I appreciate that. It's a great day in my young career that that has happened.

Let's look at what section 102 does that is so insidious for the wheel of giveaways, which by the way we want to borrow and paste over it. Instead of what you've got, how about the wheel

of takeaways? Takeaways from national defense, takeaways from communications, takeaways from national infrastructure, takeaways from balance of trade; oh, and let's talk about takeaways from living-wage jobs without standing benefits, some of which are, in fact, union jobs. So the wheel of takeaways we won't bore you with, but that wheel can go both ways.

Section 102, interestingly enough, if you like this, this is a bad thing. It requires best practices, Madam Chair, for things like considering State agency reports that have jurisdiction over the issue. That's a pretty frivolous takeaway. It already exists.

Or how about considering best practices for conducting reviews concurrently? Oh, my God, the Republicans are giving something away, conducting reviews concurrently. Oh, my goodness. How about expediting rather than delaying the process?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself 1 minute.

Again, this bill is not aimed at ensuring that we can guarantee that we increase the production of the kinds of rare Earth that we need in order to compete against China. By the way, if we're really going to be using China as the guise for the reduction in the environmental laws in the United States because they have rare Earth, and we're ramping up our production of rare Earth, what we should really be talking about is why in the world are the Republicans supporting the sale of our oil and our natural gas to China.

If they're using precious minerals as an economic weapon against the United States, then why don't we use natural gas and oil, which we have, against them because that's the most precious of all minerals.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Oil and gas really drive the economy of the world, and every time I bring an amendment out here on the floor that says, well, let's drill for oil and natural gas on the public lands of the United States, but we can't export it after we discover it here, drill for it here, to China, the Republicans, every time, vote not to put a ban on that. At the same time, they are over there with crocodile tears very concerned about China having all of these precious metals that they won't sell to us.

Well, you want to know the best way to get China to sell that stuff to us? For us not to sell the stuff we have to them, that they need to manufacture those materials. That's the game.

So you can't have it both ways. You just can't have it both ways. Either this is a great threat to our country and we're going to use the precious metals we have, the precious minerals that we have, oil and gas as our weapon against China, or we're doomed. We don't have a real strategy.

Again, this is not a coherent strategy to deal with the country of China and

their economic strategy to undermine our competitiveness.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I would just advise my friend that I am prepared to close if the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close.

Mr. MARKEY. I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Chair.

China's rare Earth policies do burn America's high-tech manufacturing competitiveness, and the Republicans just want to throw gas on the fire, American natural gas.

Our greatest competitive advantage in manufacturing right now is low-priced domestic natural gas, but the Republicans want to export that competitive edge to China and to develop a global natural gas market so that the United States natural gas prices triple here domestically, or quadruple to match the prices the rest of the world pays.

China will not send their rare Earth minerals to the United States, but Republicans have continually voted to allow exports of our low-cost natural gas, our manufacturing advantage, to China.

This is a one-way ticket to manufacturing oblivion. Natural gas in our country is six to seven times less expensive than natural gas in China. It is four times less expensive than natural gas in Europe. That is our competitive advantage.

What the Republicans have consistently done since they have taken over the majority is to put in place policies to export our natural gas that is six times less expensive to China that will then be used in the manufacture of every product that they will then sell back to us, undermining every manufacturing industry in the United States as we supply the very valuable precious natural gas they need in order to harm dramatically the American economy.

Where do they show up? They show up here with crocodile tears about the restrictions that the National Environmental Policy Act places upon mining for sand, mining for gold, mining for silver. You really think that's the way we're going to get back into a better competitive stance against the Chinese as you're saying no, let's sell our natural gas that's six times less expensive than the natural gas they have in America fueling their industries?

That's just an upside-down policy. It's just dealing with the periphery of the challenge that China presents to us, and not even in an effective way, rather than going right to the core of how they are exploiting this mindless commitment to not the American Petroleum Institute, but we might as well call it the world petroleum institute because they don't represent American interests.

That's what we have to do here on the floor of the House of Representatives. That's what our amendments do

today to make sure that we do for our country.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, for the record, Madam Chair, natural gas is not affected at all by this bill.

Madam Chair, I will submit for the RECORD excerpts from the March 2012 Report to Congress by the Department of Defense on the rare Earth materials in defense applications on national security dependence on a secure supply of high-tech critical minerals.

□ 1020

Madam Chairwoman, my colleagues have talked about the fact that this administration claims that mining permitting timelines have been reduced. Yet this President has been in office now for 40 months, and while they are filing WTO complaints against China on rare Earth minerals, they have yet to permit one rare Earth mine here in America, and there doesn't seem like there's any on the horizon that will get approval.

I want to also talk about one other thing, Madam Chairman. President Obama has been giving a lot of speeches claiming support for insourcing jobs to the United States from foreign nations. Currently, our Nation is dependent on foreign nations such as China and India for critical materials that American manufacturers and our economy depend upon. This bill will help reverse this dependency and insource these good-paying jobs right here to the United States. Yet the official position of the Obama administration is that they strongly oppose this jobs bill. Not only will this bill help create mining jobs in Nevada, Colorado, New Mexico, and many other States, it will also help produce the critical materials and minerals that American manufacturers need and that millions of jobs depend on in Ohio, Michigan, and Pennsylvania.

So President Obama can give speech after speech claiming support for insourcing jobs, but when he should take action to make that happen, the Obama administration essentially goes the other way, as he has done with this bill.

Once again, Madam Chairman, this bill simply says that in a given time period there should be a decision made. It doesn't say it should be a positive or negative, but that a decision should be made. That's all. And when we're dealing with materials that are so important to our economy and to American jobs, we should be very much in favor of this legislation.

For that reason, Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4402, and I yield back the balance of my time. Madam Chairman, I note for the

RECORD excerpts from the March 2012 Report to Congress by the Department of Defense on the Rare Earth Materials in Defense Applications on national security dependence on a secure supply of high-tech critical minerals.

ASSESSMENT OF RARE EARTH MATERIALS SUPPLY CHAIN

A. INTRODUCTION

This report is prepared pursuant to section 843 the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) and Senate Report 111-201, accompanying S. 3454, page 174. The Act requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on the supply and demand for rare earth materials in defense applications and Senate Report 111-201 requests discussion of national security issues related to rare earth materials in the defense supply chain.

C. CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

In section 843 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2011, Congress mandated that the Department assess which, if any, of the rare earth materials meet the following two criteria:

Criterion 1: "The rare earth material is critical to the production, sustainment, or operation of significant United States military equipment."

Criterion 2: "The rare earth material is subject to interruption of supply, based on actions or events outside the control of the government of the United States."

For each rare earth material that meets both criteria, section 843 requires a plan to ensure long-term availability, with a goal of establishing an assured source of supply of such material in critical defense applications by December 31, 2015.

Section 843 states that the plan shall include consideration of risk mitigation methods and states that sintered neodymium iron boron (NdFeB) magnets meet the criteria for inclusion in the plan.

F. FORECAST OF U.S. SUPPLY VS. KEY DEFENSE CONSUMPTION—2013

	Supply	Consumption	Surplus	Deficit
Dysprosium	7	7	0
Erbium	1.2	1.14	0.056
Europium	21	11	10
Gadolinium	42	4	38
Neodymium	2,232	110	2,122
Praseodymium	824	14	810
Yttrium	26	119	93

Rare earth materials are widely used within the U.S. defense industrial base. Markets for rare earth materials are dominated by commercial end-uses, and the defense industrial base represents a small fraction of overall U.S. consumption. The seven rare earth elements in the preceding table are those which are the most prevalent among defense consumption for the purposes of procurement. The assessment determined that by 2013 U.S. production could satisfy the level of consumption required to meet defense procurement needs, with the exception of yttrium (estimates based on model using 2010 data). Since 2010, both expected DoD demand, and, more significantly, actual U.S. commercial demand have decreased significantly. As importantly, the U.S. and global market has responded to market conditions with new investments, corporate restructuring, and technical advances. All are trending positive for a market capable of meeting future U.S. Government demand. It is anticipated the domestic supply of REEs and rare-earth-containing products will continue to grow between now and 2015, and it will be possible for manufacturers within the defense indus-

trial base to obtain some rare-earth-containing products from reliable foreign sources of supply. Despite the many positive developments that indicate an increasingly diverse and robust domestic and global supply chain for rare earth materials, the Department will continue to monitor these supply chains and take actions as indicated in the following sections.

G. DOD'S RECOMMENDED PLANS TO ASSURE SUPPLIES OF RARE EARTH MATERIALS

The DoD plan for ensuring the long-term availability of rare earth materials applies a multi-pronged approach. The following options could be used in conjunction with existing DoD Defense Production Act Title I authorities (e.g., priority claim on U.S. supplies and foreign supplies that are imported into the United States):

DoD will engage in continuous, rigorous monitoring of markets and production levels;

DoD will undertake recurring reviews of defense industrial base materials supply chains;

DoD will make preparations for the possible need to establish buffer stocks that are contractor-owned, U.S. Government-subsidized but not implemented unless certain predetermined marked indicators are met; and

DoD will make preparations for the possible need to establish contingency measures to obtain vendor-managed inventories when pre-determined market and/or supply chain indicators occur.

In addition to the elements of supply assurances in the plan above, the following methods will be considered during implementation of the DoD plan, as outlined in section 843:

Assessment of available financing to industry, universities and not-for profits;

Assessment of Defense Production Act benefits;

Assessment of research and development funding for alternatives and substitutions; and

Assessment of foreign trade practices with relevant U.S. Government components.

H. CONCLUSIONS

Rare earth materials are widely used within the defense industrial base. However, such ends uses represent a small fraction of U.S. consumption. As a result, when looked at in isolation, the growing U.S. supply of these materials is increasingly capable of meeting the consumption of the defense industrial base. Over the past year, there have been a number of positive developments with regard to both supply and demand within the rare earth materials markets. Reactions to market forces have resulted in positive developments, such as prices decreasing by half from their peak levels in July 2011, increased investment and domestic supply of rare earth materials, corporate restructuring within the supply chain, and lower forecasts for non-Chinese consumption. By 2015, the Department believes this will help to stabilize overall markets and improve the availability of rare earth materials.

The Department remains committed to pursuing a three-pronged approach to this important issue: diversification of supply, pursuit of substitutes, and a focus on reclamation of waste as part of a larger U.S. Government recycling effort. In addition to the many positive developments that indicate an increasingly diverse and robust domestic and global supply chain for rare earth materials, the Department will continue to monitor these supply chains, prepare possible contingency plans for ensuring their availability, and implement such plans as appropriate.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

Many Americans might not be aware, but our country is facing a crisis when it comes to rare earth elements. These naturally occurring elements are vital to our national security because they are essential components in defense weapon systems. However, their importance does not end there. Everyday items that Americans are accustomed to, such as cell phones and computers, require rare earth elements. Our energy infrastructure is dependent on these resources, including: pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production. Strategic and critical minerals are also used to support the manufacturing, agriculture, housing, and telecommunications industries. Even medical equipment utilizes these elements.

During the 1960s and continuing to the 1980s, America was the premiere leader in rare earth element production. However, since then production has moved almost exclusively to China. They now produce about 97 percent of rare earth oxides, are the single exporter of commercial quantities of rare earth refined metals, and are the manufacturer of the world's strongest magnets.

What is most disturbing is that China appears to be cutting its rare earth exports and restricting other countries access to these resources. America has become almost totally dependent on China for rare earth elements, and we have lost our domestic capacity to tap into our own supply.

Madam Chair, this House has had lengthy debates about how onerous red-tape and regulations are hurting our country's economy. Unfortunately, over-regulation is hurting our ability to produce rare earth elements. Frivolous lawsuits and a maze of a permitting process have caused America to no longer be a leader in rare earth element manufacturing. H.R. 4402, corrects this problem. This legislation will allow our country to more efficiently develop these essential resources.

The National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act will cut red-tape and streamline the permitting process to begin a mineral production project which can currently take over a decade. This bill will require the permitting review process to be completed within 30 months. Additionally, the legislation ensures projects are not indefinitely delayed by litigation by setting time limits to file legal challenges to mining projects.

Overall, this legislation would require the Departments of Interior and Agriculture to better help develop our rare earth elements here at home.

Madam Chair, this bill is vital to our national security and our economy, and I urge its swift passage.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the

text of Rules Committee Print 112–26. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 4402

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2012”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) *The industrialization of China and India has driven demand for nonfuel mineral commodities, sparking a period of resource nationalism exemplified by China’s reduction in exports of rare-earth elements necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, healthcare technologies, and conventional and renewable energy technologies.*

(2) *The availability of minerals and mineral materials are essential for economic growth, national security, technological innovation, and the manufacturing and agricultural supply chain.*

(3) *The exploration, production, processing, use, and recycling of minerals contribute significantly to the economic well-being, security and general welfare of the Nation.*

(4) *The United States has vast mineral resources, but is becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of these mineral materials, as demonstrated by the following:*

(A) *Twenty-five years ago the United States was dependent on foreign sources for 30 nonfuel mineral materials, 6 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation’s requirements, and for another 16 commodities the United States imported more than 60 percent of the Nation’s needs.*

(B) *By 2011 the United States import dependence for nonfuel mineral materials had more than doubled from 30 to 67 commodities, 19 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation’s requirements, and for another 24 commodities, imported more than 50 percent of the Nation’s needs.*

(C) *The United States share of world wide mineral exploration dollars was 8 percent in 2011, down from 19 percent in the early 1990s.*

(D) *In the 2012 Ranking of Countries for Mining Investment, out of 25 major mining countries, the United States ranked last with Papua New Guinea in permitting delays, and towards the bottom regarding government take and social issues affecting mining.*

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.**—*The term “strategic and critical minerals” means minerals that are necessary—*

(A) *for national defense and national security requirements;*

(B) *for the Nation’s energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production;*

(C) *to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, healthcare, and transportation infrastructure; and*

(D) *for the Nation’s economic security and balance of trade.*

(2) **AGENCY.**—*The term “agency” means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or tribal government, or Alaska Native Corporation.*

(3) **MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.**—*The term “mineral exploration or mine permit” includes plans of operation issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service pursuant to 43 CFR 3809 and 36 CFR 228A respectively.*

TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC SOURCES OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS

SEC. 101. IMPROVING DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.

Domestic mines that will provide strategic and critical minerals shall be considered an “infrastructure project” as described in Presidential Order “Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects” dated March 22, 2012.

SEC. 102. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LEAD AGENCY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—*The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall appoint a project lead who shall coordinate and consult with other agencies, cooperating agencies, project proponents and contractors to ensure that agencies minimize delays, set and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of reviews, set clear permitting goals and track progress against those goals.*

(b) *The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall determine any such action would not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 if the procedural and substantive safeguards of the lead agency’s permitting process alone, any applicable State permitting process alone, or a combination of the two processes together provide an adequate mechanism to ensure that environmental factors are taken into account.*

(c) *The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall enhance government coordination on permitting and review by avoiding duplicative reviews, minimizing paperwork and engaging other agencies and stakeholders early in the process. The lead agency shall consider the following best practices:*

(1) *Deferring to and relying upon baseline data, analysis and reviews performed by State agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed project.*

(2) *Conducting reviews concurrently rather than sequentially to the extent practicable and when such concurrent review will expedite rather than delay a decision.*

(d) *At the request of a project proponent, the project lead of the agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall enter into an agreement with the project proponent and other cooperating agencies that sets time limits for each part of the permit review process including the following:*

(1) *The decision on whether to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.*

(2) *A determination of the scope of any document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.*

(3) *The scope of and schedule for the baseline studies required to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.*

(4) *Preparation of any draft document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.*

(5) *Preparation of a final document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.*

(6) *Consultations required under applicable laws.*

(7) *Submission and review of any comments required under applicable law.*

(8) *Publication of any public notices required under applicable law.*

(9) *A final or any interim decisions.*

(e) *In no case should the total review process described in subsection (d) exceed 30 months unless agreed to by the signatories of the agreement.*

(f) The lead agency is not required to address agency or public comments that were not submitted during the public comment periods provided by the lead agency or otherwise required by law.

(g) The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

SEC. 103. CONSERVATION OF THE RESOURCE.

In developing the mineral exploration or mine permit, the priority of the lead agency shall be to maximize the development of the mineral resource, while mitigating environmental impacts, so that more of the mineral resource can be brought to the market place.

SEC. 104. FEDERAL REGISTER PROCESS FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.

(a) PREPARATION OF FEDERAL NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The preparation of Federal Register notices required by law associated with the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be delegated to the organization level within the agency responsible for issuing the mineral exploration or mine permit. All Federal Register notices regarding official document availability, announcements of meetings, or notices of intent to undertake an action shall be originated and transmitted to the Federal Register from the office where documents are held, meetings are held, or the activity is initiated.

(b) DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.—Absent any extraordinary circumstance or except as otherwise required by any Act of Congress, each Federal Register notice described in subsection (a) shall undergo any required reviews within the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture and be published in its final form in the Federal Register no later than 30 days after its initial preparation.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS RELATING TO EXPLORATION AND MINE PERMITS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE.

In this title the term “covered civil action” means a civil action containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action affecting a mineral exploration or mine permit.

SEC. 202. TIMELY FILINGS.

A covered civil action is barred unless filed no later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which it relates.

SEC. 203. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

SEC. 204. LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.

In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

SEC. 205. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS’ FEES.

Sections 504 of title 5, United States Code, and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (together commonly called the Equal Access to Justice Act) do not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in such a covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys’ fees, expenses, and other court costs.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a sub-

stitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112-590. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112-590.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, beginning at line 7, strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

(1) STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.—The term “strategic and critical minerals”—

(A) means—

(i) minerals and mineral groups identified as critical by the National Research Council in the report entitled “Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy”, dated 2008; and

(ii) additional minerals identified by the Secretary of the Interior based on the National Research Council criteria in such report; and

(B) shall not include sand, gravel, or clay.

Page 4, strike lines 1 through 6 and insert the following:

(1) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term “mineral exploration or mine permit”—

(A) means a mineral exploration or mine permit for strategic and critical minerals; and

(B) includes any plan of operation for strategic and critical minerals that is issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

My amendment is very simple. It replaces the overly broad definition in H.R. 4402 with a definition that truly address the materials identified in the title of the bill: critical and strategic materials.

Since the realization that China was restricting exports of rare Earth metals in 2010, the issue of critical and strategic materials has reemerged as a concern. This isn’t the first time Congress has considered our potential vulnerability to resource shortages. Just before World War II, Congress passed the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of 1939 to address our Nation’s requirement for materials needed for national defense. We have expanded our notion of strategic and critical materials since that time to include civilian and economic needs for materials. But there is no precedent for the broad definition included in H.R.

4402. The military’s current definition of strategic and critical materials in the U.S. Code is far narrower than the definition in this bill.

Nine of the ten bills introduced in this Congress dealing with strategic and critical minerals rely on definitions or specific lists of minerals that would conform to the definition in my amendment—not to the one in H.R. 4402. The definition in H.R. 4402 would include virtually all minerals and materials no matter how available they are. No other legislation proposes a definition that would consider sand and gravel “critical” materials.

The National Academy of Science panel looked at this issue in 2008. The panel specified two factors that define a mineral as critical: It is essential in use and subject to the risk of supply restriction. H.R. 4402’s definition captures only the first factor that the Academy considered. The panel recognized that the list of critical materials was likely to change over time due to technological developments, usage patterns, changes in mineral reserves, and many other factors.

They developed a matrix that could be used to evaluate substances and used this matrix to examine a group of minerals that are in current high demand. Two dozen minerals were identified as critical in the NAS report. The rare Earth metals, the platinum metals, and several other minerals were included in their list. Oddly enough, sand, gravel, iron, copper—all useful materials, to be sure—did not make it to the list. The current definition in H.R. 4402 is unnecessary if the purpose is to secure additional critical minerals.

H.R. 4402 undermines the protection of our public lands and elevates mining above all other public land uses. If H.R. 4402 is truly a bill to address potential shortages of critical minerals, then my amendment should be adopted. Let’s concentrate on the problem at hand: Securing additional rare Earth minerals and other truly critical minerals.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TONKO. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So what is the majority doing in this bill? They’re saying that sand is a “critical” material; gravel, clay. There’s no crisis in the sand industry. We don’t need to wad it down, the environmental protections for drilling for sand or gravel or clay. There is no crisis. That’s what this whole bill is. It’s a Trojan horse. It’s moving in to undermine environmental protections where they’re working and where there’s no need to reduce them.

If they want to talk about scandium or europium or cerium or terbium or some other critical strategic material that we should be discussing out here that we need for cell phones or we need

for solar panels or we need for our defense systems, that's one thing. But that's not what this is about. This is about watering down environmental protections for sand and clay and endangering the health and well-being of the Nation for no reason whatsoever because there's no strategic relationship between those very prosaic minerals and our national security.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Madam Chairman, this amendment attempts to pick which minerals are winners and losers in the Federal permitting sweepstakes. The underlying bill that we are talking about focuses on the permitting of mines that meet four clear categories of domestic need—and this is important—national security, energy infrastructure, domestic manufacturing, and our national economic balance of trade.

The amendment would restrict these down to just a 2008 study done by the National Research Council that took a limited and narrow look at only the aerospace, the electronic, and automotive industries when considering each mineral critical. However—and this is important, Madam Chairman—the report also states:

All minerals and mineral products could be or could become critical to some degree, depending on their importance and availability. The criticality of a specific mineral can and likely will change as production technologies evolve and new products are developed.

The definition of the strategic and critical minerals in H.R. 4402 is written broadly—we acknowledge that—to allow for the most flexibility when carrying out the provisions of this act. Less than 10 years ago, people were concerned about platinum group metals used for computer and electronics and the pending shortfall of copper availability.

□ 1030

Today, the focus is primarily on the availability of rare Earth elements and rare Earth metals that are in China. Tomorrow, the shortage could be lithium for batteries, silica for solar panels, and any of a host of other minerals.

Interestingly, in this talk of sand and gravel, during the U.S. Geological Survey's great shakeout in California, which simulated a massive earthquake and the problems that could be faced, they discovered that there would be a shortfall of building materials—sand and gravel, Madam Chairman—if there were a major earthquake causing significant damage in the L.A. basin and the surrounding areas. I think that would be very critical if that were to happen. It happened in the last 25

years, twice in California and once in Minnesota.

Mineral production is a key economic activity supplying strategic and critical metals and minerals essential for agriculture, communication, technology, construction, health care, manufacturing, transportation, and the arts. More specifically, strategic metals and metal alloys are an integral component of aerospace, defense, and other critical infrastructure.

Minerals, Madam Chairman, are also necessary to satisfy the basic requirements of an individual's well-being, and that includes food, clothing, shelter and a clean and healthy environment. So we should not limit ourselves today by narrowly defining what is strategic and critical. That's precisely what this amendment does, and I think that's a wrong approach. So, with that, I would urge a "no" vote.

Madam Chairman, I understand that the gentleman yielded back his time; is that correct?

The CHAIR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment. I will reserve my time, and I will not object if the gentleman wants to reclaim his time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has asked unanimous consent to reclaim the 1 minute he has remaining.

Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I appreciate that.

I just want to state clearly that the amendment itself embraces flexibility. It understands that if there are changes in time that are requiring the list to be adjusted, we would have the academy adjust that so that the flexibility is there recognizing that if, in the course of time, the change needs to be made, if we need to further extend the list, so be it. But the flexibility is contained in the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am simply saying that this underlying bill lays out four strategic areas in which we should have minerals to support those areas. And then we say there should be a timeframe, a defined timeframe, in which, unless there is an agreement it should be longer, activity should be done. It's pretty straightforward. This amendment, as offered, would very narrowly say what is critical. I think that's the wrong approach.

So with that, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112-590.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, strike lines 8 through 10 and insert the following:

(e)(1) In no case should the total review process described in subsection (d) exceed 30 months unless—

(A) agreed to by the signatories of the agreement, or

(B) the lead agency has determined that an adequate review has not been completed due to issues arising not contained in the permit application or otherwise unforeseen by the signatories at the time of submittal of the permit application.

(2) In a case described in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) the lead agency may extend the total review process by 6 months;

(B) if, at the end of that 6-month period, the issues referred to in paragraph (1)(B) have not been adequately addressed, the lead agency may extend the total review process by an additional 6 months;

(C) if at the end of that additional 6-month period the issues referred to in paragraph (1)(B) have not been adequately addressed, the lead agency shall issue its final determination on the permit application

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, despite the name of this bill, the underlying legislation has, in my judgment, little to do with securing a sufficient supply of rare Earth minerals for our country. Rather, it is another Republican giveaway to large, profitable companies that do not need congressional action to pad their bottom lines.

In fact, today's bill is so broadly drafted that it is not just rare Earth mines that will no longer have to adhere to our Federal environmental laws, but virtually any mine on public land anywhere, including silver, uranium and coal mines.

Mining operations have severe and permanent consequences for the land and residents living nearby. In fact, 75 percent of existing mines end up polluting the groundwater despite the designed mitigation plans. The need for a complete and thorough review of the environmental impact before approval is therefore absolutely necessary.

What's more, Madam Chair, is that this bill's underlying intent of loosening up the permitting process is not

even necessary. Mining is already the priority use for most public lands, which makes it virtually impossible to regulate and control. Mining on public lands is also already incredibly cheap. These companies pay little rent to the American taxpayer for the use of public land.

Moreover, under the Obama administration, 82 percent of plans are approved within 3 years, with an average of 4 years for the largest mines located on public lands. Any delays in permit approval usually stem from an incomplete application or problems that arise during review which were not anticipated and require supplemental information.

By giving the lead agency the option to extend the time period for review in the event of new information, my amendment makes sure agencies can get the job done right while still adhering to a predictable schedule. Prioritizing speed over accuracy—I learned early, as did all of us, that haste makes waste—as this bill does, guarantees that mining companies are able to drill additional mines at a faster rate with less consideration for the broader impact of those mines.

My amendment is necessary to give agencies the time they need to make sure that this bill will not compromise environmental protections that keep our drinking water safe, soil nourishing and nontoxic, and our air clean enough to breathe.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, this amendment would reverse course on the goal of this legislation to streamline red tape. This amendment could add an entire year to the time allowed for the government to make a decision on a permit. This would then drag out the process 40 percent longer than provided for in the underlying bill.

The 30-month time period set by this legislation is accomplished by making government work more efficiently—and I, quite frankly, think that's what all Americans would like—by aligning some reviews and taking some actions concurrently.

Establishing a simple deadline for the government to do their job in a timely fashion is reasonable, and I think it is reasonable. This is especially true since it doesn't change the standards and requirements that must be met to get approval. It simply provides that an agency work efficiently while still complying with all, and let me emphasize all, environmental laws and regulations, studies, consultations, draft and file documents—all of them—that are required in order for a final record of decision to be issued on a mine plan. All the same review, but

just in 30 months instead of what has been taking, in many cases, over a decade.

The underlying bill provides for flexibility on the 30-month permit timeline should a justifiable need arise for further analysis. Let me repeat: it allows for further time if that is needed. Yet this amendment would give a Federal agency an automatic excuse to prolong the process for a year, and there is no explanation that is needed.

So this amendment presents bureaucracy with a “drag your feet for free” card. It would hand over another roll of red tape to the government and invite them to string up more obstacles and delay job creators from getting a straight answer. And keep in mind, the 30-month time period that we're talking about simply says “an answer shall be given.” It could be negative; it could be positive.

This bill provides certainty for permit applicants by allowing the United States to be more competitive so that we can create more jobs here at home and produce more of the critical materials and minerals that are needed for our economy and therefore lessen our reliance on foreign sources.

□ 1040

So I oppose the amendment offered by my good friend from Florida, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I understand very clearly what my good friend from Washington is saying. My quarrel is in asking that the lead agency be given the option to extend the time, as I believe historically mining companies—who, under the underlying bill would have the right to sign off on the extension—are not likely to do that. There is no history showing that they do. They want to hurry up and get on with their mining business. When there are unpredictable kinds of circumstances, then it would seem to me that the lead agency would be the place that would determine the time for review.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of the time.

In response to my friend, the legislation says that both sides have to agree. I think that's a good way. The gentleman says that there's no evidence of that. Well, there's no evidence that the contrary would work either.

So, to give more time—again, what we have heard over and over and over, and especially those Members and the author of this legislation who comes from a State that is heavily in the mining industry, the uncertainty is what the problem is. What this legislation does is provide certainty but flexibility. Now, I think that makes sense. If you probably walk to Main Street anyplace in America and said this is what the option is of a 30-month time period rather than up to 10 or more

years, they would say, yeah, I think certainly makes a great deal of sense.

So this amendment offered by my good friend from Florida I think extends it, doesn't need to be there, and I urge a “no” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-590.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 22, insert the following new subsection:

(h) The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit for hardrock minerals on Federal land after the date of enactment of this Act shall require a royalty payment of 12.5 percent of the value of the minerals produced pursuant to the permit. Amounts received by the United States as such royalties shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the availability of appropriations and in addition to amounts otherwise available, for abandoned hardrock mine lands reclamation.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Madam Chair, I have an amendment in order today, and the reason I have it in order is that it's a very simple amendment. It would update an antiquated mining law to end the free ride that mining companies extracting minerals like gold and silver and uranium on public lands currently enjoy. It would then send that money to benefit Western States by dedicating the funding to cleaning up the more than 160,000 abandoned mines we have in the West.

The underlying bill would extend a host of new giveaways to the mining industry while doing nothing to ensure taxpayers are getting a proper return on these valuable minerals like gold and silver and uranium on public lands.

It is well past time to fix this law that was passed during the Presidency of Ulysses S. Grant in 1872. My amendment would require mining companies to pay taxpayers 12.5 percent of the value of these hard rock minerals taken off of the public lands. That is the same royalty rate that coal and oil

and natural gas companies pay to the Federal Government to mine and drill on public lands.

While mining companies pay no royalty on Federal lands to mine for gold and silver, they do pay a royalty on State lands that would abut those Federal lands. Twelve Western States already require mining companies to pay royalties up to 12 percent on mining on their State lands. Colorado charges up to 12 percent on minerals taken from their State lands. Utah, Wyoming, and California all charge up to 10 percent. Nevada charges up to 5 percent. But when it comes to mining on Federal lands, which could be right next door to the State lands, these multinational mining companies, they still get to play Uncle Sam for Uncle Sucker. They pay Federal taxpayers—all of the rest of us in the country—no royalties while reaping this massive windfall. So what my amendment would do is it would ensure that the States where this mining is occurring reap the benefits.

According to the GAO, there are more than 160,000 abandoned gold and silver and copper and uranium and other mines in the West. Some estimates put that number as high as 500,000 abandoned mines. These mines stopped production decades or, in some cases, more than a century ago and have no responsible parties to carry out the proper environmental remediation. The result is that the streams and the rivers, the aquifers, the soils continue to be contaminated by mercury and thorium and arsenic and other toxic pollutants. In fact, the GAO says that more than 33,000 mines are already a danger to the public health and environment. Arizona has some 50,000 abandoned hard rock mines; California has more than 47,000; Utah and Nevada have 17,000 and 16,000, respectively.

According to the Congressional Research Service, cleaning up abandoned mine sites can cost tens of millions of dollars per mine. Well, my amendment would generate nearly \$400 million over the next 10 years that would be dedicated to cleaning up these sites. This would ensure that mining companies are paying their fair share to aid our Western States in cleaning up these dangerous and toxic sites.

At this point, I would like to reserve the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Madam Chairman, this amendment is directly contrary to the intent of this bill that would create new jobs in the United States and ensure a stable domestic supply of the critical minerals that are so important to our economy.

This amendment would impose an entirely new, retroactive fee on mining

operations on Federal lands. It would impose a royalty that would be one of the highest of any country in the world and, thus, would probably drive more mining jobs overseas and put American manufacturing, once again, at risk.

In the past, when we've had this issue in front of the Natural Resources Committee, we've had Democrat witnesses that have testified that an 8 percent gross royalty was unprecedented in the world and would not make economic sense, and yet this amendment is talking about a 12.5 percent gross royalty.

In 2006, the World Bank report cautioned against gross royalty approaches as compared to ability-to-pay or profit-based approaches. Madam Chair, let me quote directly from that report:

Nations should carefully weigh the immediate fiscal rewards to be granted from high levels of royalty against the long-term benefits to be gained from a sustainable mining industry that will contribute to long-term development, infrastructure, and economic diversification.

So they argue directly against this type of approach.

Let us keep our focus on what is important here today. We are dependent on foreign sources for minerals that sustain our economy.

We all know that the more you tax something, the less you get. That's what this approach is. I could take the gentleman's, my good friend from Massachusetts, math that he had out there and change it a little bit and say this is where there would be a lot of job losses if this amendment were adopted and this were to become law, because that's the area that would be affected, the Western part of the United States.

So, Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1050

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chair, could you advise us as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), once again, the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. AMODEI. Madam Chair, I appreciate the comments.

I would just like to point out, for the RECORD, since we're talking about Western abandoned mines, what's your definition of abandoned mine? Because if it's where somebody pushed up a little dirt and that's considered an abandoned mine, quite frankly, we're pretty proud in Nevada of the job that our Division of Environmental Protection has done on abandoned mine projects. We collaborate with the Feds.

Quite simply, I believe the phrase was used earlier today, it's a solution in search of a problem. We're getting

on it. We're doing very well. And quite frankly, I hope the Chair is not on this committee, but when you see a 12½ gross proceeds tax subject to the appropriations process of my colleagues here, no thank you very much.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, who has the right to close on this amendment?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has the right to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would just advise the gentleman that I have no more requests for time.

Mr. MARKEY. Then I yield myself the balance of my time.

So this is a very simple amendment. What it says is this: that these big mining companies—and the ones I'm talking about have a market capitalization of \$90 billion—well, they just have to pay to drill on public lands, Federal public lands.

Right now they're paying to drill on State public lands, and when they come over to the Federal public lands it's like free parking, free rent. You don't have to pay anything.

Well, where are you going? You're going to where it's free. And who's letting them have it for free? Uncle Sam. Uncle Sucker.

So what the Markey amendment says is we're going to raise \$400 million, charging them to drill for these precious minerals on Federal lands, and we're going to give the \$400 million over to the States so that they can clean up their old mines where there are environmental problems.

So if you care about the environmental problems in these Western States, here's your ability to send \$400 million in, collected where the big companies are now paying nothing to mine on Federal lands, in order to help deal with environmental problems there. Not in Massachusetts, not in the East, but right here, right where this mining goes on, right where the environmental disasters occur.

Vote "aye" on the Markey amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Once again, as that map is moving away, that's where the jobs would go if you add a gross tax to this activity.

Let me point out just an economic issue here. Like oil and gas, probably not quite the same, you really don't know if there's any minerals in the ground until you dig. And if you put a royalty of 12½ percent, you are going to discourage that activity.

What does that mean?

When you discourage that activity, it means the potential for job creation and mineral production in this country goes away.

Now, if that's the intent of some in this country and maybe some on the other side, okay, be honest about it.

I don't think that's the right approach, so I would urge my colleagues

to reject this gross tax amendment. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-590.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 22, insert the following:

(h) With respect to strategic and critical materials within a federally administered unit of the National Forest System, the lead agency shall—

(1) exempt all areas of identified mineral resources in Land Use Designations, other than Non-Development Land Use Designations, in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the procedures detailed at and all rules promulgated under part 294 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) apply such exemption to all additional routes and areas that the lead agency finds necessary to facilitate the construction, operation, maintenance, and restoration of the areas of identified mineral resources described in paragraph (1); and

(3) continue to apply such exemptions after approval of the Minerals Plan of Operations for the unit of the National Forest System.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, this is a simple amendment. It addresses the roadless areas in national forests but, specifically, in Alaska. It does not overturn the roadless areas.

This is an attempt, as previously stated in this Congress, that highly mineralized areas would not be affected by the roadless area. It directly affects the Vulcan find of rare minerals, rare Earth.

And I have to address my colleagues for a sense. Now, right now China controls the rare Earths of this world. Yet, we have tremendous deposits in Alaskan lands and in other lands of this Nation. But rare Earth is the future of all this high technology that people do support, and the so-called things that we try to develop are from rare Earth.

It's wrong to have China control the price, control the quantity and availability for modern technology when we have our own. All we're asking in this is to make sure that an area that has high potential areas of rare Earth be accessible to the water.

And the rules of roadless area do not apply. They were exempted before. They should be exempted now. But a ruling in 2011 made this area inaccessible for the development of rare Earth for this Nation.

If you believe in the independence of this Nation, if you believe the importance of technology for the future, then you'll support this amendment. This is the right amendment for the right time to make sure we have this development.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I think that his amendment makes eminently good sense. It's exactly these sort of rulings that tie up our natural resources, and we should be utilizing them.

I think the gentleman has a good amendment, and I support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman.

Again, this is specific for an area of rare Earth that's for the future of this Nation. This amendment should be adopted, and I urge a "yes" on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Almost 15 years ago, the Forest Service began the process of reviewing the management of the last remaining, undeveloped forests, the so-called roadless areas.

In 2001, the Bush administration, yes, the George W. Bush administration, issued regulations to protect these areas in an effort recognized as one of the most far-reaching conservation initiatives taken by the Federal Government in decades.

Now, a decade later, after litigation, 60 million acres of our forests, and the clean water derived from those forests, are now protected from harmful development. Three hundred fifty four municipal water supplies flow through roadless areas on their way to homes and businesses. These areas include sacred sites for Native Americans. They include biological strongholds for fish and wildlife. The continued protection of these areas is something that people all over America care about.

I know the gentleman thinks that this is somehow infringing on Alaska. The point that must be made is this is in the national interest, and continued protection of these areas is common sense. It is what I know my constituents tell me they want.

For the record, there are already 380,000 miles of roads in the rest of our

national forests, with only 20 percent maintained to adequate standards of safety.

The gentleman from Alaska offers an amendment that purports to waive the roadless rule for the purposes of mineral development. However, both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management say that the current policy does not prevent mineral developers from accessing development sites in our forests. All the current policy requires is careful consideration before access for mining operations is permitted.

I recognize that southeast Alaska, we all recognize that southeast Alaska is a unique place that requires access by boat and helicopter. However, mine operators have been able to get the approval necessary for that access. This is a waiver that is overly broad, which Federal agencies tell us is unnecessary for the purposes purported here. And it just invites conflict where, for a decade now, there has been resolution.

□ 1100

Congress has debated the roadless policy for a decade—actually for many decades, but for a decade—and opponents of the policy have had their day in court. Congress, the public, and the courts agree that they have supported the protections, including protections for those holding valid existing mineral rights. This amendment is not necessary, and I urge its defeat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I enjoy people from Massachusetts and New Jersey talking about my State. It really always excites me that they really know a lot. They know nothing.

This roadless area was open for mining development; and, actually, exemptions of certain rules couldn't allow it. Last year, they said, no, this couldn't be done, having access to this rare Earth for the Nation—for the Nation—this small area. All they want to do is get to the water. What good is rare Earth for this Nation if you can't get to it? We might as well stake a claim on the Moon. I mean, this is 17 million acres of land that have already been set aside, all but 1 million acres. All I'm asking for is access for the American people, access to this mineral deposit for the American people for the future, for the technology that is needed so as not to be dependent on China.

Now, he may be representing China instead of New Jersey, and I respect that; but I'm talking about respect for this Nation. This amendment should be adopted for the good of the people of this Nation if you're thinking about the future. Ironically, that side offered an amendment to narrow this bill to only rare Earths. That amendment was offered, and I can't understand that.

All I'm saying is, if you want access to rare Earth, then pass this amendment. Make it good for the Nation. Let's not be listening to somebody who, very frankly, doesn't understand

the need—and this is a person who is a doctor, bless his heart, who understands the physical needs for the future, yet he says we're going to protect this little, narrow spot just to access water for the people of America. This is what this amendment does.

I'm trying to get something done for America. I'm not playing politics in this. It really doesn't affect Alaska to that extent other than the fact that it's in the State of Alaska. It does affect other States, but quite frankly, I want it for Alaska. It's my job. I'm not affecting New Jersey. I don't ever introduce an amendment or oppose anything for New Jersey. If he wants something in New Jersey, if he wants to drill in New Jersey, I'd support it. If he wouldn't want to drill in New Jersey, I wouldn't support it. If you follow what I'm saying, this is important for the people of America, and I urge the passage of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman is right, this affects more than Alaska. This affects the country at large. The roadless rule has been debated. It has been litigated. It should be considered settled.

The Young amendment, as the gentleman has explained, derives from his interest in having road access for mineral development in Alaska. Both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management—I repeat—say that the current policy does not prevent the mineral developers from accessing development sites. We don't need to overturn a well-debated, well-litigated, settled matter of the roadless rule.

Just to be clear, the amendment that the gentleman from Alaska offers would exempt all areas of identified mineral resources in land use designations, et cetera, from the procedures detailed and the rules promulgated under title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

This is sweeping and it is not necessary.

Again, I urge the defeat of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Alaska has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to point out that the areas that this amendment affects have already been set aside for mineral development. I want to repeat that, Mr. Chairman: these have already been set aside for mineral development. That policy has not changed at all. All it ensures is that we are going to have access to it.

I just want to address the irony that the gentleman pointed out. This is for rare Earth. This particular one in his State is where we have rare Earth, and now they say they don't want it. There

is some irony here, and I can't quite get my arms around it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, of course we want this country to have the minerals that it's dependent on; but need I repeat again that the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management say that current policy does not prevent mineral developers from accessing the development sites. This amendment is not necessary, and it would overturn very important resolutions that protect the public lands in the public interest.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. One last comment.

He says there is no restriction and that we can go ahead and mine this Earth. You can't develop it. It's that simple. All exploration had to be done by helicopter. There was no access by road. To develop it, we must have this road to water access. This is a good amendment. It provides this Nation with the right minerals that are necessary for future technology. We should adopt this overwhelmingly if you're thinking of the Nation instead of an interest group.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CRAVAACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112-590.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 22, insert the following:

(h) This section shall apply with respect to a mineral exploration or mine permit for which an application was submitted before the date of the enactment of this Act if the applicant for the permit submits a written request to the lead agency for the permit. The lead agency shall begin implementing this section with respect to such application within 30 days after receiving such written request.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. CRAVAACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Today, I rise in support of my amendment, as well as in support of the underlying bill.

H.R. 4402 is a commonsense, pro-growth piece of legislation that would

simply facilitate a timely permitting process for very important mining projects throughout the United States.

The United States cannot continue to depend on foreign countries to supply critical precious and rare Earth metals. This is a vital strategic disadvantage to the security of the United States. What happens if, one day, a supplying country decides it doesn't want to export or decides to restrict precious metals? What if our sea lanes become controlled by those who are not friendly to the United States? These mines are not something we can turn on and off at the flip of a switch.

These mines are multi-million if not billion, dollar projects that take years of capital investment just to get going. This bill is as much a strategic defense bill as it is a jobs bill. According to a University of Minnesota-Duluth study, 2.5 ancillary jobs are produced for every mining job. These are good-paying jobs that we cannot afford to lose.

My amendment will also allow mining projects that have already applied for a permit and are currently in the permitting process access to the new expedited procedures. My amendment falls along the same commonsense thinking that the underlying bill comes from, which is that 30 months is plenty of time to complete the total review process for permitting a mine. Currently, there are numerous projects in the permitting pipeline that have taken way too long and that still have no definitive end in sight.

One such project is in my district. PolyMet Mining initiated an environmental review of its proposed NorthMet copper and nickel mine back in 2005. Since then, the company has invested over \$40 million for EIS inquiries. That is 7 years and counting for just environmental reviews. Another project that is just getting under way in the Eighth District is the Twin Metals project, which will also produce thousands of Minnesota jobs for both construction and long-term operations.

In a 2009 study, the University of Minnesota-Duluth found that more than 12,000 Minnesota construction jobs will be created in Minnesota if all strategic metal mining projects currently under study move forward.

□ 1110

In 2009, the UMD study also estimated that more than 5,000 direct long-term Minnesota mining jobs will be created when all strategic metal mining projects currently under study become operational.

Minnesota needs these jobs, and the country needs the minerals that these mines produce, and everyone needs a definitive permitting timeline that is reliable. Unfortunately, PolyMet is not a unique project. Seven years and \$40 million is not even the worst example of inefficient permitting. Many other mining projects have been stalled for even longer due to inefficient and, at times, an agenda-driven permitting process.

Another example is the Montanore mine in Montana. It has been in the permitting process since 2003. The Montanore project was previously permitted by the State of Montana, the U.S. Forest Service, and other cooperating Federal agencies in 1993, following a full EIS process. The company chose not to proceed with the project until 2003 and has been working to obtain the same Federal permits since that time.

Mr. Chairman, I could give example after example of how inefficient and onerous our Federal permitting process is, but there's just not enough time to do so. These multiyear delays in processing Federal permits for many good projects are impeding thousands of jobs, massive investments across the country, and are blocking domestic production of much-needed rare Earth strategic and critical precious metals.

This amendment would ensure that these projects, like all future projects, are given a firm timeline that communities can count on while, at the same time, more than addressing concerns.

I urge passage of this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVAACK. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

This is, as he said in his opening remark: simply a commonsense approach that those that are in the process now should avail themselves of potential changes in law.

It is an excellent amendment, and I support it.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I thank the chairman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. MARKEY. This bill is ostensibly a bill that is supposed to be discussing rare Earth. It's supposed to be discussing strategic minerals that we can use in our competition to produce high-tech products that we're competing with the Chinese and others in order to produce in our country.

The kinds of strategic materials that we're talking about are scandium, cerium, europium, and terbium. These are not minerals that people ordinarily hear about. And from the high-tech manufacturing sector, we hear that they're central to their ability to be able to compete.

What the underlying bill would do is to reduce or eliminate the proper review of mining operations on public lands for virtually all types of minerals; not just for those rare Earths that I just mentioned, but also for gold, silver, uranium, and things like sand and gravel that are clearly—I think we should all be able to agree

upon the fact that sand and gravel are not strategic minerals for our country. They're plentiful. They're available. We don't need to be watering down environmental laws in our attempt to be able to have enough sand and gravel and clay in the United States of America.

This amendment would not only allow for insufficient review for future mining operations, it would allow mining operations that are currently being reviewed to also escape proper scrutiny. Even worse, this amendment is drafted in such a way that it could potentially even apply to mining operations that already have been approved.

Following environmental review, mines sometimes have to put in place mitigation measures to protect the public health and the environment. Under this amendment, there is the potential that those companies could seek to have those mitigation measures thrown out. In an effort to save potentially millions of dollars, I understand what the company is trying to do. That might be good for that company, but it's not good for the environment or for the American people who already have mitigation agreements in place to protect against the mining company endangering the health, the well-being, and the water table of the area where the mining is going on. It wouldn't just cover europium; it would cover, potentially, gravel, sand, and other elements that clearly don't need that kind of protection.

This amendment would likely invite a hailstorm of litigation, which I would think that my colleagues on the other side would like to avoid. I would also like to think that my colleagues on the other side would rather have the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and other Federal agencies continue to move forward to approve new mines, not be bogged down relitigating mines that have already been approved.

This amendment makes a bad bill even worse and would have a number of unintended consequences that could invite litigation and actually delay the approval of future mines.

I urge defeat of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, I inquire as to the time I have remaining.

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind our colleagues that mines aren't just permitted and then forgotten. They're constantly monitored.

The precious metals we're talking about go into our cell phones, our computers, our weaponry, and even our catalytic converters. We need these materials now, and we cannot be held ransom by China. May I remind you, 600 pounds of copper goes into every windmill.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I understand the business plan here of these mining interests that don't even pay royalties to drill on the Federal lands of our country. Let's just continue this business plan. That's what they're saying to themselves. Maybe we can get it out of this Republican Congress. So, in addition to not paying, let's also have rules that say we're going to water down the environmental laws, as well, not only for europium and cerium and other rare Earths, but also for sand and for gravel and for clay. I understand. That's a great business plan.

It's not for the American people. They get watered-down environmental laws, and they also don't even get paid the royalties on the Federal lands of our country. It's just one big, bad deal for the United States taxpayers, and I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112-590.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, line 4, before "Sections" insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—"

Page 10, after line 9, add the following:

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to a covered civil action filed by—

(1) a not-for-profit organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; or

(2) an individual.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an irresponsible giveaway to the mining industry that has taken enormous profits at American taxpayer expense.

One section in particular is extremely disturbing. Section 205 of the bill eliminates awarding of attorneys' fees to litigants bringing successful legal challenges against certain agencies' actions, like the issuance of a mining permit.

Eliminating the possibility of fee shifting makes litigation prohibitively expensive for groups and individuals that don't have the deep pockets of large corporate entities. Indeed, the whole reason fee shifting exists in the first place is so that a party does not

have to be wealthy in order to file a lawsuit.

Justice should be accessible to all, regardless of their individual financial circumstances. Eliminating the awarding of attorneys' fees means that the traditional parties for these kinds of lawsuits, such as nearby landowners, small business owners, and environmental groups, will no longer be reimbursed for the cause of successfully litigating a claim.

The only reason to eliminate this fee shifting is to discourage parties from filing these kinds of suits.

Who is the biggest beneficiary of reducing the number of permit challenges? The permit-holding mine companies, of course. Since litigation can be extremely expensive, these cash-strapped plaintiffs usually only bring those lawsuits with the most likelihood of success because they literally cannot afford to lose.

□ 1120

Eliminating the awarding of attorneys' fees will increase the predictability of the permitting process only by stifling access to the courts.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment creates an exception for the awarding of attorneys' fees to successful challenges submitted by either individual citizens or nonprofit entities so that justice in this country is not reserved for only those who can afford the hefty entrance fee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE).

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, because it would have allowed ideological special interest groups to block mining permits through lawsuits funded by taxpayer dollars.

The Equal Access to Justice to Act of 1980 is a law in need of reform. Recognizing the Federal Government's vast resources, it was intended to help protect small businesses, charities and ordinary Americans from unreasonable litigation or administrative proceedings.

To this end, the EAJA allows individuals with a net worth of under \$2 million and businesses worth less than \$7 million to collect attorneys' fees up to \$125 per hour. Last year the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on the need for EAJA reform.

The subcommittee learned that particular groups, particularly environmental organizations, are aggressively exploiting the EAJA. The EAJA exempts all not-for-profit organizations from the net worth cap, and it allows attorneys' fees over \$125 per hour if a special factor justifies such an award.

Well-heeled environmental organizations take full advantage of these provisions to collect large awards for attorneys' fees. For example, the Center for Food Safety recently awarded more than \$2.6 million under the EAJA, with its lead counsel compensated at a rate of \$650 per hour. It's a good gig if you can get it.

Simply by reviewing public court records, a witness of the subcommittee's hearing found that 20 environmental organizations collected \$5.8 million in fees between September 1, 2009, and August 31, 2010.

The EAJA was meant to help give small businesses, charities, and ordinary citizens a fighting chance against the Federal Government. Considering the pressing need for reform, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2012 was wisely written to prevent any organization or straw man plaintiff who was a member of and whose attorneys may be paid by such an organization from slowing down the permitting process or advancing its ideological agenda in court using public money.

Now, of course, they can still bring suit, but not on the taxpayers' dime.

For these reasons, I oppose this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. May I inquire how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to make a point here. The Natural Resources Committee I have the privilege to chair has been investigating the payment of attorneys' fees and court costs to revolving door plaintiffs in environmental lawsuits.

For example, we have learned that based on information that's supplied by the Department of Justice, over \$2 million in taxpayer dollars have been paid to a single organization, the Center for Biological Diversity, and they have done that for 50 lawsuits that have been filed under a single environmental statute.

This organization, which would qualify, by the way, for payments if the gentleman from Florida's amendment is adopted, they have offices in 15 States and they pay their executive director in the six figures. The question arises: Why should taxpayers be paying for their attorneys?

It seems like these lawsuit-happy environmental groups make a living from suing the Federal Government. When they sue the Federal Government, they divert resources from the Federal Government to carry out its statutory duties when it comes to environmental issues or permitting issues or whatever. I think that this amendment is ill advised by singling out some people that should not be covered.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112-590.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. 301. PROTECTION OF HUNTING, FISHING, GRAZING, AND RECREATION.

This Act shall not apply with respect to any mineral exploration or mining permit a lead agency determines would diminish opportunities for hunting, fishing, grazing, or recreation on public lands.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment states that nothing in this bill should diminish opportunities for hunting, fishing, grazing, or recreation on public lands.

H.R. 4402 would elevate the interests of the mining industry above all others. This legislation contains language requiring that the priority of the Federal Government "shall be to maximize the development of the mineral resources, while mitigating environmental impacts, so that more of the mineral resources can be brought to the marketplace."

This legislation would put mineral extraction on public lands above all other uses, jeopardizing hunting, fishing, livestock grazing, outdoor recreation, and many other critical uses of our public lands.

When open pits cover the American West, tourists to Arizona may have another Grand Canyon to visit. This time, instead of marveling at the geologic forces that over the courses of millions of years shaped one of the Nation's most awe-inspiring sites, they will be forced to ponder chains of man-made chasms left behind by unaccountable mining companies. My amendment will make sure that other important uses are not pushed aside, that all Americans continue to have access to their public lands.

In fact earlier this week the Department of the Interior issued a report on the agency's economic contributions to the Nation. Many of these contributions come from uses other than mining. In 2011, there were over 435 million recreational visits to Interior-managed lands. This activity contributed \$48.7 billion in economic activity and supported approximately 403,000 jobs nationwide, including 14,000 jobs in my home State of Arizona. By elevating the interests of mining companies

above hunters, anglers, and ranchers, as H.R. 4402 would do, we threaten that revenue that local communities have come to rely on.

Last month we considered so-called urgent legislation from the majority here on the House floor that was billed as vitally necessary to protect hunting and fishing on public lands. Now my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing just the opposite by elevating mining on our public lands above hunting and fishing. It seems that when the majority was fishing around for new sweetheart deals and ways to help the mining, oil, and gas industry, they decided to forget about their commitment the previous month to the hunting and angling communities.

My amendment would in no way hamper mining on Federal lands. It would simply reaffirm that we should not bury the other important uses of our public lands below energy development, as the underlying bill would do.

Our public lands belong to the American people and have many important uses. We should not undermine the ability of the American people to hunt and fish on public lands by destroying the current law.

I can't get my head around the idea that the mining industry will have first use above all other uses on our public lands while paying no royalties to the American taxpayer. On top of that, the bulk of the resources taken from our public lands is exported worldwide to countries like China.

Multinational mining companies get our resources free of charge while visitors have to pay a user fee to use some of our public lands. Now their needs are not as important to the Republicans as free access for the mining interests in this country.

It's very sad and ironic. I would urge a "yes" vote on my amendment to maintain a balance for the American people in their use of their public lands.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an anti-mining, anti-jobs amendment, and it is not a pro-sportsman amendment.

I believe strongly in multiple uses of our Federal lands. It is something that as chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, I take very, very seriously, and multiple means economic activity and recreational activity.

□ 1130

Earlier this year, this House worked to promote legislation advocating hunting and fishing on Federal lands. It was primarily aimed at promoting and protecting sportsmen's access to Federal lands. Sportsmen's access in-

cludes hunting and fishing. This bill had strong bipartisan support from most of America's sportsmen's organizations, and it received strong bipartisan support here in this body. However, Mr. Chairman, I must note that the sponsor of this amendment, my good friend from Arizona, opposed that bill that was for hunting and fishing for sportsmen.

Federal Land Management allows one use to be disrupted to ensure that we make the best and highest use of our lands. That's common sense. If the best use is rare Earth mining to secure our Nation against foreign resource nationalism and so forth, we should use the land for that. While at the same time that mine is being developed, we allow for mitigation to balance out disturbance of other activities. If a company disturbs an acre here, they can mitigate that with an acre there. The amendment completely ignores that reality.

So we should call this amendment for what it is. It's an attempt to stop mining on Federal lands, which, of course, will make us more dependent on foreign minerals. This amendment contradicts the express purpose of this legislation, which is to require the lead agency responsible for permitting strategic and critical mineral exploration and mining projects to reduce the permitting timelines through better coordination. This amendment would empower a Federal agency to unilaterally choose to red-tape another process that can take—which we've seen in the past—up to a decade long to complete a permitting process.

As a matter of fact, I might say, Mr. Chairman, the only effect of this amendment and other amendments that we've heard is to protect bureaucratic red tape, which is what the underlying bill wants to streamline. It makes sense. But every amendment we've heard coming from the other side seems to want to protect that point.

So this amendment falls under that same category. It does not deserve our support. I urge rejection, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the balance of my time to my good friend from New Mexico and a member of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. LUJÁN.

Mr. LUJÁN. This amendment is straightforward. It's about protecting hunting and fishing. That's how simple this is. Sadly, a similar amendment was rejected by the Rules Committee, who had a similar debate over oil and gas leasing. But I rise in strong support of the Grijalva amendment, and I urge my Republican colleagues to take a step back and consider the true impacts their policies are having on public lands.

Public lands are just that: lands for the public to enjoy and use for the

great benefits that they provide. Generations of New Mexicans have used our State lands for hunting, fishing, recreation, and grazing. Mineral development is important, but let's do it where it makes sense.

We have seen bill after bill on this floor that are giveaways to Big Oil companies, mining companies, and corporate interests that don't consider the long-term detrimental impacts to wildlife habitat and public use for recreational use. Today's bill would require the Federal Government to maximize the development of mining on public lands and limit access to land for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting. All the Grijalva amendment says is let's protect that little area.

This is a bad bill to hunters, anglers, and ranchers, and I urge support of the Grijalva amendment to H.R. 4402 to protect our access to public lands.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just simply say that this is an amendment, as I mentioned in my earlier remarks, that simply is antimining at its best, because there is, in current law, a procedure for giving higher access to certain activities and then there is the mitigation process. But to suggest that this is something that would protect sportsmen defies logic. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the NRA has come out against the Grijalva amendment.

So with that, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-590 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. TONKO of New York.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO)

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 251, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

AYES—162

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

NOES—251

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

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

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman	Dicks	Lowey
Akin	Gallegly	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Gutierrez	Murphy (PA)
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Coble	Jackson Lee	Welch
Connolly (VA)	(TX)	
Costa	Jenkins	

□ 1158

Messrs. FRELINGHUYSEN, MCINTYRE and TURNER of Ohio changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 252, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

AYES—162

Andrews	Gonzalez	Pascrell
Baca	Green, Al	Pastor (AZ)
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Barber	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bass (CA)	Hahn	Peters
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pingree (ME)
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Polis
Berman	Heinrich	Price (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Quigley
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Rahall
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Reyes
Brale (IA)	Holt	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Honda	Richmond
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Israel	Royal-Allard
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rupersberger
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Keating	T.
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kind	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Langevin	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Clay	Larsen (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Clyburn	Levin	Serrano
Cohen	Lewis (GA)	Sewell
Conyers	Lipinski	Sherman
Cooper	Loeb sack	Sires
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Crowley	Luján	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lynch	Speier
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Stark
Davis (IL)	Markey	Sutton
DeFazio	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	McCollum	Tierney
Deutch	McDermott	Tonko
Dingell	McGovern	Towns
Doggett	McNerney	Tsongas
Doyle	Meeks	Van Hollen
Edwards	Michaud	Visclosky
Ellison	Miller (NC)	Walz (MN)
Engel	Miller, George	Wasserman
Eshoo	Moore	Schultz
Farr	Moran	Waters
Fattah	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Filner	Nadler	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Welch
Fudge	Frank (MA)	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Filner	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Frank (MA)	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Garamendi	

NOES—252

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

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

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman Gallegly Lowey
 Akin Gutierrez Lummis
 Bishop (UT) Hanna Rush
 Cardoza Jackson (IL) Velázquez
 Coble Jackson Lee
 Costa (TX)
 Dicks Jenkins

□ 1203

Mr. TURNER of Ohio changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 253, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—163

Andrews Gibson Pastor (AZ)
 Baca Gonzalez Pelosi
 Bachmann Green, Al Peters
 Baldwin Green, Gene Petri
 Barber Grijalva Pingree (ME)
 Bass (CA) Gutierrez Polis
 Becerra Hahn Price (NC)
 Berman Hanabusa Quigley
 Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL) Rahall
 Blumenauer Heinrich Rangel
 Bonamici Himes Reyes
 Boswell Hinchey Richardson
 Brady (PA) Holt Richmond
 Braley (IA) Honda Rothman (NJ)
 Brown (FL) Hoyer Roybal-Allard
 Butterfield Israel Ruppersberger
 Capps Johnson (GA) Ryan (OH)
 Capuano Johnson, E. B. Sanchez, Linda
 Carnahan Kaptur T.
 Carney Keating Sanchez, Loretta
 Carson (IN) Kildee Sarbanes
 Castor (FL) Kind Schakowsky
 Chu Kucinich Schiff
 Cicilline Langevin Schrader
 Clarke (MI) Larsen (WA) Schwartz
 Clarke (NY) Larson (CT) Scott (VA)
 Clay Lee (CA) Scott, David
 Cleaver Levin Serrano
 Clyburn Lewis (GA) Sewell
 Cohen Lipinski Sherman
 Connolly (VA) Loeb sack Sires
 Conyers Lofgren, Zoe Slaughter
 Cooper Lujan Smith (WA)
 Costa Lynch Speier
 Courtney Maloney Stark
 Crowley Markey Sutton
 Cummings Matsui Thompson (CA)
 Davis (CA) McCarthy (NY) Thompson (MS)
 Davis (IL) McColium Tierney
 DeGette McDermott Tonko
 DeLauro McGovern Towns
 Deutch McNeerney Tsongas
 Dingell Meeks Van Hollen
 Doggett Michaud Velázquez
 Doyle Miller (NC) Visclosky
 Edwards Miller, George Walz (MN)
 Ellison Moore Wasserman
 Engel Moran Schultz
 Eshoo Murphy (CT) Waters
 Farr Nadler Watt
 Fattah Napolitano Waxman
 Filner Neal Welch
 Frank (MA) Olver Wilson (FL)
 Fudge Pallone Woolsey
 Garamendi Pascrell Yarmuth

NOES—253

Adams Burgess Duffy
 Aderholt Burton (IN) Duncan (SC)
 Alexander Calvert Duncan (TN)
 Altmiere Camp Ellmers
 Amash Campbell Emerson
 Amodei Canseco Farenthold
 Austria Cantor Fincher
 Bachus Capito Fitzpatrick
 Barletta Carter Flake
 Barrow Cassidy Fleischmann
 Bartlett Chabot Fleming
 Barton (TX) Chaffetz Flores
 Bass (NH) Chandler Forbes
 Benishek Coffman (CO) Fortenberry
 Berg Cole Foxx
 Berkeley Conaway Franks (AZ)
 Biggert Costello Frelinghuysen
 Bilbray Cravaack Gardner
 Bilirakis Crawford Garrett
 Bishop (GA) Crenshaw Gerlach
 Black Critz Gibbs
 Blackburn Cuellar Gingrey (GA)
 Bonner Culberson Gohmert
 Bono Mack Davis (KY) Goodlatte
 Boren DeFazio Gosar
 Boustany Denham Gowdy
 Brady (TX) Dent Granger
 Brooks Dent DesJarlais
 Broun (GA) Diaz-Balart Graves (MO)
 Buchanan Dold Griffin (AR)
 Bucshon Donnelly (IN) Griffith (VA)
 Buerkle Dreier Grimm

Guinta Marino Rooney
 Guthrie Matheson Ros-Lehtinen
 Hall McCarthy (CA) Roskam
 Hanna McCaul Ross (AR)
 Harper McClintock Ross (FL)
 Harris McHenry Royce
 Hartzler McIntyre Runyan
 Hastings (WA) McKeon Ryan (WI)
 Hayworth McKinley Scalise
 Heck McMorris Schilling
 Hensarling Rodgers Schmidt
 Herger Meehan Schock
 Herrera Beutler Mica Schweikert
 Higgins Miller (FL) Scott (SC)
 Hinojosa Miller (MI) Scott, Austin
 Hochul Miller, Gary Sensenbrenner
 Holden Mulvaney Sessions
 Huelskamp Murphy (PA) Shimkus
 Huizenga (MI) Myrick Shuler
 Hultgren Neugebauer Shuster
 Hunter Noem Simpson
 Hurt Nugent Smith (NE)
 Issa Nunes Smith (NJ)
 Johnson (IL) Nunnelee Smith (TX)
 Johnson (OH) Olson Southerland
 Johnson, Sam Owens Stearns
 Jones Palazzo Stivers
 Jordan Paul Stutzman
 Kelly Paulsen Sullivan
 King (IA) Pearce Terry
 King (NY) Pence Thompson (PA)
 Kingston Kingston Perlmutter Thornberry
 Kinzinger (IL) Peterson Tipton
 Kline Kissell Pitts
 Labrador Kline Platts
 Lamborn Labrador Poe (TX)
 Lance Lamborn Pompeo Upton
 Landry Lance Posey Walberg
 Lankford Landry Price (GA) Walden
 Latham Latham Quayle Walsh (IL)
 LaTourette Latham Reed Webster
 Latta Latta Rehberg West
 Lewis (CA) Latta Reichert Westmoreland
 LoBiondo Lewis (CA) Renacci Whitfield
 Long LoBiondo Rigell Wilson (SC)
 Long Long Rivera Wittman
 Lucas Roby Wolf
 Luetkemeyer Roe (TN) Womack
 Lungren, Daniel Rogers (AL) Woodall
 E. Rogers (KY) Yoder
 Mack Rogers (MI) Young (AK)
 Manzullo Rohrabacher Young (FL)
 Marchant Rokita Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman Gallegly Lowey
 Akin Hirono Lummis
 Bishop (UT) Jackson (IL) Ribble
 Cardoza Jackson Lee
 Coble (TX) Rush
 Dicks Jenkins

□ 1207

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

Stated for:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 464, the Markey amendment, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 178, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

AYES—238

Adams	Gohmert	Nugent
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Nunes
Alexander	Gosar	Nunnelee
Altmire	Gowdy	Olson
Amash	Granger	Palazzo
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Paul
Austria	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Bachmann	Green, Gene	Pearce
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Peterson
Bartlett	Grimm	Petri
Barton (TX)	Guinta	Pitts
Bass (NH)	Guthrie	Platts
Benishek	Hall	Poe (TX)
Berg	Hanna	Pompeo
Biggart	Harper	Posey
Bilbray	Harris	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Quayle
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Reed
Black	Hayworth	Rehberg
Blackburn	Heck	Reichert
Bonner	Hensarling	Renacci
Bono Mack	Herger	Rigell
Boren	Hirono	Rivera
Boswell	Holden	Roby
Boustany	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Issa	Rokita
Buerkle	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Calvert	Jones	Ross (AR)
Camp	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Campbell	Kelly	Royce
Canseco	King (IA)	Ryunyan
Cantor	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kingston	Scallise
Carney	Kinzinger (IL)	Schilling
Carter	Kline	Schock
Cassidy	Labrador	Schweikert
Chaffetz	Lamborn	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Lance	Scott, Austin
Cole	Landry	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lankford	Sessions
Cravaack	Latham	Shimkus
Crawford	LaTourette	Shuster
Crenshaw	Latta	Simpson
Critz	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Long	Smith (TX)
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Southerland
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Stearns
Dent	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
DesJarlais	E.	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	Mack	Sullivan
Dold	Manzullo	Terry
Dreier	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	Marino	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Ellmers	McCaull	Turner (NY)
Emerson	McClintock	Turner (OH)
Farenthold	McHenry	Upton
Fincher	McKeon	Walberg
Flake	McKinley	Walden
Fleischmann	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Fleming	Rodgers	West
Flores	Meehan	Westmoreland
Forbes	Mica	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Woodall
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Garrett	Myrick	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Young (IN)

NOES—178

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

DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Rothman (NJ)
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger
Doggett	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Linda
Doyle	Lipinski	T.
Edwards	Loebsack	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Sarbanes
Engel	Lujan	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Lynch	Schiff
Farr	Maloney	Schmidt
Fattah	Markey	Schrader
Filner	Matsui	Schwartz
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	McCollum	Scott, David
Fudge	McDermott	Serrano
Garamendi	McGovern	Sewell
Gerlach	McIntyre	Sherman
Gibson	McNerney	Shuler
Gonzalez	Meeks	Sires
Green, Al	Michaud	Slaughter
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Speier
Hahn	Moore	Stark
Hanabusa	Moran	Sutton
Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)
Heinrich	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Herrera Beutler	Napolitano	Tierney
Higgins	Neal	Tonko
Himes	Olver	Towns
Hinchev	Owens	Tsongas
Hinojosa	Pallone	Van Hollen
Hochul	Pascrell	Velazquez
Holt	Pastor (AZ)	Visclosky
Honda	Pelosi	Walz (MN)
Hoyer	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Israel	Peters	Schultz
Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Waters
Johnson, E. B.	Polis	Watt
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Waxman
Keating	Quigley	Webster
Kildee	Rahall	Welch
Kildeer	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
Kissell	Reyes	Wolf
Kucinich	Richardson	Woolsey
Langevin	Richmond	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Dicks	Lowey
Akin	Gallegly	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Jackson (IL)	Ribble
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Rush
Coble	(TX)	
Davis (IL)	Jenkins	

□ 1211

Mr. POE of Texas changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

Stated against: Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 465 on H.R. 4402, the Young (AK) Amendment, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “aye” when I should have voted “no.” Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I intended to vote “no” on rollcall vote No. 465, the amendment offered by my friend Congressman YOUNG of Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 248, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—167

Andrews	Garamendi	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Baldwin	Green, Al	Perlmutter
Barber	Green, Gene	Peters
Bass (CA)	Grijalva	Pingree (ME)
Becerra	Gutierrez	Polis
Berkley	Hahn	Price (NC)
Berman	Hanabusa	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Rahall
Blumenauer	Heinrich	Rangel
Bonamici	Higgins	Rehberg
Boswell	Himes	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Hinchev	Richardson
Braley (IA)	Hirono	Richmond
Brown (FL)	Holt	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Honda	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Hoyer	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Israel	Sanchez, Linda
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	T.
Carney	Johnson (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Chandler	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Chu	Keating	Schiff
Cicilline	Kildee	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Kucinich	Schwartz
Clay	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Sherman
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Shuler
Cooper	Loeb sack	Sires
Costa	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Costello	Lujan	Speier
Courtney	Lynch	Stark
Crowley	Maloney	Sutton
Cuellar	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Tonko
DeFazio	McDermott	Towns
DeGette	McGovern	Tsongas
DeLauro	McNerney	Van Hollen
Deutch	Meeks	Velazquez
Dingell	Michaud	Visclosky
Doggett	Miller (NC)	Walz (MN)
Doyle	Miller, George	Wasserman
Edwards	Moore	Schultz
Ellison	Moran	Waters
Engel	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Eshoo	Nadler	Waxman
Farr	Napolitano	Webster
Fattah	Neal	Welch
Filner	Olver	Wilson (FL)
Frank (MA)	Pallone	Woolsey
Fudge	Pascrell	Yarmuth

NOES—248

Canseco	Fortenberry
Cantor	Fox
Capito	Franks (AZ)
Carson (IN)	Frelinghuysen
Carter	Gardner
Cassidy	Garrett
Chabot	Gerlach
Chaffetz	Gibbs
Coffman (CO)	Gibson
Cole	Gingrey (GA)
Conaway	Gohmert
Cravaack	Goodlatte
Crawford	Gosar
Crenshaw	Gowdy
Critz	Granger
Culberson	Graves (GA)
Davis (KY)	Graves (MO)
Denham	Griffin (AR)
Dent	Griffin (VA)
DesJarlais	Grimm
Diaz-Balart	Guinta
Dold	Guthrie
Donnelly (IN)	Hall
Dreier	Hanna
Duffy	Harper
Duncan (SC)	Harris
Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Ellmers	Hastings (WA)
Emerson	Hayworth
Farenthold	Heck
Fincher	Hensarling
Flake	Herger
Fleischmann	Herrera Beutler
Fleming	Hochul
Flores	Holden
Forbes	Huelskamp
	Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Scalise
Hurt	Miller, Gary	Schilling
Issa	Mulvaney	Schmidt
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Schock
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Schweikert
Jones	Neugebauer	Scott (SC)
Jordan	Noem	Scott, Austin
Kelly	Nugent	Sensenbrenner
King (IA)	Nunes	Sessions
King (NY)	Nunnelee	Shimkus
Kingston	Olson	Shuster
Kinzinger (IL)	Owens	Simpson
Kissell	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
Kline	Paul	Smith (NJ)
Labrador	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
Lamborn	Pearce	Southerland
Lance	Pence	Stearns
Landry	Peterson	Stivers
Lankford	Petri	Stutzman
Latham	Pitts	Sullivan
LaTourette	Platts	Terry
Latta	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Lewis (CA)	Pompeo	Thornberry
Lipinski	Posey	Tiberti
LoBiondo	Price (GA)	Tipton
Long	Quayle	Turner (NY)
Lucas	Reed	Turner (OH)
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Upton
Lungren, Daniel	Renacci	Walberg
E.	Ribble	Walden
Mack	Rigell	Walsh (IL)
Manzullo	Rivera	Webster
Marchant	Roby	West
Marino	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Matheson	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
McCaul	Rogers (MI)	Wittman
McClintock	Rohrabacher	Wolf
McHenry	Rokita	Womack
McIntyre	Rooney	Woodall
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder
McKinley	Roskam	Young (AK)
McMorris	Ross (AR)	Young (FL)
Rodgers	Ross (FL)	Young (IN)
Meehan	Royce	
Mica	Runyan	

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman	Gallegly	Lowey
Akin	Hinojosa	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Coble	(TX)	Smith (WA)
Dicks	Jenkins	

□ 1214

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEST). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEST, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 726, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment re-

ported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. In its present form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Slaughter moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4402 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 9, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 105. PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF PERMITS TO PERSONS, CORPORATIONS, AND SUBSIDIARIES THAT ARE DELINQUENT ON TAXES.

No Federal mineral exploration or mine permit shall be issued pursuant to this Act to a person, corporation, partnership, trust, or other form of business organization that has failed to pay any tax required under State or Federal law, or to a subsidiary of such a corporation, partnership, or other form of business organization.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITIONS REGARDING CHINA AND IRAN.

(a) PROHIBITION ON EXPORT.—Each Federal mineral exploration or mine permit issued pursuant to this Act shall include provisions that prohibit export to the China or Iran of strategic and critical minerals produced under the permit.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF PERMITS.—No Federal mineral exploration or mine permit may be issued pursuant to this Act to—

(1) any company in which China or Iran has an ownership interest; and

(2) any person (including any successor, assign, affiliate, member, or joint venturer with an ownership interest in any property or project any portion of which is owned by such person) that is in violation of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) or the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.).

(c) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER OF PROHIBITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CHINA.—The President may waive the prohibitions under subsections (a) and (b) with respect to China upon certification that the Government of China has removed its export restraints on strategic and critical minerals.

SEC. 107. PERMIT REQUIREMENTS REGARDING USE OF AMERICAN MINING EQUIPMENT AND OUTSOURCING OF AMERICAN JOBS.

Each Federal mineral exploration or mine permit issued pursuant to this Act shall include provisions that—

(1) require, to the extent practicable, that all mining equipment used under the permit must be manufactured in the United States; and

(2) prohibit the permit holder from outsourcing American jobs.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes on her motion.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we've just concluded debate on a bill that will make it easier for the mining industry to profit from digging up valuable minerals on land owned by the American taxpayer.

□ 1220

What would the American people get in return? Nothing, except poorer public health, a dirtier environment, and fewer opportunities for hunting, fishing, and recreation.

Instead of the bill we are considering today, we should be amending the statute that was signed into law by Ulysses S. Grant. Can you imagine that? The mining law of 1872, which is our mining law today, gives away the valuable minerals we should be saving for ourselves or, at the very least, getting some revenue from. But no, 140 years later, we still have this bill which has long outlived its usefulness.

Over the 25 years that I've served in Congress, every attempt to repeal this law has failed. Today, we compound the problem by voting on legislation that will give even more power to mining interests. Adding insult to injury, the companies benefiting from this bill can continue to take minerals owned by the American taxpayers royalty free, even if they're foreign companies and even if they have cheated or are delinquent on their taxes.

There is still time to fix three of the most glaring loopholes contained in this bill, and my amendment does just that. It will not kill the bill, and we will immediately move forward with the final vote on its passage. However, if adopted, my amendment will insert safeguards into the final legislation to protect our national security and to protect American jobs.

First, my amendment prevents mining contracts from being awarded to companies that have failed to pay their taxes. Last week, the Las Vegas Sun reported that mining companies in Nevada have underpaid their taxes by \$8.7 million since 2008. At a time when cities and towns across America are going bankrupt and we're facing disaster in many areas of the country and some in Congress threaten to cut Medicare and food stamps in the name of fiscal responsibility, we must and should hold corporations accountable for the taxes they owe to the American people. If mining companies are to profit from our natural resources, they must be required to pay their fair share.

I'm the author of the Reciprocal Market Access Act, a bipartisan bill that would finally put an end to the wholesale exporting of American manufacturing jobs to China. My amendment

today echos this plan. With the passage of this amendment today, we would make sure that the door is closed when China comes knocking to profit from our precious natural resources.

Finally, my amendment protects American jobs by prohibiting outsourcing and requiring mining companies to use mining equipment made in the United States. Isn't that little enough to ask?

The sweat and blood of middle class Americans built the United States, and it's time this Congress put their interests first. With my amendment today, we can do just that, by putting in place safeguards that will protect American jobs and ensure that mining equipment is made in America.

I'm introducing my amendment on behalf of the people of Rochester, New York. Some of the greatest workers that the country has ever known live there. My constituents are among the 300 million rightful owners of our Nation's natural resources, and not a single one of them wants this Congress to simply give them away to China or outsource precious American jobs.

Over the last 2 years, the majority has consistently pandered to corporate interests. Listen to this, because we've been very concerned this week with how many times we voted to repeal health care. Try this one on. We have voted more than 100 times this term, the last 18 months, over 100 times to benefit the oil industry. As demonstrated last night by a wonderful CBS News program, it costs millions and millions of dollars. They estimate that just the health care votes over and over cost the taxpayers \$50 million.

Last year, we voted—as you remember, I voted against it, of course—to give Federal land to a single foreign mining company that has ties to Iran's nuclear program. That was mining of uranium, free, about 8 miles from the Grand Canyon. I don't know how much more stupid we can get. I think it is absolutely obvious to us that a law passed in 1872 is nowhere near adequate for what we need today.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment to protect American workers, American resources, and to protect our friends who are extremely worried about Iran by making sure that they do not benefit at all.

Mr. Speaker, we've just concluded debate on a bill that will make it easier for the mining industry to profit from digging up valuable minerals on land owned by the American taxpayer. And what would the American people get in return? Nothing except poorer public health, a dirtier environment, and fewer opportunities for hunting, fishing and recreation.

Instead of the bill we are considering today, we should be amending the statute that was signed into law by Ulysses S. Grant in 1872. In an effort to spur development of the West, the law gave almost unlimited power to mining companies. 140 years later, this law has outlived its usefulness, yet over the 25 years I've been in Congress, every attempt to repeal this law has failed. Now today, we compound the problem by voting on legislation that will give even more power to mining interests.

Adding insult to injury, the companies benefiting from this bill can continue to take minerals owned by American taxpayers—royalty-free—even if they're foreign companies, and even if they have cheated on their taxes.

There is still time to fix three of the most glaring loopholes contained in this bill, and my amendment does just that. The amendment will not kill the bill, and we will immediately move forward with a final vote on its passage.

However, if adopted, my amendment will insert safeguards into the final legislation that will protect our national security and protect American jobs.

First, my amendment prevents mining contracts from being awarded to companies that have failed to pay their taxes. Last week, the Las Vegas Sun reported that mining companies in Nevada have underpaid their taxes by \$8.7 million since 2008. At a time when cities and towns across America are going bankrupt, and some in Congress threaten to cut Medicare and other vital programs in the name of fiscal responsibility, we must hold corporations accountable for the taxes they owe to the American people. If mining companies are to profit from our natural resources, they must be required to pay their fair share.

Second, my amendment ensures that neither Iran nor China is allowed to profit from today's bill. Under my amendment, mineral resources deemed critical or strategic will be prohibited from export to Iran or China. No company that is owned by Iran or China will be allowed to mine American minerals, and under no circumstances will American minerals be exported to either of these nations.

In an age when Iran is threatening the security of our ally Israel, and the stability of the entire Middle East, this Congress must ensure that not a single American resource goes to supporting the dangerous Iranian regime. My amendment would leave no doubt that the United States stands by our allies and that not an ounce of American minerals ends up in Iranian hands.

Furthermore, as my constituents know all too well, China routinely engages in unfair and anti-competitive behavior that has stolen American jobs and weakened our middle class. It is time that this Congress, and this country, stops the decades-long giveaway to China.

I am the author of the Reciprocal Market Access Act, a bipartisan bill that would finally put an end to the wholesale exporting of American manufacturing jobs to China, and my amendment today echoes this plan. With passage of my amendment today, we would make sure that the door is closed when China comes knocking to profit from our precious natural resources.

Finally, my amendment protects American jobs by prohibiting outsourcing, and requiring mining companies to use mining equipment that is made in the United States.

The sweat and blood of middle class Americans built the United States, and it is time that this Congress put their interests first. With my amendment today, we can do just that, by putting in place safeguards that protect American jobs and ensure that mining equipment is made in the USA.

I am introducing my amendment on behalf of the people of Rochester NY—they are some of the greatest workers that the world has ever known. My constituents are among the 300 million rightful owners of our Nation's

natural resources, and I know that not a single one of them wants this Congress to simply give away our valuable assets to China, or outsource precious American jobs.

Over the last 2 years, the Majority has consistently pandered to corporate interests. The Majority has voted more than 100 times to benefit the oil industry, and even voted last year to give away Federal land to a single foreign mining company that has ties to Iran's nuclear program.

The Majority has also answered the wishes of the health insurance industry, including voting more than 30 times to dismantle historic healthcare reforms. They've continued this corporate care-giving right up until today as we prepare to vote on a bill that is a giveaway to corporate mining interests.

What we should be doing is voting on a jobs bill that helps people, not fattens corporate profits. But if the Majority insists on moving forward with flawed bills, we can at least close loopholes in order to protect the American people. By fixing three vital flaws within today's bill, my amendment will allow each of us to vote for our constituents and stand up for the middle class.

Again, my amendment will not kill the bill. If my amendment is adopted, the bill as amended will immediately be voted upon. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and stand with me as I fight to protect our natural resources and American-made jobs.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill is about American jobs and not only American mining jobs. Our manufacturing sector, as part of it, uses the minerals from these mining jobs. So it is much broader than that.

I have to comment on the tone here that we've heard over and over from the other side on this issue. The bill streamlines the bureaucracy and red tape. Every amendment that was offered today and the tone of all of their debate on this was to side with the bureaucracy that imposes more red tape.

What is even more ironic is that this is about mining in America. The arguments from the other side all day were "don't mine in America." What's the motion to recommit? Don't sell what we're going to mine in America. They didn't want to mine in the first place, and now they're saying we can't sell it if we mine it. It doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Speaker, this is a jobs bill for American workers. I urge rejection of the motion to recommit and "yes" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 231, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

YEAS—181

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

NAYS—231

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

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

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman	Flores	Lummis
Akin	Galleghy	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Cardoza	Jackson Lee	Scott, Austin
Carter	(TX)	Towns
Coble	Jenkins	Woodall
Dicks	Lowe	

□ 1243

Mr. YODER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. COSTELLO, GONZALEZ, PETERSON, and BOREN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 467 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 160, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

AYES—256

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

NOES—160

Andrews	Bass (CA)	Blumenauer
Baca	Becerra	Bonamici
Baldwin	Berman	Brady (PA)
Barber	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)

Brown (FL)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Himes	Peters
Capps	Hinchev	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Hinojosa	Polis
Carnahan	Hirono	Price (NC)
Carney	Holt	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Honda	Rahall
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Rangel
Chu	Israel	Richardson
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Clarke (MI)	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman (NJ)
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Keating	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kucinich	T.
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Crowley	Levin	Schrader
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Schwartz
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Davis (IL)	Loebsock	Scott, David
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
DeGette	Luján	Sires
DeLauro	Lynch	Slaughter
Deutch	Maloney	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Markey	Speier
Doggett	Matsui	Stark
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Edwards	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Engel	McGovern	Tierney
Eshoo	McNerney	Tonko
Farr	Meeks	Towns
Fattah	Michaud	Tsongas
Filner	Miller (NC)	Van Hollen
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Velázquez
Fudge	Moore	Visclosky
Garamendi	Moran	Walz (MN)
Gonzalez	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Green, Al	Nadler	Schultz
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Waters
Grijalva	Neal	Watt
Gutierrez	Olver	Waxman
Hahn	Pallone	Welch
Hanabusa	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)
Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)	Woolsey
Heinrich	Pelosi	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Gallegly	Lummis
Akin	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Bishop (UT)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Cardoza	(TX)	Serrano
Coble	Jenkins	
Dicks	Lowe	

□ 1250

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 468, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 835

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 835.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3001. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust.

H.R. 4155. An act to direct the head of each Federal department and agency to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purposes of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Madam Speaker, the House will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 5872, the Sequestration Transparency Act, sponsored by Congressman JEB HENSARLING. This is a bill that will bring needed transparency to the administration's process for implementing devastating cuts to our national defense and many social programs on January 2. Chairman PAUL RYAN and the Budget Committee passed this bill in a bipartisan fashion, so I expect it to be brought up under suspension of the rules.

Finally, and in keeping with funding our national security, the House will consider H.R. 5856, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, sponsored by Congressman BILL YOUNG. This will be the House's seventh appropriations bill of the year.

I expect the defense funding bill to be on the floor for the balance of the week. Members should be aware that late evening votes are possible on Wednesday, July 18, and Thursday, July 19.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that scheduling information.

As the gentleman knows, we have, as I calculate, 12 legislative days left to go in July and the beginning of August, of which 3 of those days we will be coming in at 6:30. As a result, we don't have much time left, and I would ask the gentleman if there is any expectation of having bills other than the regulatory—I understand one of those weeks will be the regulatory week. Other than the regulatory bills, will we have any jobs legislation on the floor?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for the question.

Madam Speaker, we've been, as the gentleman knows, very transparent about scheduling the floor, sending out a memo making Members aware of where we're headed for the remainder of the July period. I would say to the gentleman that, after next week, we will be focusing on cutting red tape, reducing the regulatory burden on our job creators. As we know, the regulatory atmosphere in this country is making it more difficult and more expensive for small businesses and large to create jobs. We'll be focusing on that.

The following week, Madam Speaker, will be the week in which we will bring forward a piece of legislation to stop the tax hikes to ensure that all Americans know we are not going to see taxes go up for them at the end of this year.

In addition to that, we'll bring forward a bill that will be focused on how we get to a pro-growth tax system in this country, laying out the principles for tax reform and suggesting an expedited procedure so that we can actually achieve results for the American people so that our job creators and working families can get back to work.

Mr. HOYER. I understand the gentleman's answer, and I think we have consensus on this floor about cutting red tape and facilitating decisions by the Federal Government or by the State government or by local government. We have all heard that complaint throughout our careers. I think that's a legitimate concern for us to have. However, when I ask about a jobs bill, the gentleman responds on a couple of levels.

I think I may have mentioned this before, but what concerns me is that Bruce Bartlett, whom I think the gentleman probably knows, a former President Reagan and President H. W. Bush administration official, says that no hard evidence is offered for the claim that regulatory issues have increased. But he says that Republicans have embraced "the idea that government regulation is the principal factor holding back employment. They assert that Barack Obama has unleashed a tidal wave of new regulations, which has created uncertainty among businesses and prevents them from investing and hiring."

□ 1300

As I said, he says no hard evidence is offered for this claim. He then says:

In my opinion, regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it's a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.

Now, that's his opinion, I understand that. But my concern is, if you ask an economist whether or not many of the pieces of legislation we've passed that we've called jobs bills—the gentleman's pointed that out—economists say in the short term—which is really what