

Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman

## NOES—192

Andrews  
Barber  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Grayson  
Green, Al

## NOT VOTING—10

Bilirakis  
Campbell  
Herrera Beutler  
McCarthy (NY)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1441

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Wolf  
Yarmuth

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, November 20, 2013, I missed rollcall vote No. 600 for unavoidable reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 600: "aye" (On passage of H.R. 1965.)

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 600 (final passage of H.R. 1965) I was unavoidably detained and did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted, "yea."

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

## OFFICE OF THE CLERK,

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, November 20, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,

*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 20, 2013 at 11:51 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 3304.

That the Senate passed S. 381.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## PROTECTING STATES' RIGHTS TO PROMOTE AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY ACT

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2728.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 419 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. 2728.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1444

## 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. 2728) to recognize States' authority to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in

section 2 of House Resolution 419 and shall not exceed 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

□ 1445

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

Mr. Chairman, the Obama administration is once again attempting to block new energy production, keeping energy prices high and hurting middle class families. The Department of the Interior is proposing new regulations on the practice of hydraulic fracturing on Federal and tribal lands. These regulations, once implemented next year, will in all likelihood add new layers of red tape and lower energy production even further on Federal land.

For over 2 years, the Natural Resources Committee has conducted extensive oversight of the Obama administration's proposed regulations. We have held multiple hearings across the country and have heard from energy experts, tribal leaders, and State officials who have all had the same message: these are bad regulations that potentially destroy jobs and stifle American energy production.

According to one study, these new Federal regulations would cost nearly \$350 million annually. As a consequence, the 1.7 million jobs that are currently supported by shale oil and natural gas production—a number, I might add, Mr. Chairman, that is expected to increase to 2.5 million by 2015—these jobs would be put in jeopardy. Even worse, these proposed regulations duplicate efforts already being carried out by States across the country.

Hydraulic fracturing has been safely and effectively regulated by States for decades. So the Obama administration's proposed regulations are unnecessary, they are redundant, and they simply waste precious time and money duplicating what is already being done successfully.

That is why two of our colleagues from Texas, Mr. FLORES and Mr. CUELLAR, introduced the bipartisan H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, before us today. This bill prohibits the Interior Department from enforcing duplicative hydraulic fracturing regulations in any State that already has regulations or will adopt regulations in the future and recognizes

States' authority to regulate this type of activity.

The bill acknowledges that States are doing a good job and an effective job regulating this activity. And ironically, Mr. Chairman, officials from the Obama administration, itself, have admitted that there has not been one known case of groundwater contamination from hydraulic fracturing. The reason I mention this, Mr. Chairman, is because groundwater contamination is the argument most frequently used against this process.

The bill also recognizes that States are able to carefully craft regulations to meet the unique geological and hydrologic needs of their States. A one-size-fits-all regulatory structure, like this administration is trying to impose, will not work and is certainly not the answer.

I want to be very clear: this bill does not prevent the Federal Government from implementing baseline standards in States where none exist. This bill simply prevents the Federal Government from wasting time, money, and resources by imposing duplicative red tape on a process that is widely regarded as being properly regulated by the States.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this bill. Apparently, Mr. Chairman, the Republican majority believes that the greatest threat that Americans face from hydraulic fracturing today is too many regulations. They don't seem to be concerned about the danger posed to our drinking water supplies or the impacts of industrialization on our rural landscapes or the increased risk of earthquakes from wastewater injection or the emissions of methane or other noxious chemicals into the air or the identity of the mystery chemicals being pumped underground nor the disposal of waste safely. Americans are concerned about these things, and so should we be.

The House Democrats are trying to do something about that. My colleagues and I have introduced an entire series of bills designed to address the very real impacts that fracking has on American communities: the BREATHE Act, by Mr. POLIS; the SHARED Act, by Ms. SCHAKOWSKY; the CLEANER Act, by Mr. CARTWRIGHT; the FRESHER Act, also by Mr. CARTWRIGHT; and the FRAC Act, by Ms. DEGETTE. These are attempts to protect the air, the water, the land, and ensure that people know what is being injected into the ground under their homes. The Republicans will not bring any of these bills to the floor, and I doubt they will because, according to the Republicans, the real threat is too many regulations.

This is preposterous, Mr. Chairman. Tell the people who want to know what chemicals are being injected under

their homes that the real danger is that the Federal Government wants them to know. Tell the people who are seeing elevated levels of methane in their drinking water that the real danger is that the Federal Government wants to ensure that the wells are built better so they will not leak methane. Mr. Chairman, tell the people living next to the huge open pits of wastewater that the real danger is the Federal Government wants to make sure that States have minimum standards.

Mr. Chairman, I am astonished that the sponsors of this bill and the leadership would even bring the bill to the floor. It will do nothing, absolutely nothing, to address any of the concerns that families have legitimately about the impacts of fracking in their communities. Worse than that, the bill will strip existing protections in place across the entire Nation.

It would eliminate the ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service to regulate oil and gas operations on their own lands. It would prevent the Fish and Wildlife Service from enforcing wildlife protection regulations under the Endangered Species Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act—oh, yes, I know my colleagues will say, That is not true; read the bill—and any number of other laws everywhere across the country.

Now I would like to think that these are unintended consequences of a poorly drafted bill, but given past attacks on the Endangered Species Act and such, I think there is reason to suspect that this is an intended consequence.

They will say, This is about states' rights, but Democrats are actually focused on the American people's rights: their rights to clean air; their rights to clean water; to be free of hazardous waste; to know what is happening under their very feet.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill and to bring up legislation that will really deal with the health and safety of Americans across the country.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the author of this legislation, who is a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, this bill will put the House on record in support of the shale energy boom, more American jobs, and lower energy prices, all of which are a direct result of hydraulic fracturing technology.

For the average American family last year, the shale energy boom meant \$1,200 per family in lower energy bills. During our slow economic recovery, it has been the lone bright spot responsible for creating the most new jobs, both in energy and in manufacturing.

States have been effectively regulating fracturing on Federal, State, and private lands for over 50 years, and the States oppose the Federal Government trying to overrule their expertise. There is no demonstrated need for

the Federal Government to waste taxpayer money by duplicating and complicating State efforts. The only reason for the Federal Government to get involved is to placate those who oppose the shale energy revolution and the jobs boom that has come from it. I hear the arguments:

First, they will say that States might have insufficient regulations. The facts are that all States that produce oil and gas have comprehensive rules and regulations to ensure that hydraulic fracturing is done safely. Moreover, there are many Federal laws that will continue to apply to energy development, and this bill will not change those.

Second, they argue that the Federal Government should be able to apply any rules and regulations it wants on Federal land. Well, for instance, States already effectively manage the wildlife and the water on Federal lands. Yet the environmental concern surrounding fracturing is water protection, and water protection authorities have always been the purview of the States.

Third, the proponents of Federal regulation argue that the administration will not expand the Department of the Interior rule to State and to private lands. Instead of embracing the booming shale energy production, this administration has directed over 10 Federal agencies to look for ways to override State rules in this regard.

Energy is a key economic input to a more prosperous future for all Americans. H.R. 2728 stops the Federal Government from more Federal regulation encroachment on State water authorities and potential infringement on State and private lands.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. FLORES. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for his assistance in moving this legislation through his committee and the bill's co-lead, Mr. CUELLAR.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2728 and support the American manufacturing renaissance, lower energy costs, and American jobs.

Mr. HOLT. I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the senior ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, now here, a group has done an assessment of the various State regulatory regimes, and as you can see, they vary tremendously. They think that the best is Maryland. There are others gathered toward the top, the middle, and then way down here at the bottom, you have Virginia.

Some States require comprehensive pressure testing of the casing. That is essential, particularly if you are going through the water table to get to the gas. If you get the leaks, then you destroy the water table. Some States don't require that.

Some States require that you contain the fluids that come back up, the waste products laden with toxic materials not only from the fluids but from the ground itself. Other States allow it to be in open pits.

Some States require disclosure of the chemicals that are used. Now how can you say there has been no contamination when there are contaminated wells in many places across the U.S.? Some of it has to do with baseline contamination with arsenic or other things, but if you don't know what they are sticking into the ground near your well or water table, you can't track what it is that was a baseline before and/or what is pollution that has resulted. We don't know that. So why not require disclosure of the chemicals?

We are having a gold rush right now for fracking. It is not exactly like this is going to have an impact if we put in place a reasonable floor of Federal regulations. One Macondo, just one Macondo in this industry, one well that blows out in a large aquifer or some other disaster, and this whole thing is going to come grinding to a halt, and then you are going to see a strong push-back for strong regulations.

Quite frankly, I don't think that the regulations being proposed by this administration are stringent enough for a floor. They are probably above maybe some of these people on the bottom, but they are way below some of the best-performing States here.

Why should it be different State to State? What is it? Do we want to protect the above ground resources and not have open pits? Well, under this bill, if you have an open pit, it is on a flyway, migratory birds land there and die quickly, the Federal Government can't do anything about it. If that State allows open pits, we can't do anything about that. That is up to that State, and that is a fact. A number of States allow open pits.

We should have a regulatory regime where the Federal Government, on its lands, which belong to all the people of the United States, sets a reasonable floor for regulations. If a State like Maryland wants to go above good, solid regulations, well, then, good. But if someone else is a bad actor, and they want to drag it down, and they want to have open pits, they don't want to test the casing, they don't want to do other things that are absolutely essential to protect resources, then they can do that on Federal lands?

It is bad enough that they are allowing people to do it on private lands and do it on their State lands. But these are Federal lands. We are going to require and should require a higher bar to protect the public, to protect the environment, to protect these precious resources and do this responsibly.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to ask the distinguished ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee if he could tell me who did that study.

I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) for him to tell me who did that study.

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

It was done by an advocacy group called Resources for the Future. It is kind of like your study that says it will cost \$350 million, which was done by industry. It is an advocacy group. You have an industry advocacy group. We have an environmental advocacy group.

□ 1500

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

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), chairman of the subcommittee that dealt with this legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2728, which came through the subcommittee I chair and which I am pleased to co-sponsor.

This bipartisan legislation requires the Department of the Interior to defer to State regulations regarding hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands within the States.

These proposed Federal regulations will lead to more bureaucratic red tape that will further discourage energy producers from developing on Federal land.

The time period for approving a simple application for a permit to drill has only increased under President Obama. An energy producer can wait for nearly a year for a permit to be approved on Federal land, while in my home State of Colorado, it is only an average of 27 days.

The Federal regulations being proposed by the administration will add an entirely new layer of regulations to the already cumbersome Federal process. This will increase the cost of producing energy and does not help working American families.

The proposed Federal regulations also ignore the extensive work done by the States to regulate hydraulic fractures within their borders. Our committee has heard from numerous witnesses from Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and other States who have testified to the extensive process these States went through to draft their regulations, regulations that are very successful. No one can show where States are dropping the ball.

My home State of Colorado has been safely using hydraulic fracturing for over 40 years and has the toughest disclosure rule in the Nation. Even our Democratic Governor, John Hickenlooper, to his credit, believes that it is the State's responsibility to regulate the industry. The States know their own geology and water better than bureaucrats in Washington do.

This bill will eliminate Federal regulations that are unnecessary, burdensome, and expensive. Please support H.R. 2728.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and someone who is as expert as anyone in this Chamber on oil and gas industry and regulations.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague. Although, I have to admit, sometimes I feel a little awkward listening to my colleagues' statements, but I am glad that report showed Texas is one of the more tougher States that regulates hydraulic fracturing.

Mr. Chairman, in the State of Texas, hydraulic fracturing has been a common practice for many years. The technique, combined with horizontal drilling, has made the idea of energy independence in the United States almost a reality.

Across the United States, the development of natural gas continues to power our economic engine and is the foundation of a manufacturing renaissance. Thus far, State agencies have done a great job of regulating hydraulic practices on State and private lands.

In Texas, the Railroad Commission—inappropriately named—has set a variety of standards that aim to protect the environment and allow for the development of this vital natural resource.

I am a firm believer in property rights and that whoever owns that land should have the right to regulate that land.

I would not support the Federal Government regulating the development of natural gas or the practice of hydraulic fracturing on State and/or private lands. More importantly, I cannot support the idea of legislation that would prevent the Federal Government from regulating Federal lands. Unfortunately, that is what this bill is asking us to do.

I understand and support the desire to develop our natural resources in the most economical way possible with as little bureaucratic red tape as possible. I know the significant advantage that the shale gas boom has provided our domestic petrochemical industry, various manufacturers, and a whole host of end-users.

Let's make sure, though, that the Department of the Interior does their job and does not have to transfer oversight of Federal lands to State lands. We need the Department of the Interior to allow resource development under Federal law.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill. Hopefully, we will bring up a bill that will make the Department of the Interior actually let us produce on our Federal lands.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in my good friend from Texas' comments, especially in light of the fact that there are a significant number of jobs in his district and in

Texas that are powered by natural gas that comes from the shale energy revolution.

My friend from Texas undoubtedly knows that the Federal Government takes 10 times as long to issue a permit as does the State of Texas for energy activities, and I wouldn't want to have the Federal Government add another layer of complexity to that.

We are not plowing new ground with my bill. The Federal Government already defers to the States on the management of wildlife and water on Federal lands.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2728 with my good friend, BILL FLORES, and, of course, our chairman also.

The U.S. has become the world's largest producer of oil and natural gas, surpassing Russia this year. The transformation of our energy production has rejuvenated our middle class by reviving core American industries and bringing blue-collar jobs back to U.S. soil.

In light of this new American energy revolution, we must ensure that we have a smarter and more focused approach to energy regulation.

This legislation would prevent the Interior Department from enforcing Federal rules related to hydraulic fracturing in States that already have existing oversight rules, like my State of Texas, and the Railroad Commission in my home State.

This legislation is not about more or less regulation. This bill helps our Federal Government work in a smarter and more cost-effective manner. We need to enable States to regulate their own lands—because they know it better—and not try to create a Federal one-size-fits-all approach.

This bill would untangle redundant regulation in States that have created their own regulations that address well design, location, water quality, emissions, wildlife protection, and health and safety.

I represent the Eagle Ford Shale area in Texas, which is one of the largest production areas in the United States. That shale has transformed my area, whether it is Webb County, LaSalle, Atascosa, Wilson, or McMullen County. The other counties there have been transformed by Eagle Ford.

I also worked at the State for many years as a legislator, and I understand the Railroad Commission. I understand they also do a good job.

Therefore, the State of Texas has passed smart regulations by working directly with our communities and with our counties, with our industry, and is leading the Nation in establishing FracFocus, which informs all Texans what materials are used in the fracking activities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Our State governments know their own land best. Let us improve how our government functions, empower our States to enforce their own laws on their own lands, and continue this energy growth that we have.

With that, I thank the chairman, Mr. BILL FLORES, and also the ranking member, Mr. HOLT, who allowed me to speak.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), another member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to my dear friend, BILL FLORES, and to DOC HASTINGS, chairman of our committee. I appreciate Mr. CUELLAR's comments.

The truth is, we have been working on this for a long time, and Mr. FLORES has gotten it here. This is fantastic because we need jobs in America. We need more of our own energy in America. This bill helps us do that.

I got into a discussion with one of our colleagues across the aisle who is now in the Senate, and I brought this up to him in previous years. If a State has a regulatory body that is addressing the issue, has cleaner air, cleaner water, is doing the job, then let them do it. Let's not add another layer of bureaucracy that takes away jobs. It slows the economy.

I am very grateful that it looks like we are going to pass a bill that creates jobs instead of these job-ending things that have been happening down the hall and down Pennsylvania Avenue.

So I applaud my colleague and I applaud my friends that support this bill. This is going to help America.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES), another member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act.

Hydraulic fracturing has been critical to the production of our rich Montana-Bakken oil. It is key not only to our State's economy but also to unlocking a valuable source of revenue for the Federal Government and our State. This helps fund our schools, our teachers, and our infrastructure in Montana.

Montana has smart, environmentally sensitive regulations of this process already in place. Like most Montanans, I love to hike, I love to hunt, I love to fish. We are the safeguards of the environment in Montana. We do not need bureaucrats in Washington telling us how to protect our lands in Montana. Yet the Obama administration has put more senseless barriers in place by

stiffening the Federal restraint and red tape on this process.

Do you realize that Montana Indian tribes face over 50 percent unemployment? This rule could deny our Native Americans the independence that energy development on their lands can make possible. H.R. 2728 would ensure the Federal Government does not get in the way of responsible energy development on tribal land and throughout Montana. Washington, D.C., needs to look more like Montana, not the other way around.

The people of Montana and our country need a responsible energy plan that protects our environment and creates a better future for our kids. That means jobs and lower energy prices.

I urge passage of H.R. 2728.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), a former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, natural gas is revitalizing American industries. It is revitalizing the middle class. That natural gas is being produced because we do a process called hydraulic fracturing.

My background is in oil and gas. I have seen the process my whole life. I have seen new technological innovations that keep us more safe, keep the process safe, protect the well bores, and protect the water.

So who would be against a process that is rebuilding American industries, that is rebuilding the job base of this country?

Sand sales you would not seem to identify with this particular process, and yet that is exactly why sand sales are soaring in the country and the production of chemicals is soaring—because of the use of this process called hydraulic fracturing.

It has been around for decades. New Mexico has safe drinking water, but we have also got plentiful jobs, and American consumers have lower costs of living, all because of a process.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. PEARCE. New Mexico knows how to regulate its own industry. Do not force us to live by some cookie-cutter mold that has produced an Affordable Care Act that is killing jobs across the country. Give us our freedom and we will protect the environment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

It is traditional and appropriate in this country that matters dealing with health and safety, clean water, and clean air are handled at the interstate level, at the Federal level. This legislation would remove all sorts of regulations. Best practices that are designed to minimize the environmental impact

of oil and gas legislation for Bureau of Land Management practices would be gone.

It gets rid of requirements to protect sacred sites and historic properties. It would throw out the regulation that prevents occupancy within a quarter of a mile of designated fisheries. It would remove the regulation that you can't do any of these activities in the floodplain of the Yellowstone River, and on and on.

My colleague a moment ago talked about the booming industry in chemicals because of fracking. Yes, that brings up an interesting point about the difference in State regulations. We would hope that anybody in the drilling area would have access to the chemicals that are being injected into these wells under their very feet, under their homes.

□ 1515

But if you look at what some States allow now, they allow chemicals that are confidential, proprietary, undisclosed to be used, and they number in the dozens. Let's see. We have got here oxyalkylated phenol resins; we have terpenes and terpenoids; we have quaternary amines. These are all items that are held confidentially, proprietarily; and under this legislation that we are considering, a State could make sure that they are not disclosed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a State that is booming because of this activity.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Mr. FLORES for bringing H.R. 2728 to the floor for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind everybody that, although they might say, Why do we do this? Why is the rhetoric important? I mean, if we don't counter the kind of alternate reality that the other side often touts, people will think that that is reality. I will remind everybody in the room that the Federal Government and every State government has said that there has been not one accident—zero—referring to the aquifer regarding hydraulic fracking—not one.

People in Washington have never been to Dimock; they have never been to Renovo or to Tidioute or to Warren, Pennsylvania. They don't know anything about these places and what happens here, but yet they want to regulate us. The people who live there are the ones who are working there, and they have the greatest stake in protecting the environment.

Let me tell you what it has done for Pennsylvania: \$750 million in road and infrastructure and improvements since 2008 has been provided by the gas industry. The average income is up \$1,200 because of it; \$1.8 billion in tax revenue has been generated by responsible shale development.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. PERRY. Ninety-six percent of the employment comes out of the Appalachian basin. That is in Pennsylvania. That is where we live. There has been a \$650 savings per household per year because of it, and there are 232,000 associated jobs with an average pay of \$83,305 a year.

Mr. Chairman, there is a list of agencies that these people must comply with for every single portion of this. I am going to run out of time, but I am going to run out of time just going through them, all right: the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the County Conservation District.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds as I see he is on a roll.

Mr. PERRY. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, the Pennsylvania Game Commission, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, the Occupational Health and Safety Administration, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Pennsylvania Historic Museum Commission, and the Pennsylvania Public Utility Council.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, all of those chemicals that were noted on every job site are listed on a material safety data sheet, which is required by law.

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues say that there have been no cases of contamination from the fracking, itself. What about leakage from poorly constructed wells? What about leakage from unlined pits? Are they prepared to claim that there has never been water contamination because of this? That is what the Bureau of Land Management regulations and rules get at—well construction, wastewater management, the threats to drinking water in neighboring communities. This legislation would gut—it would remove—any possibility of such rules.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), another member from an energy-producing State.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, we are producing more energy now than we have ever produced, and it is thanks to new technologies like hydraulic fracking for making that happen.

The Eagle Ford shale in the district I represent has created over 400,000 jobs and, roughly, \$2.6 billion in salaries in

a 13-county area. The benefits from this are not isolated. Shale has brought back rail, steel, plastics, sand, and manufacturing; and the average U.S. household's energy costs have gone way down. I have seen numbers as high as \$1,200 less for energy bills. This technology isn't new. We have been using it in Texas for over 60 years. It is regulated by the Texas Railroad Commission, and they do a great job.

All of these people with all of the scare tactics sometimes forget that, when hydraulic fracking is done, it is done a mile below or two miles below the water table. It is safe. It is well regulated by the State. It is good for the economy. It is turning the balance of trade. It is saving us money on energy. It is also creating an economic revival in this country. We have got to let States regulate it. I urge the support of this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, let me inquire of my friend from New Jersey if he is prepared to close. We had some further requests for time, but I don't see them, and sometimes they don't get their time when they don't come down here.

Mr. HOLT. I say to the gentleman from Washington that we are in the same situation. I was expecting a few other speakers. In not seeing them, I am prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, here is a partial list of the Federal laws, rules, and regulations that could not be enforced were this bill to become law:

The Endangered Species Act; the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; the oil and gas operations in National Park Service units; the oil and gas operations in National Wildlife Refuges; the casing and cementing regulations, such as should have been applied in the Deepwater Horizon case; the wastewater management regulations; the plugging and abandonment regulations, in other words, when pits or wells are abandoned; the best management practices for oil and gas drilling on public lands; the timing limits of when operations could be conducted with the least disruption to wildlife; the protections for sacred sites, historic trails, fisheries, and wetlands; and much more.

It has been sold as a states' rights bill that would only block the Bureau of Land Management's fracking rules, but it would strip agencies on Federal lands of the authority to enforce almost every regulation on the books because any State that has any regulation that affects these activities means that none of these regulations could apply, that they would all be superseded by the State regulations. That is what the bill says.

As for whether there is any damage done, I would point my friends to this

picture. Maybe you have a little trouble seeing it, but, essentially, it shows burning tap water. No, this is not a staged picture. This happened in a residence. This is methane flaming because the water is full of methane.

Now, I know my colleagues will say, Oh, but that is not because of fracking. There must be some other reason. There must be.

They haven't found it. They have blamed it on all sorts of other things, but it happens where the fracking is occurring.

So this is a case in which the practice has gotten ahead of the science, in which the practice has gotten ahead of our regulations, in which it has gotten ahead of our understanding; and the idea to reduce regulations and understanding so that we could do it faster is preposterous. This is not the way you protect public health. This is not the way you protect public safety. It is not the way you stimulate the economy. It is false economy to proceed in disregard for the protection of the environment.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2728.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time the gentleman from New Jersey has left if he is going to yield back.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would advise the gentleman to reserve his time because one of our speakers came, which we didn't think was going to happen. So I would advise the gentleman to reserve his time so that he has time to respond.

Mr. HOLT. I appreciate the advice. It is possible that some of my speakers will arrive. I urge that we vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader, who is from a State that would like to do more offshore even though we are talking about onshore.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act.

Over the last 10 years, America has been experiencing a shale energy boom; and because of new technology in hydraulic fracturing, the development of energy resources has been environmentally friendly. While the technology that has made this boom possible is truly impressive, I want to take a moment and focus on the impact this boom is having on hardworking middle class families.

Many of these families are living paycheck to paycheck. Many have gone

years without a meaningful raise, but powering their lights or heating their homes is not an optional expense. An unexpected rise in the monthly utility bill means less money for new school clothes, the college savings account, or even a night out at the movies. That is why it is so important that we pursue policies that lower energy costs. Hydraulic fracturing is one such policy.

A recent study found that, absent hydraulic fracturing, a family's home energy bills and other costs for goods and services would have been \$1,200 higher last year. The study concludes that the continued production of our domestic energy resources could increase disposable household income—principally by lowering costs—by \$800 over the next 2 years. This is the type of relief American families deserve.

But lower energy costs for working families is not the only benefit of hydraulic fracturing. The same study showed that the natural gas and shale oil industry contributed over 1.7 million jobs in 2012 alone. Going forward, it is predicted to add a total of 2.5 million jobs by 2015. These are good, well-paying jobs right here in America. For those who have been struggling to find work for months or, in some cases, for years, this kind of advancement in energy technology could allow these folks to find work, to get back on their feet, and to provide for their families. It is no coincidence that areas of our country with active domestic energy production from hydraulic fracturing are experiencing lower levels of unemployment.

These benefits to working families are now under threat. They are under threat from newly proposed Federal regulations by this administration that would cost our economy jobs, keep energy bills from falling, and hinder our cause to become more energy secure.

State governments and local regulators have been very effective with implementing environmentally sound regulations to meet the specific geologic requirements of their States for over 60 years. This act will keep the Federal Government from imposing redundant regulations and needless red tape that will only raise the monthly utility bills of millions of American families and cost America new jobs.

The States and local regulators should be allowed to do this job without any Federal interference. I saw firsthand, when I accompanied my colleague from North Dakota, KEVIN CRAMER, to Williston, wellheads that were being drilled, and the last thing they need in that State, in that area, are the Federal regulators coming in to tell them how to drill a well.

This bill is an opportunity for the House to act in a bipartisan manner and show our constituents that we are serious about creating jobs, that we are serious about easing the burden of high energy costs, and are serious about strengthening our energy security.

I want to thank all of those involved and the chairman of the committee, as

well as Congressman BILL FLORES and the rest of Chairman HASTINGS' Natural Resources Committee, for their hard work and dedication to this issue for working middle class families. I also want to thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH and the Science Committee for their important contribution to this legislation.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. This is Groundhog Day, Mr. Chairman. I would say to my friend, now I have no more speakers whom I can foresee at all, so I am prepared to close if the gentleman doesn't repeat his last statement.

Mr. HOLT. Then I will take just a moment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, when I showed the picture of the burning tap water, I saw expressions of incredulity from the other side of the aisle. Surely that can't be true; or if it is true, surely it is not because of fracking.

A Duke University study found that methane contamination was in 115 of 141 shallow residential drinking wells that they studied, six times higher than wells greater than a mile from the fracking operations. Now, it is hard to tell when you are deep in the ground where that methane is leaking and what other chemicals, undisclosed chemicals, are leaking with that methane.

There is something here that should be regulated, and this legislation would prevent such regulations. I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

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

The underlying bill, as has been mentioned several times, is about American jobs and American energy security.

Just last week, the International Energy Agency released its World Energy Outlook. In that report, they predicted that the U.S. would surpass Saudi Arabia and become the top oil producer in the world in only 2 more years. Now, this is great news for our economy, it is great news for American workers, it is great news for potential energy prices, and, Mr. Chairman, it is great news for our national security.

This recent boom in energy production would not be possible without the new technological advances of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing. Let me give you an example. In



the year 2000, shale gas, which is the prime area that you go after with hydraulic fracturing, provided just 1 percent of our Nation's natural gas supplies. Today, it is 25 percent. That number will only continue to grow.

While the White House is quick to take credit for this uptick in energy production, the truth is this increase is happening in spite of this administration's policies and not because of them. Because what has been well documented, all of the increase in energy production is happening on State and private lands, not on Federal lands. Currently, 93 percent of shale oil wells are located on private and State lands and only 7 percent on Federal lands. That simply means that there is a great potential on Federal lands that are currently being ignored because of the regulatory hoops.

I suggest that if the Department of the Interior goes through with their regulations on fracking that would be duplicative of those States, it would only keep that 7 percent where it is rather than increasing. It seems to me, from a standpoint of policy for our country, it is best to be as energy secure as we can possibly be because that means that we are secure from a national security standpoint.

Finally, and certainly not least, that means that American jobs, good-paying American jobs, are creating the energy for the American consumer. That is what this bill is all about.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Each week there is more good news about the benefits of the energy revolution underway across America. Whether it is the manufacturing renaissance spurred by affordable natural gas or the new opportunities for good-paying energy jobs, the benefits of the shale revolution can hardly be overstated. For that reason, I am happy to support H.R. 2728, a bill that seeks to prevent redundant Federal regulations where States already have environmental protections in place.

H.R. 2728 also incorporates legislation reported by the Science Committee—the Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act. Title II of this legislation holds the EPA accountable by requiring it to base its studies on the facts instead of worst-case scenarios that exist only in the EPA's imagination.

In its zeal to regulate, the EPA has rushed to link water contamination to hydraulic fracturing. It has made this claim in three high-profile cases, only to be forced to retract its statements after the facts have come out. The EPA's track record does not instill confidence in their ongoing studies of the relationship between hydraulic fracturing and drinking water.

The Science Committee has conducted numerous oversight hearings on

EPA research. These efforts have revealed that the EPA's approach is to try to find problems without considering whether these problems would actually occur in the real world. Title II corrects this by requiring a real-world look at risk that gives an honest evaluation of probability. This will prevent the misuse of the EPA's studies by those simply looking for an excuse to scare people. Title II of this legislation will enhance our ability to ensure continued safe and responsible production of America's natural energy resources.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act.

Title II of this act is a bill passed by the Science Committee, the EPA Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act. This is a piece of legislation that should not have been passed out of the committee.

First, title II contains provisions that designate the fracking study is a highly influential scientific assessment and requires EPA to follow its standard peer review protocols for such assessments. This language is unnecessary because EPA already considers the fracking study to be a highly influential scientific assessment.

Second, and importantly, unfortunately, this bill will obstruct EPA's ability to carry out its important work. The requirements of this bill may force the EPA to delay production of their final report on the effects of hydraulic fracturing on water quality. This bill could delay an important report that is based on a study that the EPA initiated more than 3 years ago. The study was reviewed and approved by the EPA's independent Science Advisory Board. The Science Advisory Board found the study to be both appropriate and comprehensive. The American public should not have to wait any longer before they receive a scientific analysis of whether their water has been affected by hydraulic fracturing.

What I found troubling is that the Science Committee never got information from the Science Advisory Board, which validated the study, regarding its opinion about the bill, nor did we get comments from the EPA or any other experts. In fact, the bill never had a hearing. This bill effectively attempts to micromanage the EPA without a factual basis for doing so.

The bill requires the EPA to do an ad hoc risk analysis by requiring them to quantitatively estimate the probabilities, uncertainties, and consequences of impacts to drinking water from hydraulic fracturing; however, this was never a study that was set up to determine the risk effects of hydraulic fracturing. The study was meant to examine the science to determine if hydraulic fracturing operations have any

effect on groundwater. By requiring an ad hoc risk analysis on a study that was not designed to acquire the data necessary to do a risk analysis, the EPA would be forced to try to fit a round peg in a square hole.

What remains truly unclear is why this language is included when it is so unnecessary. If the current study were to find a link between fracking and groundwater contamination, then a full risk assessment will be required before the Agency can establish any regulations to address the issue.

What this bill is doing here is requiring a risk analysis simultaneously, and as part of, the very study that is meant to determine if there is a need for a risk analysis. These efforts to become involved in directing the specific details of scientific process are very troubling.

It appears that this bill is setting up the EPA to fail. If the EPA doesn't complete the study by the deadline, they have failed; and if the EPA completes the study but the ad hoc risk analysis is not as detailed as the bill's proponents expect, then they would have also failed. More importantly, their ad hoc risk analysis may taint the very accurate scientific data behind that analysis.

It is not in the public interest to have this study delayed any longer. Let the EPA complete their study. If the science shows the effects connecting hydraulic fracturing with contaminated groundwater, then we will let the EPA's long-established process of doing a risk assessment after such a study to be followed completely with all the I's dotted and T's crossed.

It is also difficult to understand how the proponents of the bill reconcile title II with title I. Title I clearly attempts to prevent the Federal Government from having oversight inspection or enforcement responsibility for hydraulic fracturing regulations. However, if the States are supposed to regulate, don't they need the science to support those regulations?

This study is designed to be the science that provides the Federal Government and the States with the information they will need to make policy choices about the effects of hydraulic fracturing on groundwater. By possibly delaying this study, we delay the ability of the States or the Federal Government to make prudent choices to protect the American public.

If you support hydraulic fracturing, delaying the study will not speed up the process of opening new areas of the country to hydraulic fracturing. Title II of H.R. 2728 will only delay an important scientific study and, ironically, may delay the development of new shale fields throughout the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on the way to yielding time to the gentlewoman from Wyoming, I want to

point out that the underlying bill, the science bill that is contained in the underlying bill, did pass by voice vote in the Science Committee.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), who is also the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee on the Science Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the right of State governments to regulate hydraulic fracturing. I am pleased that the bill before us also includes Chairman LAMAR SMITH's bill to ensure the integrity of Federal research into hydraulic fracturing.

Mr. Chairman, the EPA botched its study linking hydraulic fracturing to groundwater contamination in a 2011 report on groundwater in Pavillion, Wyoming. The report was so flawed that the EPA was forced to disavow their preliminary conclusion that hydraulic fracturing caused contamination in Pavillion.

The EPA's phoney preliminary conclusions were widely reported, altered national public perception, and the EPA did not back away until the damage was already done. Two years later, the EPA turned the study over to the State of Wyoming where it will undergo the scientific rigor it deserves.

Mr. Chairman, the question today is not whether hydraulic fracturing should be regulated. It should. But we shouldn't allow the Federal Government to regulate when States are already stepping up to the plate. My home State of Wyoming has been a leader in hydraulic fracturing regulation, so much so that even the Bureau of Land Management holds up Wyoming as a model.

What works for Wyoming might not work for Texas or Pennsylvania. The hydrology and the geology are different. Any State that assumes the responsibility of regulating hydraulic fracturing should be allowed to do so. Governors, legislators, and State regulators care about the well-being of the citizens in their State. More than that, who better to regulate the practice than those who live near the wells, who drink the groundwater, and who know the local geology, hydrology, and industries better than anyone?

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2728.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To clarify, there was opposition to the legislation in the Science Committee; however, there is no recorded vote.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS), who is a member of the Science Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak today.

I want to speak out about the importance of the EPA Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act, legislation that makes up title II of the act.

The EPA is currently conducting a multiyear study on the relationship between hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, and groundwater. This legislation will greatly improve the value of the EPA study by increasing transparency and requiring it to include an objective risk assessment.

□ 1545

Hydraulic fracturing has been studied over and over again. My home State of New York is a prime example of how studies can stall job creation.

In New York, a moratorium on hydraulic fracturing was enacted in 2008. Now, 5 years later, that moratorium is still in place because the New York Department of Environmental Conservation is conducting a study on the environmental impact of fracking. Yet, no details of this study have been revealed, and a date of completion has yet to be announced.

Now the EPA is trying to do a similar study, which will only further delay a practice that many States currently allow and are benefiting from.

Fracking represents one of the greatest opportunities for strengthening our Nation's energy security and spurring economic growth. If New York would allow fracking, 520 shale gas wells could sustain 62,000 new and needed jobs.

This legislation will increase transparency and accuracy in how the EPA reports on the study of hydraulic fracturing and will get rid of the need for duplicative studies, like the one being done in New York.

Additionally, the risk assessment requirement will turn the study into a useful tool for both scientists and decisionmakers. By providing decisionmakers with the data and information they need in order to become comfortable with fracking, we can help create jobs and further our Nation's energy independence.

Ms. BONAMICI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. We are prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, in 2010, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act required the EPA to perform a study on the relationship between hydraulic fracturing and groundwater contamination. The final report is currently expected to be released in 2016.

EPA's proposed study plan was reviewed by the EPA Science Advisory Board. The Science Advisory Board determined that EPA's approach was generally appropriate and comprehensive. Further, the Science Advisory Board recommended that some analysis of risks be considered in the study, but a full risk assessment could add another 5 to 7 years to the expected release date.

The proponents of this legislation mischaracterize the EPA's study plan as flawed for failing to include a com-

prehensive risk assessment. That position is not consistent with the conclusions of the highly qualified scientists, researchers, and industry representatives who are members of the EPA's independent Science Advisory Board, and importantly, title II could delay the release of this very important study. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we actually have two more individuals who will speak on this side, so if the gentlewoman from Oregon wants to reclaim some time after our next speaker, she is welcome to do so.

Meanwhile, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) who is a distinguished member of the Science Committee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SMITH.

Texas has produced half of all new jobs in America in recent years. Even *Time* magazine noted how things are good in Texas. They call it maybe the future of America. The creation of many of these jobs in Texas would not be possible without hydraulic fracturing. Fracking is reaching previously untapped shale natural gas deposits, thereby increasing our Nation's natural gas supply and lowering the cost of energy for all Americans.

Seemingly unaware of all of the economic benefits of America's energy renaissance, the Obama administration has moved to regulate fracking on Federal lands and to spend millions of dollars in studies at the EPA, despite its safe usage in Texas for over 60 years.

The EPA is zero for three when it comes to hydraulic fracturing alarmism. Their allegations of groundwater contamination in Texas, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming all struck out after proper review and analysis.

That is why I support H.R. 2728, because it will leave the regulation of fracking up to the States. We care about our States more than any bureaucrat up in Washington, D.C., and one size doesn't fit all. Texas was environmentally friendly before being green was cool. This legislation also holds the EPA accountable to taxpayers by requiring that their multimillion-dollar study of hydraulic fracturing follow basic and widely agreed upon scientific processes. We have it right in Texas. They ought to leave us alone, and we will help create jobs and get this economy moving again.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, Mr. SMITH from Texas, for his offer to reclaim. I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are now on our last speaker, so if the gentlelady wants to yield back, we can proceed.



Ms. BONAMICI. May I inquire whether there are other speakers?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. We are on our last speaker now, to respond to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), also a member of the Science Committee.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of North Dakota sent me to Washington in large part to protect our thriving economy from the overreaching regulations, often based on faulty science, from destroying that very economy. In carrying out that charge, I get the opportunity to tell the North Dakota success story in Washington, with the hope that we can duplicate it around our country.

A major part of telling that story, of course, is talking about the successful regulation of hydraulic fracturing in our State.

Lynn Helms, the director of North Dakota's Department of Mineral Resources, testified in the Natural Resources Committee on this very issue, saying:

Our oil and gas rules are reviewed at least every 2 years through a public comment process. North Dakota regulations also address flow-back disposal, chemical disclosure, well construction, and well bore pressure testing and have reduced well bore failures from six per year to zero.

From six to zero—that is success at the State level.

In addition to the fact that any Federal hydraulic fracturing rule will be duplicative, the rules will be impractical to implement across the Nation, where environmental and geological circumstances are as diverse as the views in this Chamber.

North Dakota has gone from number nine to number two in oil production, and at the same time from number 38 to number 6 in economic success.

While the BLM is developing its hydraulic fracturing rules, the EPA is conducting studies on the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources. A stated goal of the EPA study is to ask the question: What are possible impacts—I restate, possible impacts—of hydraulic fracturing fluids on drinking water? Even the EPA's independent advisers have raised questions, with one member stating:

There is no quantitative risk assessment included in EPA's research effort.

Despite, Mr. Chairman, no cases of hydraulic fracturing impacting drinking water resources, title II of this bill does not prevent the EPA from conducting such studies but ensures any such study done is held to the highest standards of review and risk assessment. I urge passage so that the Federal Government cannot impose its mediocrity on States' success.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, I voted no on H.R. 1965, the Federal Lands, Jobs, and Energy Security Act. I appreciate that my colleagues brought this legislation to the floor, and, in fact, have supported many of the titles contained in the measure—and continue to do so. I have a long record of supporting efforts to increase development of our domestic energy resources. However, I could not support the bill today given that two troubling amendments, specifically the Marino and Hanabusa amendments, which were adopted to the bill with little debate and Members were not given the opportunity to vote on these additional provisions.

I was particularly concerned with the Marino amendment. It calls for plans to allow the construction of new power lines "across federal lands to ensure that that energy produced can be distrusted to areas of need." Some may consider this to be non-controversial, but I have fought the impact of similar language for a number of years. I am privileged to represent Virginia's hallowed grounds, and I simply cannot support efforts to construct new power lines through our area—particularly power lines that would ship energy to other parts of the country. That's why I opposed PATH, and why I opposed TrAIL. Cedar Creek and Bell Grove National Historic Park and Manassas National Battlefield Park are just a few areas in our region that could be impacted by this amendment.

I also could not support the inclusion of the Hanabusa amendment, which I am concerned is a continued effort to classify native Hawaiians as a Native American tribe, and, as such, have lands taken into trust. That would allow for the expansion of Indian gambling in Hawaii. I will continue to fight efforts to expand gambling in America, whether it is on-reservation, off-reservation or over the Internet.

This evening, I voted for H.R. 2728, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act. I support the development of our nation's natural gas resources, which will help our economy and strengthen our national security. Advances in technology have unlocked significant domestic reserves that were historically inaccessible, which has resulted in lower heating costs and lower prices at the pump. At the same time, I understand and recognize the real concerns expressed by those concerned that horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing in Virginia, particularly within the George Washington National Forest, could negatively impact our region's water quality, water supply and recreational resources. To be clear—environmental protections should be increased in Virginia before any potential activity of this kind is allowed within the George Washington National Forest. I fully support efforts to enact strong laws to protect Virginia's national resources and respect the wishes of local jurisdictions in making any decisions about energy exploration on state or federal lands in the Commonwealth.

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, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-27 is adopted.

The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2728

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

#### **TITLE I—STATE AUTHORITY FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION**

##### **SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE.**

*This title may be cited as the "Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act".*

##### **SEC. 102. STATE AUTHORITY FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION.**

*The Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by redesignating section 44 as section 45, and by inserting after section 43 the following:*

##### **"SEC. 44. STATE AUTHORITY FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION.**

*"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Department of the Interior shall not enforce any Federal regulation, guidance, or permit requirement regarding hydraulic fracturing, or any component of that process, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on or under any land in any State that has regulations, guidance, or permit requirements for that activity.*

*"(b) STATE AUTHORITY.—The Department of the Interior shall recognize and defer to State regulations, permitting, and guidance, for all activities related to hydraulic fracturing, or any component of that process, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on Federal land regardless of whether those rules are duplicative, more or less restrictive, shall have different requirements, or do not meet Federal guidelines.*

*"(c) HYDRAULIC FRACTURING DEFINED.—In this section the term 'hydraulic fracturing' means the process by which fracturing fluids (or a fracturing fluid system) are pumped into an underground geologic formation at a calculated, predetermined rate and pressure to generate fractures or cracks in the target formation and thereby increase the permeability of the rock near the wellbore and improve production of natural gas or oil."*

##### **SEC. 103. TRIBAL AUTHORITY ON TRUST LAND.**

*The Department of the Interior shall not enforce any Federal regulation, guidance, or permit requirement regarding the underground injection of fluids or propping agents as part of the hydraulic fracturing process, or any component of that process, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on any land held in trust or restricted status for the benefit of Indians except with the express consent of the beneficiary on whose behalf such land is held in trust or restricted status.*

#### **TITLE II—EPA HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RESEARCH**

##### **SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

*This title may be cited as the "EPA Hydraulic Fracturing Study Improvement Act".*

##### **SEC. 202. EPA HYDRAULIC FRACTURING RESEARCH.**

*In conducting its study of the potential impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources, with respect to which a request for information was issued under Federal Register Vol. 77, No. 218, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall adhere to the following requirements:*

*(1) PEER REVIEW AND INFORMATION QUALITY.—Prior to issuance and dissemination of any final*

report or any interim report summarizing the Environmental Protection Agency's research on the relationship between hydraulic fracturing and drinking water, the Administrator shall—

(A) consider such reports to be Highly Influential Scientific Assessments and require peer review of such reports in accordance with guidelines governing such assessments, as described in—

(i) the Environmental Protection Agency's Peer Review Handbook 3rd Edition;

(ii) the Environmental Protection Agency's Scientific Integrity Policy, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(iii) the Office of Management and Budget's Peer Review Bulletin, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) require such reports to meet the standards and procedures for the dissemination of influential scientific, financial, or statistical information set forth in the Environmental Protection Agency's Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by the Environmental Protection Agency, developed in response to guidelines issued by the Office of Management and Budget under section 515(a) of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-554).

(2) **PROBABILITY, UNCERTAINTY, AND CONSEQUENCE.**—In order to maximize the quality and utility of information developed through the study, the Administrator shall ensure that identification of the possible impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water resources included in such reports be accompanied by objective estimates of the probability, uncertainty, and consequence of each identified impact, taking into account the risk management practices of States and industry. Estimates or descriptions of probability, uncertainty, and consequence shall be as quantitative as possible given the validity, accuracy, precision, and other quality attributes of the underlying data and analyses, but no more quantitative than the data and analyses can support.

(3) **RELEASE OF FINAL REPORT.**—The final report shall be publicly released by September 30, 2016.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113-271. Each such further 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. HOLT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113-271.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. 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 1, line 14, strike "The" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (c), the".

Page 2, line 4, strike "The" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (c), the".

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent quoted subsection accordingly):

"(c) **METHANE EMISSIONS.**—Nothing in this section limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations to require

the minimization of venting and flaring of methane from oil and gas drilling operations on public lands, and to issue regulations designed to reduce fugitive methane emissions.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in support of the amendment that I am introducing, along with Mr. PETERS and Mr. POLIS, to allow the Secretary of the Interior to regulate methane.

Methane is the second most abundant greenhouse gas emitted in the United States, and the oil and gas industry is responsible for about 30 percent of all methane emissions into the atmosphere.

Methane is a super pollutant more than 20 times more potent than carbon dioxide in warming the atmosphere. Now we know that methane can and sometimes does leak from fracked wells. That is what we see here with the ignited tap water. This so-called fugitive methane also contributes to air pollution as tropospheric ozone, or smog, which threatens public health by triggering asthma attacks and aggravating the conditions of people with bronchitis and emphysema.

In fact, methane leaks have contributed to the Upper Green River basin in Wyoming having some of the worst air quality in the country, at times rivaling the worst air quality days in Los Angeles.

Although discussed as a cleaner burning and more climate friendly energy source, natural gas, which is mostly methane, leaks at every stage of production, not just into the groundwater, and hence into drinking water wells. It does leak, and it does affect the Earth's climate. It is true that burning methane releases less carbon dioxide greenhouse gas to the atmosphere than does burning an equivalent amount of coal, but the methane itself is a greenhouse gas. Fugitive methane emissions in excess of only a few percent remove the relative advantages of natural gas compared to other fossil energy sources.

Aside from issues of climate and health, leaked methane represents lost royalties for the Federal Government, lost revenue for oil and gas companies, and I know that supporting greater profits for Big Oil is something my colleagues should be eager to support.

Our amendment will help prevent the wasteful leakage of natural gas, will limit avoidable methane emissions, and will protect air quality and public health. I urge a "yes" vote on the Holt-Peters-Polis amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the

House today is designed to eliminate duplicative regulations and allow for increased energy production. That is the intent of the legislation. Yet here we are with an amendment that creates a loophole in the bill to allow the government to impose back-door regulations to restrict and block American energy production, which, of course, we know would result in lost job opportunities.

H.R. 2728 aims to give the States primacy in regulating hydraulic fracturing operations within their borders. I want to mention that again. This bill aims to give the States primacy in regulating hydraulic fracturing within their borders. So if a State regulatory body wants to implement emissions regulations, which this amendment addresses, in conjunction with their other rules and regulations, they are free to implement their own regulations beyond what is already required. Nothing in this bill prevents any State from putting emissions at the end of the regulations in place.

Further, the Secretary has the authority to manage methane emissions for production on Federal lands and, working collaboratively, we have seen significant reductions in the last 2 years because of that effort. However, attempting to cloak these regulations as fracturing regulations through a loophole that will cost American jobs and inhibit energy production in my mind is simply not the way to go.

So this amendment aims to impose controversial and political regulations into a bill that is simply about American energy production, and I urge a "no" vote.

Let me make just one other point. I will probably repeat this again. There is nothing in this bill that prevents a State from regulating emissions within their State, which, of course, would take effect and what the gentleman is trying to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, the whole point of the underlying bill is to make it impossible for the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Land Management, the Secretary of the Interior to impose regulations. It says if the State has any regulations, then the Federal regulations don't count.

All this amendment would do is say on the important issue of what is called fugitive methane, leaked methane, methane that gets into the atmosphere by whatever means because of the drilling and fracking, should be limited. And it should be limited for several reasons. It is a potent greenhouse gas, and it is lost revenue. So I would think that everyone would be eager to make sure that none of this fugitive methane gets into the atmosphere or into the drinking water.

We know methane can and sometimes does leak from fracked wells. We should want the Secretary to be able to regulate that, because under the underlying bill, the Secretary could not.

This amendment is necessary, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

My good friend, the author of this amendment, opened his second remarks by saying, This legislation makes it impossible to regulate—fill in the blanks. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the case.

This bill says that primacy of regulation of hydraulic fracturing, which has been going on for some 60 years, if a State has it in place, that State's laws shall be the ones that we should follow. Those States that don't have it, then, of course, this legislation would allow the Department of the Interior's regulations to be there until they changed their regulations.

I want to make a point. This amendment is about the emissions from the process of hydraulic fracturing. Nothing in this bill, as I said before, prevents a State from doing what they can do. After all, keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, those States that have hydraulic fracturing rules maybe in all likelihood have some regulations dealing with the emissions that come from that. Nothing in this bill prevents that from happening.

What the amendment does do, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, is a back-door way to regulate hydraulic fracturing when, as I said just a moment ago, it has been done successfully for over 60 years in the States.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, the Holt-Peters-Polis amendment would allow the Secretary of Interior to minimize fugitive methane emissions on public lands.

Methane is a potent greenhouse gas that commonly leaks during the drilling and transportation of oil and gas. If you look at the entire production process, excess methane emissions can make natural gas energy just as dirty as coal energy. Moreover, methane and Volatile Organic Compounds emitted from oil and gas wells interact with sunlight to create ozone, another greenhouse gas.

Although national methane emissions fell between 2011 to 2012, emissions in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and other energy producing states have risen due to oil and gas operations. Colorado has approximately 50,000 wells which contribute to the state's current non-attainment status for the EPA's 2008 national ambient air quality standard for ozone. In addition, rural areas in the Upper Green River Basin in Wyoming have recorded dangerously high levels of smog that rival the worst pollution days in Los Angeles due to drilling. This is concerning since ground level ozone or "smog" can trigger asthma attacks and aggravate conditions of people with bronchitis and emphysema.

Earlier this year I introduced the BREATHE Act, H.R. 1154 because oil and gas wells and their associated infrastructure contribute to air pollution. Despite the overwhelming evidence that oil and gas production causes air pollution, oil and gas operators are still exempt

from the basic federal protections afforded by the Clean Air Act. The BREATHE Act would close the loopholes in the Clean Air Act carved out for the oil and gas industry.

Energy companies can easily and cheaply curb methane emissions by simply fixing the leaks in oil and gas equipment. Also, methane control technology is inexpensive and readily available. Industry also stands to benefit from capturing emissions because they can sell the captured methane and other valuable hydrocarbons for a profit instead of leaking them into the air.

Reducing methane leaks will in turn reduce ground level ozone pollution and protect the quality of life for our communities and our families. Please support the Holt-Peter-Polis amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113-271.

Mr. FLORES. 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 2, beginning at line 9, strike "regardless" and all that follows through line 11 and insert a period.

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following:

"(c) TRANSPARENCY OF STATE REGULATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall submit to the Bureau of Land Management a copy of its regulations that apply to hydraulic fracturing operations on Federal land.

"(2) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall make available to the public State regulations submitted under this subsection.

"(d) TRANSPARENCY OF STATE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall submit to the Bureau of Land Management a copy of any regulations of the State that require disclosure of chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing operations on Federal land.

"(2) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall make available to the public State regulations submitted under this subsection.

Page 2, beginning at line 23, strike "the" and all that follows through "process" and insert "the process of hydraulic fracturing (as that term is defined in section 44 of the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended by section 102 of this Act)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a simple amendment today that

makes technical and clarifying corrections to H.R. 2728. My amendment also calls on State regulators to provide their hydraulic fracturing and chemical disclosure requirement regulations to BLM for public disclosure.

States have the expertise in carefully crafting hydraulic fracturing regulations that meet the unique geologic and hydrologic needs of their States. This bottom-up regulatory relationship between the States and the Federal Government is one of the reasons that we are able to enjoy the vast economic benefits of the shale energy boom.

These changes will ensure that the cooperative and transparent State-driven regulatory approach to energy activity will continue. The energy shale boom is driving our economic recovery, and we need to keep the Federal Government from slowing down energy production on taxpayer owned Federal lands with duplicative regulations and unnecessary red tape.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLORES. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment goes right to the heart of what those who are opposed to this process are concerned with by disclosing the chemicals which is embodied in this amendment. This amendment does exactly what seems to be the opposition on the other side. I think it is a good amendment, and we are prepared to accept it.

Mr. FLORES. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague.

I rise today in support of the Flores amendment, which would make public States that have established efficient and regulatory programs that both encourage domestic development of our resources and protect the environment and health of our citizens.

My home State of Ohio has some of the most transparent and robust oil and gas regulations in the Nation, which in many cases far surpass Federal regulations. In fact, since 1953, over 80,000 wells have been hydraulically fractured in Ohio without a single case of groundwater contamination. At the same time, we are experiencing an energy renaissance that is estimated to bring more than 65,000 jobs and contribute nearly \$5 billion to Ohio's economy by 2014. Ohio now has the potential to be a leader in domestic energy production and would bring much needed high-paying jobs and economic growth to northeast Ohio.

It is clear that prudent and responsible development of our resources that creates jobs, enhances our national security and energy independence, and impacts long-term economic growth should not be a partisan issue.

I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. FLORES. I thank Mr. RENACCI for his comments.

Again, this is a simple amendment in response to feedback I received during the past few weeks.

Again, the American energy shale revolution is completely dependent on hydraulic fracturing. Without this evolving technology, job creation, growth in manufacturing, lower energy prices, and lower greenhouse gas emissions would all stop. All the benefits our Nation is experiencing today would stop.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I will not oppose this amendment because by itself it does not change anything, but it does underscore the problems with the bill itself. So I would like to speak on that for a moment.

I don't think there is anything wrong with making Interior a one-stop shopping place for State drilling regulations, although I don't know if there are any States that want to keep their regulations secret. So I don't know if that provision actually has any real impact.

Let me read a provision of the bill that this amendment strikes so that everyone understands what the amendment is trying to do. Subsection (b) of the bill says Interior shall defer to all State regulations for all activities related to any component of the hydraulic fracturing process. It then goes on to say "regardless of whether those rules are duplicative, more or less restrictive, shall have different requirements, or do not meet Federal guidelines."

Apparently the majority, as well as the author of this amendment, recognize that the last sentence was a little excessive and now this amendment proposes to strike that. But it doesn't make any difference because in subsection (a), the bill reads that Interior cannot enforce any of its regulations or guidance for any component of the hydraulic fracturing process.

Subsection (a) strips Interior of their authority to enforce. This certainly has the same effect as the language in subsection (b) directing them to defer with respect to any regulations or requirements.

Even after this amendment is adopted—and we are prepared to accept it—the language in the bill will still require that Interior defer to the States, regardless of whether State rules are less restrictive or adequate or are inadequate or if they don't meet Federal guidelines. That is the problem with the bill. The bill remains the same.

This amendment is really superfluous. I will not oppose the amendment, but it does underscore the fundamental problem with the legislation that we are considering here today. It strips Interior of any authority to protect public health, public safety from drilling and fracking operations on public lands.

Although I will also accept the amendment, I will continue to oppose the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. I thank the gentleman for accepting 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 Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. REED

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113-271.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 10, insert the following:  
**SEC. —. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.**

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study examining the economic benefits of domestic shale oil and gas production resulting from the process of hydraulic fracturing. This study will include identification of—

(1) State and Federal revenue generated as a result of shale gas production;

(2) jobs created both directly and indirectly as a result of shale oil and gas production; and

(3) an estimate of potential energy prices without domestic shale oil and gas production.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Comptroller General shall submit a report on the findings of such study to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives within 30 days after completion of the study.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. REED

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113-271 be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REED OF NEW YORK TO RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 113-27

Strike "Page 4, after line 10" and insert "Page 2, after line 19".

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have a straightforward amendment to H.R. 2728, which I am offering on a bipartisan basis with my colleague from California (Mr. COSTA).

Our amendment will direct the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on the number of jobs created from shale development in America. In addition, the study will look at the impact that shale production has had on energy prices and State and Federal revenues.

Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward, simple amendment to quantify and document the economic benefits from shale development in America.

As I serve on the Natural Gas Caucus, as well as the Manufacturing Caucus, I can tell you that the development of natural gas in America has put us on a course to have a manufacturing rebirth and renaissance here in the United States. It is consistent with my philosophy that we need to build it here and sell it there, and this amendment will quantify on the Federal level the economic benefits that are associated with the development of this resource not only from the direct jobs of producing the resource, but the indirect and secondary jobs in the United States manufacturing sector, as well as all the other jobs that would support the development of this resource that we have been blessed with here in America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman.

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

I think this amendment will probably no doubt prove what we have been saying, that producing American energy will produce American jobs.

I think the gentleman's amendment adds to this legislation, and I am willing to accept that.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman for that acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my cosponsor on this amendment.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from New York and fellow cochair of the Natural Gas Caucus, Mr. REED, for the time.

Places like the San Joaquin Valley, which I represent, are still struggling to create jobs in the wake of our Great Recession.

Energy production is a game changer not only in California, but around the country. These are exciting times with the findings in the Marcellus, the Barnett, the Bakkan, and the Monterey in California, which is estimated to be as large, if not larger, than the others that I mentioned.

Those who doubt the ability of States to regulate the oil and gas industry, I urge you to look at my home State of California which has put forth a long-term plan for responsible production of

natural gas that the Governor signed into law last month.

□ 1615

Many other States are taking their lead because we know one size doesn't fit all and, therefore, I think that is a preferred approach.

As all of us in the House are looking to determine what our next generation economy will look like, efforts like the amendment that we are proposing here, I believe, are critically important. The United States is on track to become the largest oil and gas producer in the world in the next few years. These are exciting times. The potential of the United States, Canada, and Mexico will far surpass the Middle East in the production of fossil fuels.

We should take advantage, therefore, of this opportunity, this dividend that will benefit our economy and also benefit the geopolitics of the world that we live in that is so dangerous. This shift from being importers of our energy to an international exporter will yield significant dividends for both our economy and global security. Our amendment will show that the economic opportunity cost of blocking or continuing to delay responsible—responsible—development of natural gas simply should not be the case.

The fact is that this study is more about the numbers and the dollars and how we do it safely and telling this side of the story, the human side of the story.

I support the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, at this point in time, I would just like to note, in this Chamber you have a gentleman from California and a gentleman from New York standing together to highlight the game-changing economic impact of the development of this natural resource. I believe this amendment will clearly articulate how this goes to create a manufacturing rebirth, a job renaissance here in America. I join with him in this amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to support the Reed-Costa amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member claim time in opposition?

If not, the question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. REED).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–271.

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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 —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**  
**SEC. 01. REQUIREMENT TO OFFER FOR SALE ONLY IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Secretary of the Interior shall require that all gas produced under a lease issued

pursuant to authorities granted by this Act shall be offered for sale only in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I think will help deliver on some of the promises being made here today. This would say that natural gas produced on Federal lands, on Federal lands only, would not be allowed to be exported from the United States.

Now, the principal argument we are hearing on the Republican side is that, by adopting their standard, which they say is the states' rights standards—I have already raised concerns about that on fracking—that it will encourage yet more development on Federal lands, increase our domestic energy supply, and free us from the OPEC cartel. Okay. But that won't work if we produce energy on Federal lands and then we export it to other countries like China or Japan or elsewhere.

The Energy Information Administration has done a study. They say there will be a tipping point in the export of liquefied natural gas where we will create a world market; we will be subject to the world price. That means that there would be a dramatic increase in gas prices here in the United States both for residential, factory use, and as an input for manufacturing fertilizer or other sorts of manufacturing.

So, suddenly, we would see an advantage which we have only very, very recently developed. We have manufacturing companies bringing production back to the U.S. because of our plentiful natural gas and saying it is to our advantage, our energy is cheaper here, our feed stocks are cheaper here. This is a tremendous advantage for us, and they are producing here and exporting finished goods.

If we begin to export in great volume the raw material, the feed stock, the natural gas through a liquefied process, then suddenly it will be we are in the international market. It means a dramatic run-up in natural gas prices. We lose our competitive advantage for domestic manufacturing, and we are back where we are with oil, despite the idea that if we produce more oil we will somehow become free of OPEC or other countries around the world.

The fact is that oil is traded as an international commodity, and no matter how much we produce here, it is going to be priced internationally at the highest price being paid in the international market. That is not so today for natural gas. But if we export enough of it and create enough capacity to export it, that will become the case.

So this would have no impact on gas produced on State lands, Indian lands, private lands. It just simply says that

that approximately 15 percent of the natural gas being produced on Federal lands could not be exported, must be used domestically to keep prices down here at home to advantage manufacturers here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a similar amendment like this has been offered multiple times in our committee markups and they have always failed on a bipartisan vote, and similar amendments like this have also failed on the floor. This is nothing more than an effort to make production on Federal lands more challenging and less valuable.

The vast majority of the natural gas that is produced in the United States stays in North America, but that that is exported, 98 percent goes to Canada and Mexico. We ought to keep those customers.

Additionally, since 2009, the U.S. has been the largest producer of natural gas in the world, which, I guess, goes to my friend from Oregon's argument. But energy is going to be globally decided in the marketplace. Many companies operating in United States are international companies with businesses all over the world. Undercutting the basic premise of the free market and restricting the use of the resource always has real economic consequences in the future.

Now, there is one other point about this amendment, too. The amendment makes it unclear what is considered natural gas. The question arises, are products derived from natural gas also only to be sold in the United States because they are made from natural gas? It is unclear the way the amendment is drafted. But if that were to be the case, Mr. Chairman, there would be vast spin-off industries that would be affected, namely, the plastic industries.

So I tend to be one that believes that the American consumer, in fact, consumers everywhere, are benefited if we have free trade in the world. That should apply to everything, including a big resource that we are becoming a leader in, and this amendment, I think, is contrary to that approach.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. To the gentleman's point, it is absolutely clear. It says "gas." It does not say products derived from gas, fertilizer, or manufactured plastic or anything else. It just says the gas must be sold here in the United States.

He admits and says that it will make it less valuable. That means he is looking at increasing the price of natural gas here to accommodate exports overseas to put us in a world market. Then we are, yet again, screwed, just like we

have been with oil for years. We are back to the point where we are competing in an international market. We lose international competitiveness. We lose more manufacturing.

This is pretty transparent here. I mean, the industry is pressuring, I am sure, on their side of the aisle, saying, Oh, my God, don't do that. Don't say that that 15 percent of the gas produced on Federal lands, belonging to the taxpayers of United States, has to be used here to help keep down our prices for our homes, for our manufacturing, to give us a competitive world advantage. Let's do it like all our other free trade, which is bankrupting the country and exported millions of manufacturing jobs over the last few years.

He talked about it again. Globally decided free market. He used those words. If we go to a globally decided free market in the export of natural gas, we lose the advantage, and their basic premise that this will lower prices for Americans is stood on its head.

If you don't adopt this amendment, if you vote against it, you are voting to increase the price of natural gas, according to the Energy Information Administration, for all consumers and manufacturers and the downstream products from those in the United States of America. So, if you really want to lower the price to consumers, vote for this amendment.

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

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, the DeFazio amendment is ill-conceived. Creating jobs in the energy sector is creating American jobs, and this amendment would, in fact, inhibit our ability to reduce our trade deficit and also affects an issue of providing natural gas to our strategic allies.

As a result of increased natural gas production, the price of natural gas has fallen over the last few years, making it competitive in the global marketplace. This presents an opportunity to export U.S. natural gas.

Many of our allies rely heavily upon a single source or unstable regions for natural gas. For example, Russia has used its European market dominance to influence other countries, cutting off natural gas supplies over various disputes. Poland is so eager to wean itself off Russia for natural gas that it plans to buy LNG from Qatar at a price estimated to be 40 to 50 percent higher than the rate charged by Gazprom, Russia's state-owned monopoly, just to be able to have some independence.

Increasing natural gas exports would provide our allies with an alternative and reliable source of energy, helping to strengthen our economic and geopolitical partnerships.

It should be noted that the boom in natural gas production has already made an impact. Supplies previously

destined for our shores but no longer needed as a result of increased production have been diverted elsewhere. This increase in global supply has helped several European countries successfully renegotiate their long-term contracts with Gazprom, Russia's state-owned monopoly.

Mr. Chair, in general, when it comes to trade, we often talk about barriers that other countries have to U.S. producers, ones that we must overcome in order to export. In this case, these are regulatory burdens we are placing upon ourselves that are preventing our ability to create jobs and preventing our ability to lower our overall trade deficits. Restraining U.S. natural gas exports would only hurt our abilities to bolster strategic partnerships and create jobs right here at home.

The DeFazio amendment does nothing to decrease the cost currently of natural gas. This is an important ability to create jobs and lower our trade deficit.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

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

I would just simply say and correct my good friend from Oregon, I did not say that because natural gas would enter the international market it would become less available. I simply said that it would become part of the global market.

I dare say that, when oil was discovered in Titusville, Pennsylvania, nobody thought that that oil would become part of the world market, but it has. But unfortunately, because we in the United States have not utilized our resources like we should with crude oil and not competed as we should with past decisions, there was a cartel that was formed internationally called OPEC. They control the oil market.

The best way to beat cartels is to outsupply them. If we are going to be a leader in natural gas in the world, we ought to take advantage of that and lead when we can, but recognize that a free market gives the best services to people and recipients of that, not only in the United States, but in the world.

With that, I urge rejection of the DeFazio amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1630

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113-271.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

**SEC. . REVIEW OF STATE ACTIVITIES.**

The Secretary of the Interior shall annually review and report to Congress on all State activities relating to hydraulic fracturing.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 419, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, in just a second, I will yield to the distinguished chairman.

Just in a sentence, the Jackson Lee amendment is simple and will provide for an annual review of any and all hydraulic fracturing activity, as well as a report to be submitted to Congress.

I now yield to the gentleman from Washington, Chairman HASTINGS, for the purpose of entertaining a question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentlelady for her amendment and for yielding to me for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my friend from Texas, the text of the gentlelady's amendment requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an annual review of all State hydraulic fracturing activity. My concern is that this provision appears to be very broad.

I would be delighted to work with the gentlelady, as this bill works its way through the legislative process, to consider some additional conditions to ensure that the broad review is targeted at those areas subject to the jurisdiction of the committee and results in a report to Congress that is meaningful and productive.

To that end, would the gentlelady be willing to work with me to clarify that her amendment is intended to apply to State permitting of hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for working with me on this matter. I appreciate his willingness to work with me.

I want to achieve what the ultimate intent was, and that is, to have this amendment pertain to Federal lands. My response is that I do not object to a modification of the amendment to make clear that the review and report required of the Secretary should be limited to State permitting of hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands, which will, in fact, provide this Congress with



the necessary information on these processes.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. With the clarification that the gentlelady will work with me, that this is subject to Federal lands, with the clarification that the review and report required of the Secretary should be limited to State permitting of hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands, I am willing to accept the gentlelady's amendment. I thank her for her work on that.

I yield back to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chair, I just wanted to indicate that we have the opportunity to do a number of things: create jobs, energy independence, preserve and create a strong economy, and protect our environment.

I am interested in seeing the opportunity for low-income families to be able to be helped in the cold of the winter and the heat of the summer, to be able to find relief from the energy costs that we have talked about so often, and I would hope that as we move forward with the legislation that we will be able to work together.

I believe that the 2.1 million jobs that will be created, the increase of consumers' household dollars, and the amount of money that will be going into the government Treasury really should bring us together. My amendment, as clarified by the chairman in our discussion in the colloquy, is to give Congress that oversight pertaining to those Federal lands.

I thank the chairman for his clarification. I am looking forward to working with him and maintaining the language in the bill, however, with the understanding that we will get that review for Federal lands and that that will come from the Secretary of the Interior to the United States Congress.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

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 113-271 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

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. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) 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 190, noes 230, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

#### AYES—190

Andrews	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Barber	Grijalva	Nolan
Bass	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Beatty	Hahn	Owens
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Payne
Blumenauer	Himes	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Holt	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Honda	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Bustos	Huffman	Polis
Butterfield	Israel	Price (NC)
Capps	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capuano	Jeffries	Rahall
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Keating	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kuster	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schneider
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Levin	Scott, David
Courtney	Lewis	Serrano
Crowley	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Loebbeck	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sinema
DeFazio	Lowe	Sires
DeGette	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Slaughter
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Speier
DelBene	Maffei	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Maloney	Takano
Dingell	Doyle	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Duckworth	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Edwards	Tierney
Ellison	Ellison	Titus
Engel	Engel	Tonko
Enyart	McCollum	Tsongas
Eshoo	McDermott	Van Hollen
Esty	McGovern	Vargas
Farr	McIntyre	Veasey
Fattah	McNerney	Velázquez
Foster	Meeks	Visclosky
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Walz
Fudge	Michaud	Waters
Gabbard	Miller, George	Watt
Garamendi	Moore	Waxman
Garcia	Moran	Welch
Gibson	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Nadler	Yarmuth
	Napolitano	
	Neal	

#### NOES—230

Aderholt	Blackburn	Carter
Amash	Boustany	Cassidy
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Bachmann	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Bachus	Brooks (AL)	Coble
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Coffman
Barr	Brown (GA)	Cole
Barrow (GA)	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Barton	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Benishek	Burgess	Conaway
Bentivolio	Calvert	Cook
Bilirakis	Camp	Costa
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Cotton
Black	Capito	Cramer

Crawford	Jordan	Rigell
Crenshaw	Joyce	Roby
Cuellar	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Culberson	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Daines	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Dent	Kline	Rokita
DeSantis	Labrador	Rooney
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Roskam
Duffy	Lance	Ross
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Rothfus
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Royce
Ellmers	Latta	Runyan
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Fincher	Long	Salmon
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Sanford
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Fleming	Marchant	Schock
Flores	Marino	Schweikert
Forbes	Massie	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	Matheson	Sensenbrenner
Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Simpson
Gallego	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Gardner	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Garrett	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Gerlach	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Gibbs	Rodgers	Southerland
Gingrey (GA)	Meadows	Stewart
Gohmert	Meehan	Stivers
Goodlatte	Messer	Stockman
Gosar	Mica	Stutzman
Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Terry
Granger	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	Mullin	Tiberi
Green, Gene	Mulvaney	Tipton
Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Griffith (VA)	Neugebauer	Upton
Grimm	Nugent	Valadao
Guthrie	Nunes	Vela
Hall	Nunnelee	Wagner
Hanna	Olson	Walberg
Harper	Palazzo	Walden
Harris	Paulsen	Walorski
Hartzler	Pearce	Weber (TX)
Hastings (WA)	Perry	Webster (FL)
Heck (NV)	Peterson	Wenstrup
Hensarling	Petri	Westmoreland
Holding	Pittenger	Whitfield
Hudson	Pitts	Williams
Huelskamp	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	Wittman
Hultgren	Posey	Wolf
Hunter	Price (GA)	Womack
Issa	Reed	Woodall
Jenkins	Reichert	Yoder
Johnson (OH)	Renacci	Yoho
Johnson, Sam	Ribble	Young (AK)
Jones	Rice (SC)	Young (IN)

#### NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Shuster
Herrera Beutler	Noem	Wasserman
Hurt	Radel	Schultz
Lummis	Rush	

□ 1702

Mr. WHITFIELD changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 601, on the amendment offered by Rep. HOLT to H.R. 2728, Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HECK of Nevada). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the Committee now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given

their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) 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 142, noes 276, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 602]

#### AYES—142

Andrews	Grijalva	Neal
Barrow (GA)	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Bass	Hanabusa	O'Rourke
Beatty	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Becerra	Heck (WA)	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Pascarell
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Pastor (AZ)
Blumenauer	Honda	Payne
Bonamici	Horsford	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Huffman	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Israel	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Jeffries	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Capps	Jones	Polis
Capuano	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Carney	Keating	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Cartwright	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Ruiz
Chu	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda T.
Ciциlline	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kuster	Schakowsky
Clay	Langevin	Schiff
Cleaver	Lee (CA)	Schneider
Clyburn	Levin	Scott, David
Cohen	Lewis	Serrano
Conyers	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loebach	Sherman
Cummings	Lofgren	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lowe	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Lynch	Speier
Deutch	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Doggett	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Matsui	Tierney
Engel	McCollum	Titus
Enyart	McDermott	Tonko
Eshoo	McGovern	Tsongas
Esty	McNerney	Van Hollen
Farr	Meeks	Velázquez
Fattah	Meng	Walz
Fortenberry	Michaud	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Watt
Fudge	Moore	Welch
Gabbard	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nadler	Yarmuth
Grayson	Napolitano	

#### NOES—276

Amash	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Bachmann	Black	Burgess
Bachus	Blackburn	Butterfield
Barber	Boustany	Calvert
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Camp
Barr	Bridenstine	Cantor
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Capito
Benishkek	Brooks (IN)	Cárdenas
Bentivolio	Broun (GA)	Carter
Bera (CA)	Brown (FL)	Cassidy

Castro (TX)	Hudson	Price (GA)
Chabot	Huelskamp	Rahall
Coble	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Coffman	Hultgren	Reichert
Cole	Hunter	Renacci
Collins (GA)	Hurt	Ribble
Collins (NY)	Issa	Rice (SC)
Conaway	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Connolly	Jenkins	Rigell
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Roe (TN)
Costa	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Cotton	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Courtney	Joyce	Rogers (MI)
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Kind	Rokita
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rooney
Cuellar	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Culberson	Kingston	Roskam
Daines	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross
Davis (CA)	Kline	Rothfus
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Royce
DeGette	LaMalfa	Runyan
Delaney	Lamborn	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lance	Ryan (OH)
Denham	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Larsen (WA)	Salmon
DeSantis	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DesJarlais	Latham	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Scalise
Dingell	LoBiondo	Schock
Doyle	Long	Schrader
Duckworth	Lucas	Schwartz
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)
Duncan (TN)	(NM)	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sensenbrenner
Farenthold	(NM)	Sessions
Fincher	Lummis	Sewell (AL)
Fitzpatrick	Maffei	Shimkus
Fleischmann	Marchant	Simpson
Fleming	Marino	Sinema
Flores	Massie	Smith (MO)
Forbes	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Foster	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Fox	McCaul	Southerland
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Stewart
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Stivers
Gallego	McIntyre	Stockman
Garcia	McKeon	Stutzman
Gardner	McKinley	Takano
Garrett	McMorris	Terry
Gerlach	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)
Gibbs	Meadows	Thornberry
Gibson	Meehan	Tiberi
Gingrey (GA)	Messer	Tipton
Gohmert	Mica	Turner
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Upton
Gosar	Miller (MI)	Valadao
Govdy	Miller, Gary	Vargas
Granger	Mullin	Veasey
Graves (GA)	Mulvaney	Vela
Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Green, Al	Murphy (PA)	Wagner
Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod	Walberg
Griffin (AR)	Neugebauer	Walden
Griffith (VA)	Nugent	Walorski
Grimm	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Nunnelee	Webster (FL)
Hahn	Olson	Wenstrup
Hall	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Hanna	Paulsen	Whitfield
Harper	Pearce	Williams
Harris	Perlmutter	Wilson (SC)
Hartzer	Perry	Wittman
Hastings (WA)	Peters (CA)	Wolf
Heck (NV)	Petri	Womack
Hensarling	Pittenger	Woodall
Himes	Pitts	Yoder
Hinojosa	Poe (TX)	Yoho
Holding	Pompeo	Young (AK)
Hoyer	Posey	Young (IN)

#### NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Noem	Wasserman
Campbell	Radel	Schultz
Chaffetz	Rush	Waxman
Herrera Beutler	Shuster	
McCarthy (NY)	Smith (NE)	

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1711

Mr. HECK of Nevada and Ms. DUCKWORTH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the Chair, Mr. HECK of Nevada, 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. 2728) to recognize States' authority to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation, and, pursuant to House Resolution 419, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments 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 further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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

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

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lowenthal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2728 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 1, line 14, strike "The" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (c), the".

Page 2, line 4, strike "The" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (c), the".

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent quoted subsection accordingly):

(c) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Nothing in this section limits the authority of the Department of Interior or any State from requiring the public disclosure of chemicals in hydraulic fracturing fluids, the source and type of base fluid used in hydraulic fracturing, the disposition of hydraulic fracturing flowback fluids, and any other details of how and where hydraulic fracturing operations occur, for use by the public to study and analyze for the benefit of public health and safety.

Mr. FLORES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, transparency and public disclosure are critical ingredients to successful public policy and, I would dare say so, to successful democracy. My amendment would provide just that—transparency and public disclosure of the hydraulic fracturing operations that are now prolific in so many States.

Right now, our communities do not have access to reliable or complete information about fracking operations. Colleagues, our communities have a right to know.

If the public has a right to know what ingredients are in their food, don't our communities have a right to know what chemicals the oil and gas industry is going to pump past their drinking water?

If the public has a right to know where Superfund pollution sites are, don't our communities have a right to know where the oil and gas industry is going to store these millions of gallons of unknown chemicals and contaminated slurry?

If the public has a right to know about major land-use changes, don't our communities have a right to know when the oil and gas industry is going to start a fracking operation next-door—with its accompanying air emissions? its truck traffic? its noise? and its derricks?

I would hope that encouraging transparency and public disclosure would be a bipartisan issue. I certainly hear about transparency from the majority when this Chamber is talking about other Federal programs. We should be consistent and make sure the people in our communities also have a right to know about fracking chemicals injected below their backyards, their schools, their farms, and their parks.

And to those who would resist providing the community a right to know about fracking operations, I would warn that you prevent transparency at the oil and gas industry's own peril.

To develop our resources responsibly and to harness the benefits of the shale gas boom, we need the public's trust, and industry will not earn it if they hide the facts. When the oil and gas industry refuses to disclose the facts, it is natural for the public to ask then: Why won't industry tell us what chemicals they are using? What are they hiding?

When the oil and gas industry hides the facts, it erodes the public's trust and breeds suspicion.

□ 1715

Hiding the facts prevents first responders and health workers from understanding how to appropriately treat exposed individuals after a fracking accident.

Hiding the facts prevents emergency officials from understanding how to

properly contain and clean up a chemical spill after a fracking accident.

Hiding the facts prevents the public from knowing which chemicals to test for in their drinking water before, during, and after fracking.

Hiding the facts prevents researchers who conduct chemical transport studies from understanding the prevalence, the movement, and the longevity of fracking chemicals in the subsurface environment.

Hiding the facts prevents the public from verifying the oil and gas industry's assertion that hydraulic fracturing is safe.

Don't hide the facts. Our communities have a right to know. Vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, this should be pretty easy.

In my earlier amendment that was approved by voice vote today, we addressed the concerns raised by the gentleman from California, so let's move on down the road and vote for American jobs and American energy.

A vote today for H.R. 2728 is a vote to regain our Nation's position as the world's leading energy producer, a product of the shale energy boom.

Thanks to shale energy, middle class manufacturing jobs are returning to the U.S. after generations of decline. Thanks to shale energy, our Nation's production is a huge blow to unstable and unfriendly areas like Russia and the Middle East, who previously dictated the world supply of energy.

Just last year, shale energy supported 2.1 million jobs. Turning our backs on the shale energy boom now would cause the Federal Government to lose up to \$1.6 trillion in revenues over the next decade and a half.

I would repeat: the issue that was raised in the motion to recommit was already in my amendment that was passed by voice vote earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, lower energy costs for American families, a cleaner environment, an increase in American manufacturing jobs, and domestic energy security would all be lost without the underlying bill.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and to support abundant, safe, and clean energy through the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act. Vote "yes" for American jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 603]

AYES—188

Andrews	Grayson	Nadler
Barber	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bass	Grijalva	Neal
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Negrete McLeod
Becerra	Hahn	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pallone
Blumenauer	Higgins	Pascarell
Bonamici	Himes	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Payne
Braley (IA)	Holt	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Honda	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Peters (CA)
Bustos	Hoyer	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Israel	Pocan
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Polis
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cartwright	Jones	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ruiz
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Clarke	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kilmer	T.
Cleaver	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kuster	Schakowsky
Connolly	Langevin	Schiff
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Levin	Scott, David
Cuellar	Lewis	Serrano
Cummings	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Loebach	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Sinema
DeGette	Lowe	Sires
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
DeLauro	(NM)	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Deutch	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Takano
Doggett	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Carolyn	Tierney
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Ellison	Matsui	Tonko
Engel	McCollum	Tsongas
Enyart	McDermott	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McGovern	Vargas
Esty	McIntyre	Veasey
Farr	McNerney	Velázquez
Fattah	Meeks	Visclosky
Foster	Meng	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Waters
Fudge	Miller, George	Watt
Gabbard	Moore	Welch
Garamendi	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Garcia	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth

NOES—232

Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Amodei	Broun (GA)	Costa
Bachmann	Buchanan	Cotton
Bachus	Bucshon	Cramer
Barletta	Burgess	Crawford
Barr	Calvert	Crenshaw
Barrow (GA)	Camp	Culberson
Barton	Cantor	Daines
Benishek	Capito	Davis, Rodney
Bentivolio	Carter	Denham
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DeSantis
Black	Coble	DesJarlais
Blackburn	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Boustany	Cole	Duffy
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Bridenstine	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)

Ellmers	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)	Bishop (GA)	Harper	Pitts	Green, Gene	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Farenthold	Lance	Rohrabacher	Bishop (UT)	Harris	Poe (TX)	Grijalva	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda
Fincher	Lankford	Rokita	Black	Hartzler	Pompeo	Gutiérrez	Maloney,	T.
Fitzpatrick	Latham	Rooney	Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Posey	Hahn	Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta
Fleischmann	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen	Boehner	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)	Hanabusa	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Fleming	LoBiondo	Roskam	Boustany	Hensarling	Rahall	Hastings (FL)	Matsui	Schakowsky
Flores	Long	Ross	Brady (TX)	Holding	Reed	Heck (WA)	McCollum	Schiff
Forbes	Lucas	Rothfus	Bridenstine	Hudson	Reichert	Higgins	McDermott	Schneider
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Royce	Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Renacci	Himes	McGovern	Schrader
Fox	Lummis	Runyan	Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble	Hinojosa	McNerney	Schwartz
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Ryan (WI)	Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rice (SC)	Holt	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Frelinghuysen	Marino	Salmon	Buchanan	Hunter	Richmond	Honda	Meng	Scott, David
Gallego	Massie	Sanford	Bucshon	Hurt	Rigell	Horsford	Michaud	Serrano
Gardner	Matheson	Scalise	Burgess	Issa	Roby	Hoyer	Miller, George	Shea-Porter
Garrett	McCarthy (CA)	Schock	Calvert	Jackson Lee	Roe (TN)	Huffman	Moore	Sherman
Gerlach	McCaul	Schrader	Camp	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)	Israel	Moran	Sinema
Gibbs	McClintock	Schweikert	Cantor	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Gibson	McHenry	Scott, Austin	Capito	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Slaughter
Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Sensenbrenner	Carter	Jones	Rohrabacher	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Gohmert	McKinley	Sessions	Cassidy	Jordan	Rokita	Kaptur	Neal	Speier
Goodlatte	McMorris	Shimkus	Chabot	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen	Keating	Negrete McLeod	Swalwell (CA)
Gosar	Rodgers	Simpson	Coble	Kelly (PA)	Roskam	Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Takano
Gowdy	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Coffman	King (IA)	Ross	Kennedy	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Granger	Meehan	Smith (NE)	Cole	King (NY)	Rothfus	Kildee	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Graves (GA)	Messer	Smith (NJ)	Collins (GA)	Kingston	Royce	Kilmer	Pallone	Tierney
Graves (MO)	Mica	Smith (TX)	Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Kingpatrick	Kind	Pascrell	Titus
Green, Gene	Miller (FL)	Southerland	Conaway	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (WI)	Kuster	Pastor (AZ)	Tonko
Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)	Stewart	Cook	Kline	Salmon	Langevin	Payne	Tsongas
Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary	Stivers	Costa	Labrador	Sanford	Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Grimm	Mullin	Stockman	Cotton	LaMalfa	Scalise	Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Vargas
Guthrie	Mulvaney	Stutzman	Cramer	Lamborn	Schock	Lee (CA)	Peters (CA)	Veasey
Hall	Murphy (PA)	Terry	Crawford	Lance	Schweikert	Levin	Peters (MI)	Vela
Hanna	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)	Crenshaw	Lankford	Scott, Austin	Lewis	Pingree (ME)	Velázquez
Harper	Nugent	Thornberry	Cuellar	Latham	Sensenbrenner	Lipinski	Pocan	Visclosky
Harris	Nunes	Tiberi	Culberson	Latta	Sessions	Loeb sack	Polis	Walz
Hartzler	Nunnelee	Tipton	Daines	LoBiondo	Sewell (AL)	Lofgren	Price (NC)	Waters
Hastings (WA)	Olson	Turner	Davis, Rodney	Long	Shimkus	Lowenthal	Quigley	Watt
Heck (NV)	Palazzo	Upton	Denham	Lucas	Simpson	Lowe	Rangel	Waxman
Hensarling	Paulsen	Valadao	Dent	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)	Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Holding	Pearce	Vela	DeSantis	Lummis	Smith (NE)	(NM)	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Hudson	Perry	Wagner	DesJarlais	Marchant	Smith (NJ)	Lujan, Ben Ray	Runyan	Yarmuth
Huelskamp	Peterson	Walberg	Diaz-Balart	Marino	Smith (TX)	(NM)	Ruppersberger	
Huizenga (MI)	Petri	Walden	Duffy	Massie	Southerland			
Hultgren	Pittenger	Walorski	Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Stewart			
Hunter	Pitts	Duncan (TN)	Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers			
Hurt	Poe (TX)	Ellmers	Ellmers	McCaul	Stockman			
Issa	Pompeo	Farenthold	Farenthold	McClintock	Stutzman			
Jenkins	Posey	Fincher	Fincher	McHenry	Terry			
Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Westmoreland	Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Thompson (PA)			
Johnson, Sam	Rahall	Whitfield	Fleischmann	McKeon	Thornberry			
Jordan	Reed	Williams	Fleming	McKinley	Tiberi			
Joyce	Reichert	Wilson (SC)	Flores	McMorris	Tipton			
Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Wittman	Forbes	Rodgers	Turner			
King (IA)	Ribble	Wolf	Fortenberry	Meadows	Upton			
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Womack	Fox	Meehan	Valadao			
Kingston	Rigell	Woodall	Franks (AZ)	Messer	Wagner			
Kinzinger (IL)	Roby	Yoder	Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walberg			
Kline	Roe (TN)	Yoho	Gardner	Miller (FL)	Walden			
Labrador	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)	Garrett	Miller (MI)	Walorski			
LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)	Young (IN)	Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Weber (TX)			
			Gibbs	Mullin	Webster (FL)			
			Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney	Wenstrup			
			Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland			
			Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Whitfield			
			Gosar	Nugent	Williams			
			Gowdy	Nunes	Wilson (SC)			
			Granger	Nunnelee	Wittman			
			Graves (GA)	Olson	Wolf			
			Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Womack			
			Griffin (AR)	Paulsen	Woodall			
			Griffith (VA)	Pearce	Yoder			
			Grimm	Perry	Yoho			
			Guthrie	Peterson	Young (AK)			
			Hall	Petri	Young (IN)			
			Hanna	Pittenger				

## NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Noem	Wasserman
Chaffetz	Radel	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Rush	Waxman
McCarthy (NY)	Shuster	

## □ 1728

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOLT. 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 235, noes 187, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 604]

## AYES—235

Aderholt	Bachus	Barton
Amash	Barletta	Benishek
Amodei	Barr	Bentivolio
Bachmann	Barrow (GA)	Bilirakis

Andrews	Castro (TX)	Dingell
Barber	Chu	Doggett
Bass	Cicilline	Doyle
Beatty	Clarke	Duckworth
Becerra	Clay	Edwards
Bera (CA)	Cleaver	Ellison
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Engel
Blumenauer	Cohen	Enyart
Bonamici	Connolly	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Conyers	Esty
Braley (IA)	Cooper	Farr
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Fattah
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Foster
Bustos	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Capps	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Capuano	DeFazio	Gallego
Cárdenas	DeGette	Garamendi
Carney	Delaney	Garcia
Carson (IN)	DeLauro	Gibson
Cartwright	DeBene	Grayson
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Green, Al

## NOES—187

Dingell	Doggett	Doyle
Duckworth	Edwards	Ellison
Engel	Enyart	Eshoo
Esty	Farr	Fattah
Foster	Frankel (FL)	Fudge
Gabbard	Gallego	Garamendi
Garcia	Gibson	Grayson
Green, Al		

## NOT VOTING—9

Campbell	Noem	Wasserman
Chaffetz	Radel	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Rush	
McCarthy (NY)	Shuster	

## □ 1739

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

## CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JIM HOLDEN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Jim Holden, a resident of Franklin, Venango County, Pennsylvania.

An outdoor enthusiast who tirelessly promoted recreation and tourism in Pennsylvania, Jim passed away on November 9 at the age of 73.

As cofounder of the Allegheny Valley Trails Association, Jim was instrumental in the Rails-to-Trails movement, an effort in the early 1990s to rehabilitate abandoned railways into