

with my eldest daughter. That is where a tall, thin, and shy Timmy began playing basketball, and let me just say: they were not the winningest team.

From his time at Wake Forest, where I attended his last game, we, in the Virgin Islands, have followed his career with pride. Beyond the games, we appreciate the way he stayed in touch with his classmates and friends these 22 years, the way he has given back to us, to North Carolina, and to San Antonio through his foundation—the character program in our schools—and his support of youth sports and health awareness and research.

Tim Duncan is a champion in basketball and in the lives of the communities that he continues to give back to.

On behalf of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands: Thank you, Timmy, for making us proud and for being the role model that you have been for our young men and for young men everywhere.

□ 1230

#### COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, the American people want and favor comprehensive immigration reform. An overwhelming majority believe in a pathway to citizenship for the undocumented because we are a compassionate country.

But you have not brought it to the floor.

You have said you favor the ENLIST Act, but wouldn't put it as part of the National Defense Authorization Act.

What is wrong with serving our country and earning a pathway to citizenship? What is wrong with going to school and being a good member of our society and earning a pathway to citizenship?

These are DREAMers—dreamers of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with reuniting families, keeping the promises to people like the Filipino World War II veterans, who believed in what General MacArthur said to them? There is nothing wrong with that.

Bring the comprehensive immigration reform bill to the floor and let us all vote. Vote for the DREAMers who truly believe in this country.

#### PRE-K FOR USA

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for generations in America, we have seen that education is the surest path to success. That is why today I am introducing the Pre-K for USA Act.

The Pre-K for USA Act allows local education agencies and governments to

apply directly to the Federal Government for grants to develop and expand high-quality pre-K programs. Cities and school districts need to have the ability to step up to the plate and pick up the slack where their State governments are failing.

Unfortunately, in my home State of Texas, as is the case in other States, legislatures have curtailed their investment in education. Instead, they have picked up the troubling practice of pretending to balance budgets by slashing early childhood education funds.

I call on my colleagues to support the Pre-K for USA Act and get our country one step closer to ensuring that all American children have the opportunity to get ahead in life, achieve their dreams, and boost our Nation's prosperity.

#### CONGRESS MUST ACT TO PASS A FAIR PLAN FOR COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Americans want Congress to act on comprehensive immigration reform, and the Senate already has. In fact, it has been exactly 1 year this week since the Senate passed bipartisan legislation to offer a pathway to citizenship for millions living in the United States. But 365 days later, there has still been no action in this House.

The Democrats have a plan that will decrease the Nation's deficit by nearly \$1 trillion, secure our borders, unite families, and provide an earned pathway to citizenship. But the GOP has other ideas. Republicans have made it clear that they have no intention of acting on a plan for comprehensive immigration reform.

Last October, we introduced H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, based on bipartisan principles and bipartisan solutions to fix our country's broken immigration system. The bill has strong bipartisan support and has the votes to pass in the House if it comes for a vote. The legislation already has 200 cosponsors, including three Republican cosponsors.

The United States, Mr. Speaker, has rightfully earned its reputation as the land of opportunity. We need to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4899, LOWERING GASOLINE PRICES TO FUEL AN AMERICA THAT WORKS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4923, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 641 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 641

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-50. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be

debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from June 27, 2014, through July 7, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

SEC. 6. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 3, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel An America That Works Act of 2014. It makes 10 amendments in order—four Republican and six Democrat—and the rule provides 1 hour of general debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 4923, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act of 2015, under a modified open rule and provides for other technical and clerical purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act is a bipartisan measure that provides for the essential funding of several Federal agencies during the next fiscal year, including the Department of Energy, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

This measure would also fund important Federal science research in the fields of energy, high-performance computing systems, and next-generation energy sources. It is appropriate that this measure providing for the Nation's energy needs also be included with this rule.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today and speak in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014.

American families, Mr. Speaker, are hurting. Every time you pull up to the gas pump, you have to wonder whether there will ever be any relief to the family budget for these ever-increasing gasoline prices.

It means simply—whether you support or like the guy or not—that before President Obama took office in 2009, the average national price for a gallon of unleaded regular gas was under \$2 a gallon. Today, it has nearly doubled to around \$4 a gallon. And the prices keep rising almost every day.

This administration touts its growth in energy production, not recognizing that that production increase has all come on private and State-owned property. If we are to have sustained growth of our economy, if we are not having peaks and valleys, if we are not having boom and bust, it is important that the resources that we have in great abundance that are on Federal lands also be included so there can be a sustained growth to our economy.

Unfortunately, since President Obama took office, total Federal oil production has dropped 6 percent, total Federal national gas production has dropped an astounding 28 percent, and, at the same time, offshore oil production is down 15 percent and offshore gas production is down 47 percent.

Unfortunately, 87 percent of all the area that is allowed offshore of acreage of potential development is currently off limits to oil and natural gas production.

We have policies that are really harming our progress forward, and they need to be changed. This act that will be put before us, if we pass this rule, does indeed do that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, my friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I join my good friends on the Energy and Water Committee, Representatives LOWEY and KAPTUR, in applauding the chairman's concerted effort to compose H.R. 4923 in an inclusive manner.

□ 1245

I appreciate the bipartisan nature of the bill and am supportive of many of the provisions contained within it. However, I am not without my concerns. All of these phrases that my friends on the other side of the aisle bandy about—"increase over this," "funding above last year's levels"—sound great, but as always, we need to see what is lurking in the shadows.

For example, H.R. 4923 is completely uninspired when it comes to renewable energy. Its approach, in my view, is a myopic one—one that, if we follow it too far, leaves us trying to play catch-up with our competitors, like the Chinese and many other countries, that have turned their attention to renewable energy. As China continues its now decade-long trend of increasing investment in its renewable energy sector—a footnote here: it invested \$56 billion just last year—we take the truly uninspired step of cutting funding for renewable energy by 6.4 percent.

I am aware of the studies that conclude that our Nation will be able to meet 97 percent of its energy needs through domestic production by 2035, and I consider that to be great. This Nation has spent \$2.3 trillion on importing foreign oil since 2003. This is a serious national security vulnerability, and I think we can all agree that lessening this dependence is a desirable goal.

I also know that, for many in this day of Twitter and Facebook and Instagram, 2035 seems like a long way off. Those of us in this Chamber do not have the luxury of thinking that way. We have a responsibility to look past 2035, and we have a responsibility to leave our children and grandchildren with an energy portfolio that will keep them in good stead for the years after 2035. We abdicate this responsibility when we underfund research and development in the renewable energy sector. We abdicate this responsibility when we skew applied energy programs at the Department of Energy too heavily toward nuclear energy and fossil fuels. An increased investment in renewable energy makes good economic sense; it makes good environmental sense; and it makes good national security sense. The time to make this investment is now.

We need to be careful even where we see funding increases. Though these funding increases may seem impressive and prudent, we need to be reminded that all that glitters is not gold. They merely mask a continuation of the status quo for my friends from across the

aisle. They would have you believe they are increasing funding for environmental protection while reducing spending on defense, but alas, in my view, this is an illusion. In reality, this bill represents business as usual for the Republican Party—slashing funding for research in renewable resources while doling out more handouts to dirty energy and environmental polluters. It seems like every other week we are voting to drill off our shores, in our parks, or on Federal lands.

To that end, H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014—we are the greatest naming people in the world here in Congress—is just a greatest hits record, rehashing two measures the House has already voted on, one of which itself was already cobbled together from a number of separate bills. Like all greatest hits albums, it, too, is stuck in the past. Those past attempts rightly died in the Senate, and there is no reason to expect a different result this time around. Yet here we are again, tossing legislation into the void while our country's very real problems fester.

My friends across the aisle have no ideas, evidently, for energy independence and security beyond more drilling. They would rather score political points than propose real solutions. I am sure they will go home to their districts next week for one of the biggest driving weekends of the year. Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I commented that the oil industry manipulates us. Every year in the summer, prices go up on gasoline, and I just don't think that is coincidental when gas prices historically tend to be high. Yet they are going to point to these votes as evidence that they tried to lower gasoline prices. While it may make for a good feel-good story, that is all it is. Putting more oil out there won't move prices. Domestic production is already at a 25-year high in this country, up 60 percent since 2008. Imports are at 29-year lows.

Despite my friend's claims, onshore oil production from Federal lands has gone up 30 percent since 2008. I can never pass up an opportunity to say that I will continue to resist offshore drilling off the coast of Florida beyond the accommodations that have already been made by this body. Yet gas prices remain unchanged. The U.S. holds only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. Even tripling current offshore drilling capabilities by the year 2030 would lower gasoline prices only 5 cents per gallon more than if we would continue at the rate we are going; or if we would increase oil production all the way to 50 percent—which is more than drilling in the Arctic, increasing public lands and offshore drilling, and the pipelines would provide—prices would decrease by only 10 percent at most.

Oil is priced on the global market, which is far more complicated than my friends let on. RECORD demand for fossil fuels in this country and in places

like India and China and Singapore and Japan have far more impact on the price of gasoline than anything my friends here hope to do. The liquid natural gas export bill the House passed yesterday shows they understand the nature of the market. They just choose to ignore it whenever it is convenient.

My friends across the aisle have no plans for addressing the demand for the kinds of policies that actually could help reduce energy costs, like increasing our energy efficiency, improving the fuel mileage of our cars, and developing renewable energy resources. I was visited by one of our college presidents, John Kelly, who is new at Florida Atlantic University. He visited with me today, and that university has a new grant dealing with currents, which may very well at some point add to our understanding with reference to renewable energy resources. So it won't be the American people who benefit from more drilling. It will be the bottom lines of the companies that own the wells. Hardworking Americans will be left to bear the risk.

This "drill everywhere, all the time" plan isn't a serious energy strategy; it is a cash grab by the fossil fuel industry. It is not a path to energy independence and security; it is a road to environmental and economic collapse. This isn't a game. The threat is real, Mr. Speaker. We haven't enacted any safety or environmental reforms in response to the BP Deepwater Horizon spill. Let me repeat that. We haven't enacted any safety or environmental reforms in response to the BP Deepwater Horizon spill. A footnote here: BP has not paid for all of the damage that they did in that area, and I defy anybody to show me how it is that they did. I ask anybody who is getting ready to eat seafood that comes out of that bay to look at the damage that was done and at the continuing sediment that continues to rise from that area that was polluted.

What happens to all of those Floridians whose livelihoods depend upon our oceans and beaches?

If you want to know, ask the oyster people what happens. Ask the shrimpers who go out into the gulf what their product looks like nowadays, including the deformed product that they are seeing from this awful disaster.

Florida's GDP from its living resources, which includes fishing, hatcheries, aquaculture, seafood processing, and seafood markets, is worth nearly \$300 million. Additionally, the State's GDP from ocean-based tourism and recreation is nearly \$16.5 billion. On top of that, Florida generates millions of dollars in commercial fishing, including shrimp, mackerel, blue crab, swordfish, and stone crabs, which we are finding are diminishing in numbers. We have 350,000 jobs in tourism and recreation and nearly 120,000 direct jobs in recreational and commercial fishing.

But you can't eat contaminated fish, and who wants to spend one's hard-

earned dollars and vacation time lounging on a beach that is covered in tar balls?

When I lifted up on Monday in the US Air plane and looked down at the shore of Florida, I saw what amounts to about a mile-long oil slick. I saw people walking, and I knew that, in a matter of time, they would be walking on tar balls.

How bad does the next spill have to be?

Climate change is not even pending anymore. It is here, and its effects are conspicuous. Downtown Miami, for example, floods whenever it rains, and so does Hollywood, Florida, and areas that I live around. People can't get to work, businesses can't open, and historic droughts have now ravaged the West, and my friends say that there is nothing to concern ourselves about as it pertains to climate change.

The Risky Business report just released by President George W. Bush's former Treasury Secretary—Henry Paulson—and Mayor Bloomberg and Tom Steyer and other former Cabinet officers, lawmakers, corporate leaders, and scientists says climate change could cost the country billions of dollars over the next two decades.

This bill fully ignores the reality of the world we live in, but I do want to say one thing.

In yesterday's Rules Committee, my friend who is managing this rule, Mr. BISHOP from Utah, did make to me a compelling argument regarding education in the State of Utah and the fact that, on some of the Federal lands in Utah, if they had an opportunity to do further oil exploration, it could have an impact on Utah's economy. I think that, in many respects, a lot of that is reasonable. I am hopeful that at some point some of his views in that regard will prevail, but I hope, for the most part, that his overall views do not prevail.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), my good friend.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

H.R. 4899 is yet another example of the majority's backward energy policy that doubles down on dirty fossil fuels instead of investing in a clean energy future. The bill also specifically targets my congressional district, requiring new oil drilling leases off the central coast of California.

□ 1300

This is the fourth time in as many years that the House leadership has tried to override the will of my constituents and California voters who overwhelmingly oppose new offshore drilling.

Even if drilling in these waters could start tomorrow, it would certainly have no impact on gas prices.

Why is that? Because the low-quality oil off the central coast of California can't be used to make gasoline. It is used to make asphalt.

While I certainly support investing more in our Nation's roads and bridges, this is certainly not the way to do it, so I find it incredibly disingenuous for my colleagues to pretend that this bill would lower gas prices for consumers when, in reality, it is just another big giveaway to Big Oil.

I also oppose this rule because it blocks consideration of two important amendments that I had filed. One of those amendments simply required a study on the environmental impacts of offshore fracking.

We depend on our oceans for such varied needs and values that the least we can do is understand how they are impacted by these offshore activities. Our constituents sent us here to get things done, not to stifle debate, but this rule won't even allow us to discuss this important issue.

The rule also blocks a vote on my amendment to protect the central coast from additional offshore drilling.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. CAPPS. This amendment is identical to one which was made in order to be considered on the floor last year, when the House last considered this redundant legislation.

Perhaps the majority believes it is a waste of time to consider something that has already been voted upon. I only wish they would apply this logic to bills that they bring to the floor because, if they did, we wouldn't be here wasting our time with a bill the House already voted on last year.

Stapling two old bills together doesn't make it a new idea. H.R. 4899 is still a bad idea, and it is still a waste of time.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and to oppose the underlying bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1426, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act of 2013, Representative TIM BISHOP's bill, to end the billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies given to the largest, most profitable oil companies each year.

To discuss our proposal, I am pleased, at this time, to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), my good friend.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise to urge defeat of the previous question to allow consideration of my legislation, the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act, which would finally end middle class subsidies to big oil companies.

For too long, this Congress has perpetuated corporate welfare, saying job

creators need incentives to continue growing this country, but last year, the largest oil companies reported a bottom-line profit of \$93 billion—let me say that again, \$93 billion—and yet, this Republican-led Congress continues to lavish subsidies and tax breaks on these highly-profitable companies.

We can not overlook that cuts to good programs continue during this second year of sequestration and, as we face the ever-present imperative to cut the deficit, Congress should rethink preferential treatment for Big Oil that burdens millions of hardworking Americans and small businesses which foot the bill for these subsidies.

For instance, we can save \$9.2 billion over 10 years by repealing the outdated section 199 tax break, which designates oil production as a manufacturing activity, and gives Big Oil a 6 percent deduction from their income. This could be much better spent on real efforts to create jobs, increase revenue, and support local economies.

We could direct that funding towards infrastructure construction or education or keep it in the energy sector, to further incentivize renewable energy technology development, rather than perpetuate our reliance on fossil fuels.

These are real job creation efforts that Congress has supported in the past and are still needed to ignite economic growth; or we could use the savings from the bill to help fill the immediate need to pay for the shortfall in the highway trust fund, which will run out of money only weeks from now.

This means the House could leave this week without a solution to this impending crisis threatening to freeze construction projects and lay off workers, further imperiling our Nation's economic recovery.

There is no shortage of solutions Congress needs to reach this year, and many of them have steep price tags. By supporting the previous question, my colleagues can use a source of funds that oil companies won't miss to offset our to-do list.

With no signs from the majority about whether the House will ever move to consider tax reform, it remains unclear, when—if ever—the opportunity will arise again to reform the Tax Code, so that it reflects the needs and aspirations of working families and small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in better prioritizing taxpayers' funds by defeating the previous question.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise at this time and ask if you would learn from my colleague if he is ready to close. I have no further speakers, and I am prepared at this time to close.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The gentleman has only from me yet to hear.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that these bills just leave us spinning our wheels, while we could be making actual progress in helping hardworking Americans all across this Nation.

It is outrageous that 3 million Americans have lost their emergency unemployment insurance since it expired in December 2013. I might add that we learned yesterday that 300,000 of that 3 million are American veterans.

We have also had, along with the expiration of tax extender provisions that help individuals that have expired, they help families and small businesses invest.

Republicans and Democrats should be working together to move our Nation forward on comprehensive immigration reform, and I might add that I agree with everybody that says that the border needs to be secure, and one good way to do that is to do comprehensive immigration reform and tax reform.

We need to raise the minimum wage in this country, and we need to protect voting rights and secure equal pay.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before I will urge my colleagues to vote "no," I just want to make it very clear that the measures that we are considering today have already been voted on by the House and did not go further to become law. The likelihood of this measure reaching that same fate is very strong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

Vote "no" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am an old history teacher, and one of the things I have always claimed for my students is you should actually try to look to the past, to see how you can plan for the future.

When Ronald Reagan became President of the United States, this country was faced with the crisis of double-digit inflation, double-digit unemployment, and double-digit interest rates; and as President, after so many years of a Congress that tried to have the policy of spending ourselves into economic growth that failed, his issue was: Which of those do you attack first?

I think it is interesting to realize—to grab hold of each of those issues, his first action was to increase the supply of affordable energy. That became the basis of growing an economy in which he could then attack each of those problems of unemployment and inflation and interest rates which were plaguing this country.

We have to realize now that a strong foundation of affordable energy is extremely significant, from whatever source, but especially from what will be workable now.

High gasoline prices—and the price that is increasing in every form of energy we have today—hurts the middle class, and it especially hurts the working poor, many of whom have to decide, every time they go to the pump, whether they are going to put food on the table or fill up the minivan.

We have to deal with something. Now, in my area of the west where we live and the part of the country where the distances between communities are extremely large, as opposed to back here in the east, where everything is so lumped closely together, the increase in fuel costs hits home with a real inflicting pain.

I am sorry. The policies of the past that we had that made the desert bloom are being reversed by the policies of the present. Whether you are at the pump realizing the pain that is inflicted or whether your concern is what kind of energy cost it will take when you go into the room and flip on the light or you decide to cook food, we have to realize these are real problems facing middle America, as well as the working poor of America.

We can either come up with policies that move us forward, or we can implement policies that allow us to freeze in the dark, and so far, we have done a good job on the latter and not the first.

Republicans in the House of Representatives have passed several bills over the past few years—and this year as well—aimed at increasing U.S. domestic fuel production, only to have those bills sidelined in the deliberative body on the other side of this building.

It reminds me of a great quote, when Thomas Brackett Reed, the old Speaker of the House, went over to the Senate to watch them in debate and came back and announced to the body:

Thank heavens we are not a deliberative body.

There are problems that we have that can be solved. We have those places, too, and I appreciate the fact the gentleman from Florida did mention that China and others are putting money into alternative energy programs.

They are also going around the world and gobbling up whatever kinds of oil and coal resources they can get their hands on, to support and sustain a growing economy over there, while our administration is taking the United States in the opposite direction by self-inflicted artificial limits, policies that have actually hurt our economy, killed high-paying jobs, and increased the cost of consumer goods for all, including the middle class.

There are reasons why, Mr. Speaker, in the last 6 years, our economy is simply limping along, and we should learn the lessons of the past to recognize what we can do from that. Our economic malaise can be attributed to a lack of attention to a commonsense energy program on Federal lands.

So what would this bill, H.R. 4899, actually do? It would establish and demand a new 5-year plan for the leases of those areas, with the concept of

going after where the resources actually are. We can talk about all the lands that are leased, but it is totally unimportant if there are no resources there.

Have a plan that focuses on where the resources are. Produce a revenue-sharing plan with the coastal States. Come up with three distinct agencies which would replace the new structure that has been put upon since the oil spill and make them actually functioning. That is the problem.

I agree with some of the things you have said. We haven't done much in reform, but we have done a whole lot in regulatory reform on the administrative level, and I agree with you, that that hasn't worked as well.

To establish a policy that the NPR-A is for the purpose of providing oil as a resource to the United States and to establish some kind of Internet-based auctions for these programs—look, we are not talking about taking over everything and drilling everywhere.

This Federal Government owns somewhere around 400 to 450 million acres of land. Of that, 350, roughly, are already in a conservation status that can never be touched.

There are 50 million acres, at the most, that have development potential, and those are the areas in which policies of this administration are strangling the ability to move them forward.

I will—because I hadn't planned on it, so I don't have my wonderful charts here. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida talking about education because I want to finish off with that in just one second.

I appreciate his sentiment that, some day, my position can prevail, but unless we change the overall Federal position, I can't get that moving forward, and that is why it becomes extremely important.

We are not just talking about gas at the pump and the cost of electricity and the cost of cooking your food. There are also those tradeoff effects which specifically deal with education.

If one looks at a map of the States, there is overwhelming control by the Federal Government of ownership of the land, the public land States of the Midwest and the west coast, and you look at the States which have the hardest time increasing their funding for public education.

It is an amazing correlation between the two, which means that, over the past 20 years, those who do not live in public land States, those areas east of Denver, which average about 4 percent of their States being controlled by the Federal Government, have grown their educational funding by 68 percent.

□ 1315

Those of us who average over 50 percent of our land controlled by the Federal Government in these public lands States have grown our education budget by 35 percent.

It is simply a matter that my State cannot improve its education funding

alone unless we are allowed to develop some of the resources we have in huge abundance but are tied up in the policies of the Federal Government.

So, yes, it is true. We are growing petroleum activities in this country. We are growing our exploration. We are growing what we are developing, what we are exporting. But it is all coming from private lands and State lands that are not part of the West. And if you want to keep that growth on a continuous basis and not have spikes, then you have to go after the resources that we have on the public lands.

And if you were allowed to do that, not only would we get royalties coming back in from those resources, but it would spin off all sorts of jobs that would then generate the income tax we need and the sales tax revenue and the royalties to replace the fact that we are not getting property tax from lands that are controlled by the Federal Government and were promised to us a long time ago when we became States.

This bill provides a plan on how to do this. This bill is something that is desperately needed if we are going to move forward. If enacted into law, it would encourage greater oil and gas development on Federal onshore and offshore lands with a plan of how you actually accomplish it and how you do it. And it may actually give my kids a chance at a fairer shot for an education, because they desperately need it, and the status quo is not providing it. And that has to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I would only urge Members to support this rule. It is a fair rule. It is a good rule. And then I would hope, afterwards, they would support the underlying bills which provide for our Nation's critical energy needs and would help promote jobs at the same time, as well as funding for my schools in Utah.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 641 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1426) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities with respect to oil and gas activities of major integrated oil companies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on

the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1426.

**THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

**DOMESTIC PROSPERITY AND GLOBAL FREEDOM ACT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1318

**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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 24, 2014, all time for general debate had 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 Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-48. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 6

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act".*

**SEC. 2. ACTION ON APPLICATIONS.**

(a) *DECISION DEADLINE.*—The Department of Energy shall issue a decision on any application

for authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) not later than 90 days after the later of—

(1) the end of the comment period for such decision as set forth in the applicable notice published in the Federal Register; or

(2) the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) *JUDICIAL ACTION.*—(1) The United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the export facility will be located pursuant to an application described in subsection (a) shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of—

(A) an order issued by the Department of Energy with respect to such application; or

(B) the Department of Energy's failure to issue a decision on such application.

(2) If the Court in a civil action described in paragraph (1) finds that the Department of Energy has failed to issue a decision on the application as required under subsection (a), the Court shall order the Department of Energy to issue such decision not later than 30 days after the Court's order.

(3) The Court shall set any civil action brought under this subsection for expedited consideration and shall set the matter on the docket as soon as practical after the filing date of the initial pleading.

**SEC. 3. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF EXPORT DESTINATIONS.**

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) *PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LNG EXPORT DESTINATIONS.*—As a condition for approval of any authorization to export LNG, the Secretary of Energy shall require the applicant to publicly disclose the specific destination or destinations of any such authorized LNG exports."

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113-492. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113-492.

Mr. GARDNER. 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:

Redesignate subsection (b) of section 2 as subsection (c).

Strike subsection (a) of section 2 and insert the following:

(a) *DECISION DEADLINE.*—For proposals that must also obtain authorization from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or the United States Maritime Administration to site, construct, expand, or operate LNG export facilities, the Department of Energy shall issue a final decision on any application for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) not later than 30 days after the later of—

(1) the conclusion of the review to site, construct, expand, or operate the LNG facilities required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(2) the date of enactment of this Act.