

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1201

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON) at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AMERICAN ENERGY SOLUTIONS FOR LOWER COSTS AND MORE AMERICAN JOBS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, JOBS FOR AMERICA ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 22, 2014, THROUGH NOVEMBER 11, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 727 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 727

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2) to remove Federal Government obstacles to the production of more domestic energy; to ensure transport of that energy reliably to businesses, consumers, and other end users; to lower the cost of energy to consumers; to enable manufacturers and other businesses to access domestically produced energy affordably and reliably in order to create and sustain more secure and well-paying American jobs; and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4) to make revisions to Federal law to improve the conditions necessary for economic growth and job creation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order

against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from September 22, 2014, through November 11, 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. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, 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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today, the House is considering a rule for the consideration of two bills, a package to boost America's energy production and a package to jump-start our American economy. Combined, these bills will help get America back to work with an America that we can afford.

First, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2, the American Energy Solutions for Lower Costs and More American Jobs Act.

This bill would accomplish three important goals for the American family: first, it would create up to 1.2 million good-paying jobs for Americans who are out of work or who are underemployed; second, it would lower—it would lower—energy prices in America; third, it would draw our country closer to an important goal that we should all share, and that is American energy independence.

Let's start by identifying the problem. The facts of the case are that the Federal Government is standing in the way of an American energy boom. That

means they are standing in the way of American progress and progress for Americans to have jobs and a better life.

For over 6 years, the American people have waited for this administration to approve construction of the Keystone pipeline. Unfortunately, the approval process has been marred by indecision and unnecessary delays.

First, opponents of the pipeline argue that it would be an environmental disaster; since then, virtually all of the major environmental concerns surrounding the project have been not only addressed, but debugged.

Second, opponents of the pipeline argue that it was unsafe; yet study after study after study have shown the pipeline to be safe and an effective means to transport much-needed energies for America's resources.

The opponents of the Keystone pipeline have run out of excuses, but they continue to delay a decision.

Then there is the Department of Energy, which has been far too slow in approving applications to export liquefied natural gas. The Department has decided on only nine applications submitted to it for the last 4 years.

Twenty-six applications still await action—many, many of which have been delayed by this administration for purely political reasons—another reason to say they are getting in the way of Americans having jobs today. They are getting in the way of American independence for energy.

As a result of these delays, America is squandering an energy boom that could make America, which is the largest producer of natural gas, even better and add to the American economy.

The Department's broken application process destroys good-paying jobs and hampers our economic growth. The energy revolution already supports 1.7 million high-paying, great jobs in America, and we could add an additional 1.3 million new American high-paying jobs by 2020, but only if the Federal Government will get out of the way of its development.

It also allows our international competitors, such as Russia and Iran, not to be dominant in the marketplace and not to use domination for political power and economic power over other countries in Europe.

The Federal Government has ruled 87 percent of our offshore acreage currently off-limits to energy production. Even worse, the administration doesn't have a plan to develop these resources. In fact, the administration's offshore leasing plan for the next 3 years offers no new areas for lease and includes the lowest number of lease sales in history.

This administration's no new drilling policies have cost Americans jobs. We have forfeited revenue that would help us pay down our national debt and denied access to American oil and natural gas that would lessen dependence on foreign sources. More importantly, the American consumer continues to pay higher prices at the pump, nearly

double from the time this administration took office a scant 5-plus years ago.

My friends in the minority might rightly point out that U.S. oil and natural gas production is growing; however, the growth is entirely due to increased output on State and private lands, not on Federal lands. Our growth in energy production is in spite of the Federal Government, not because of it.

Combined, these policies hurt the American people. They hurt men, women, and families who need to be able to have a stable price at the pump with energy that is available in a constant supply throughout the seasons.

High energy costs drive up prices, they limit what American families can do with their individual resources, and it is a problem in our economy. That means that the American people have less money in their pockets to buy groceries, to pay the mortgage, or to purchase school supplies for their kids.

What are the solutions to these problems? First, the energy package considered under this rule would speed up approval of the Keystone pipeline. When completed, the Keystone pipeline will transport over 800,000 barrels of oil every single day, adding to the supply.

That means that we can wean ourselves off Middle East oil. The equivalent of half of our daily imports comes from the Middle East.

Second, the bill would force the Department of Energy to issue a final decision on applications to export liquefied natural gas within 30 days of completing the environmental review process, an important step in increasing our exports of LNG and adding to the 1.3 million jobs that are awaiting filling as a result of this delay by this administration.

Third, H.R. 2 would expand oil and natural gas production in the United States by rolling back the administration's overzealous environmental policies that have slowed our economic progress and made energy too expensive.

At a time when so many Americans are unemployed and underemployed, this job-creating legislation would unleash our vast energy resources to create these 1.2 million jobs. We need them now. We need America to have stable energy prices.

In short, the bill would finally pave a way forward for energy policies that would lower energy prices, strengthen our economy, create jobs, lessen our dependence on foreign energy sources, and give the American family and worker an opportunity to have gasoline at the pump at a lesser price.

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

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

□ 1215

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

bills, the so-called American Energy Solutions for Lower Costs and More American Jobs Act—it is H.R. 2—and the Jobs for America, so-called, Act, H.R. 4. Don't let the titles of these bills fool you. H.R. 2 and H.R. 4 won't create any new jobs but would continue to degrade the quality of life and health of the American people.

These bills put more money in the pockets of big industry, corporate welfare, undermine the efficiency of our regulatory activities, and continue to fail to provide opportunities for the middle class, while they continue to enrich international conglomerates and corporations.

Not only are these bills bad, but I should add, Mr. Speaker, the House has already voted on all of these bills that are already included in H.R. 2 and H.R. 4 this session—just another waste of taxpayer time and money here debating and voting on bills that have already been passed. Just as the Republicans have chosen to repeal the Affordable Care Act 53 times, so too we are passing many of these bills for the second time here today if that is the decision the House chooses to make.

Now, I think it is clear, all of us here know, that these bills will not become law, that the Senate did not take them up after the House passed them. There is no indication or reason to believe that in this new configuration and being lumped together in new and more sinister ways that the Senate will react any more positively.

Sadly, it is quite clear that the majority here in the House are either unable or unwilling to bring forth fresh ideas to jump-start the middle class.

These bills instead are bound to political pandering, rewarding of campaign donors and large corporations in advance of elections, instead of taking advantage of our precious few remaining days of session to address the real problems facing our Nation.

I am also dismayed that both of these bills are being reviewed under a closed rule here today. It was fairly recently here on the floor of the House that we celebrated the diamond jubilee of closed rules, 75 closed rules from the Republican Party. H.R. 2 and H.R. 4 are the 76th and 77th closed rules this Congress. Just before this Chamber breaks for a 6-week-long recess, the majority has shut down the process of regular order and not allowed Republicans or Democrats to offer our amendments to improve these bills.

Even though they are not bringing new legislation before us today, we should at least allow—at least allow—Democrats and Republicans to offer their ideas to make these bills better. What is the point in passing the exact same bills without even giving Members of this body the ability to make them better?

I offered two amendments in this bill, which I will speak about later, but, unfortunately, neither was made in order. Other Members of this body also offered great ideas to help improve this

legislation, but none were allowed. Instead, we have a restricted rule which has shut out debate from Members on both sides of the aisle. If we can defeat this rule, we can move forward with an open process, encouraging and allowing amendments from both sides of the aisle.

We don't have the precious time left for political posturing. While we were talking here now, I got a text on my phone that votes are, in fact, canceled for tomorrow. I am not sure if my colleague is yet aware of that or if the Speaker is yet aware of that, but this, in fact, may be the last day that we are in session before the election.

And yet instead of dealing with immigration reform, there is a bill to pass of more than two-thirds. Instead of protecting LGBT Americans from being fired from their job just because of who they love or who they are, here we are today bringing forward bills that have already passed in different configurations, that would hurt the quality of life for American families, that would hurt the environment and hurt the health of the American people.

This compilation of bills in H.R. 2 is really an oil and gas industry wish list. Now, of course all of us support responsible energy development on Federal lands and private lands, make sure we balance production with our quality of life and our health. This bill, however, would prioritize development over all other uses of land and all other values that we hold as a country. This bill would also reduce important protections that we have in favor of speculative energy exploration and development.

Now is not the time to pass a massive corporate giveaway bill to the oil and gas industry, an industry that is already very profitable. They don't need more taxpayer subsidies just to add to their bottom line, especially not at the expense of our health, our environment, and the enjoyment of our public lands and our quality of life.

While there are many problematic provisions in the bill, several are particularly concerning. One provision in the bill would streamline pipeline approvals, so would even allow for the automatic approval of natural gas pipeline projects without any impact studies or opportunities for public comment.

This bill would also discourage environmental analysis, undermine agency decisions like curbing carbon pollution, and yet another provision would prevent the Federal Government from overseeing fracking activities on Federal lands, an issue near and dear to the hearts of my constituents in the State of Colorado.

It is particularly egregious that given that this bill has a wish list from the oil and gas industry, that somehow, for those of us who support an all-of-the-above energy approach, it left out the wind energy production tax credit.

The wind production tax credit is a solution that has allowed for rapid scaling of wind power over the past couple of decades. So why would we be doubling down with taxpayer subsidies for the oil and gas industry at the same time we are not even renewing the one important subsidy that wind energy has?

Now, I offered two different solutions for this, and I was hoping either one of them would have been a constructive way to approach this on the floor of the House. I offered an amendment with Mr. PERLMUTTER to simply extend the wind production tax credit for the next 2 years. Now, that would create jobs, encourage private investment, and allow wind energy to compete on a level playing field with the heavily subsidized oil and gas industry.

I also offered another solution—and I am certainly willing to support either—and that solution would be to eliminate the over \$40 billion in taxpayer subsidies to the oil and gas industry. If we had gone that route, again, at least wind and solar energy would be able to compete on a level playing field because we would stop doling out our precious taxpayer dollars as subsidies to the legacy interests in the oil and gas industry.

That too was not allowed to even be debated, not for 10 minutes, not for 1 minute. Instead, apparently having Friday off was more important than allowing Democratic and Republican Members of this body to present their ideas on how to make a bad bill better.

H.R. 4, the Jobs for America Act, is a group of 15 bills that have also been previously passed by the House. Many of them serve to attack our processes we have in place to keep American consumers safe. The bill empowers polluters, bogs down agencies that are charged with protecting the public health. None of them have become law, having already been passed, and I think all my colleagues here know that none of them will become law in this new and more sinister configuration.

Now, I would love to see a balanced tax extender package that lowers the Federal deficit, strengthens our economy, can actually pass the Senate and be signed into law, but I think we all know that is not the bill before us today.

H.R. 4 would actually add to the deficit by making tax cuts for many special interests permanent. A \$574 billion deficit-busting bill on our last day of session, what a great lead-in to the general election for the Republicans to present a massive, Big Government spending, \$574 billion subsidy bill for our consideration. I think the American people understand the contrast and the different approaches that are in play this year.

Now, an amendment I offered with Mr. BLUMENAUER, which I mentioned earlier, would have offset some of that cost by eliminating the oil and gas industry subsidies to the tune of \$40 billion. Now, the bill still would have cost

\$534 billion, but it would have cost \$40 billion less if we had eliminated the oil and gas subsidies. But, again, apparently having a Friday off is more important to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle than having a full and open debate of the merits or lack of merits of the proposal I advanced with Mr. BLUMENAUER.

In summary, I oppose the closed rule in addition to the underlying bills.

Now, we could have shown the American people that Congress could end on a positive note, that we could come together and address our broken immigration system, that we could come together to address our deficit; but instead, we are providing yet another example of why Congress continues to have record low approval ratings: rehashed, repackaged, partisan bills costing taxpayers \$574 billion, enriching the special interests in corporations, and then going on vacation. And people wonder why the American people aren't thrilled with the United States Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee has actually read the bills that are in this package and knows that they are much more than what my colleague and friend from Colorado just described. Because actually, the forestry legislation is something that passed this House 363 days ago in a big bipartisan vote, a big portion of which was written by my Democratic friends PETER DEFAZIO and KURT SCHRADER. That is in this package.

We have another bill coming up later that has twice passed this House unanimously. Those aren't partisan bills that are being put out, as you said, Mr. POLIS, to reward donors or anything else. This is about creating jobs in America.

By the way, lots of parts of the world, like my district, need jobs. They need the certainty of jobs. And I don't know about Colorado, but Oregon and California and a lot of places are going up in smoke, choked with smoke because of forest fires.

The legislation in this package that we are going to send back over to the Senate one more time, thanks to this rule and thanks to the leadership of this chairman, would allow us to get people back to work in the woods, address the problems of these fires, produce revenues for schoolteachers, for sheriffs and sheriff's deputies, for search and rescue, for all the basic, fundamental services that matter in rural communities and, I think, matter across the West.

So, if you don't believe in taking care of your forests, then vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, 363 days ago, the House passed H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy

Forests for Healthy Communities Act. Two days short of a year, the Senate has done nothing—nothing. They failed to pass a single active forestry bill—nothing. Our forests are going up in smoke. We are spending taxpayer dollars to fight the fires. We are devastating watersheds. This has to change.

The Federal Government controls over 50 percent of the land in Oregon. In 10 of the 20 counties I represent, they control over half of the land. Over the last 30 years, timber harvests on these lands, these Federal lands, has been decreased by 90 percent—nine-zero. Forests aren't static; they keep growing and they keep dying. We get beetle infestations; we get drought; and then we get fire. Nothing happens after the fire, other than the trees sit there and burn. Then they die; then they rot; then they fall over. There is no productive use. All that needs to change.

Ninety percent reduction in harvest of Federal lands.

Do you know what that means out in our areas where the Federal Government is supposed to be the steward? It means that we have lost 300 mills and 30,000 American jobs—30,000 American jobs. These are jobs bills we are talking about here. These same rural areas that I represent have poverty rates at 20, 25, 30, even as high as 33.9 percent in Josephine County, right down in here, 33.9.

You want to do something about poverty? Create a job. You want to do something about getting America on track? Pass these bills. Get the Senate to pass these bills. We will create jobs. We will generate revenue. We will have positive cash flow in this country for once. It doesn't have to be this way. We can put people back to work. So Chairman HASTINGS and Chairman BISHOP and myself and others worked on the bipartisan forestry legislation.

As I mentioned, we actually have run this bill through an independent evaluation process to say what does this mean for the people of Oregon, because there is a portion here that relates just to the O&C lands which are only in Oregon. Democratic Governor—Democratic Governor—John Kitzhaber, his team took a look at our bipartisan bill, and they concluded that it would create or save 3,000 Oregon jobs. These are real jobs. These are real people. These are real families that have been suffering. Three thousand Oregon jobs.

It would generate \$100 million in revenue or thereabouts. That would pay—pay—for basic services, pay for basic services. 500 million board-feet of timber a year would be harvested. It would be predictable. You would have a private sector involvement here.

Twenty-nine Oregon counties, from Klamath, to Hood River, to Wallowa, including all 20 in my district, 29 Oregon counties passed resolutions supporting this bipartisan legislation. We passed it 363 days ago. The Senate, I don't know what they do over there, not much productive. We are going to give them another chance.

Yes, we are repackaging these bills. Yes, the House has passed these bills before. Yes, they passed in a bipartisan manner. We are at the end of our legislative session. It is time, one more time, to make another attempt to pass this into law, to wake up the Senate, to get them to do the right thing.

So support the rule. Let's move forward. We don't need more partisan rhetoric here. We need to help America get on its feet. We need to take better care of our forests. We need to take better care of our watersheds. We need to put people back to work in America. And that is what these bills do.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. And for the benefit of my colleagues, I want to be very clear about one of the implications of the language in this rule that is before us.

□ 1230

A vote for this rule is a vote to shut off the mechanisms of the War Powers Resolution for the next 2 months. If any Member of this House has any concerns about the ongoing military operations in Iraq, the potential of U.S. military airstrikes in Syria, or the possible introduction of U.S. combat ground forces into either country, then this rule will tie their hands for the next 2 months.

If any Member introduces a privileged resolution under the terms of the War Powers Resolution, this rule freezes that resolution in place and stops the clock that would normally advance under the War Powers Resolution.

It is perfectly clear that the House will not debate and vote on an authorization on Iraq at this time. Unfortunately, it is not clear if any vote will ever happen at any time in this House, even after we come back in November, even though there is a growing bipartisan consensus that such an authorization is needed.

This rule freezes out each and every Member of this House from taking any action to move forward the possibility of a vote on Iraq or Syria under the terms put in place by the War Powers Resolution.

On August 8, the U.S. began daily bombing in Iraq—at first to protect the Yazidis trapped on Mount Sinjar. But almost immediately, the bombing campaign expanded to include infrastructure, and then to provide air support to ground operations to retake territory by Iraqi and Kurdish military forces, and then to protect more major infrastructure, and this week to dislodge ISIL from the environs of Baghdad. For 6 weeks, I have been waiting patiently for the leadership of this House to recognize that what we all know is true: the United States is engaged in hostilities and carrying out sustained combat operations in Iraq and that it

is time for the House to debate and vote on an authorization.

Yesterday, this House voted to authorize training and equipping Syrian opposition forces. But we have yet to debate and vote on an authorization for the combat operations we are already carrying out in Iraq. Over 150 airstrikes—bombs falling nearly every day—in Iraq. And if that doesn't count as sustained combat, then I don't know what the hell does.

I hear the Senate is drafting an authorization, but no such leadership is happening here in the House. The Speaker says he is waiting for the White House to send a request for an authorization to the House. But as I have said before, the President has stated that he thinks he has all the authority in the world that he needs or wants. It is Congress that is failing to carry out its constitutional responsibilities. It is Congress that is shirking its duties. It is Congress that is sniping from the sidelines while avoiding any responsibility for the servicemen and -women that we are placing in harm's way.

In July, this House overwhelmingly passed a resolution that I offered, along with WALTER JONES and BARBARA LEE, requiring the House to vote on an authorization. And I have been waiting—patiently and respectfully—for the Speaker to schedule such a vote.

Instead, this rule goes in the opposite direction, shutting down the ability of any Member to introduce a privileged resolution and allowing it to mature, as we set forth in the War Powers Resolution.

Now, I understand that this restriction is often included when Congress is in recess for a prolonged period of time. But this time is different, Mr. Speaker, and every Member of this Chamber knows it is different.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Not only are we engaged in sustained combat operations in Iraq, but the President announced last week that he intends to escalate and expand those military operations, and quite likely extend them to Syria. This is a moment in history when the House should not and must not remain silent, let alone slink out of town. We have a responsibility to act.

Until that happens, until we get an ironclad commitment from the leadership of this House that we will debate and vote on an authorization, then I would urge my colleagues to vote down this rule. We have a constitutional responsibility when it comes to war.

Now, I don't believe we should go into another war, but whether you agree with me or you think we should launch into another war, we have an obligation, a constitutional responsibility, to debate and vote on that authorization. We are not doing that. I urge the Speaker to give us that commitment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Massachusetts well understands that we handled a privileged resolution on the floor where there was a vote a little bit more than a month ago before the last break.

What the gentleman wants to do is bring Congress back to come and grandstand on the floor for a privileged resolution during the break. The gentleman well understands the rules of the House, the privileges that he is given as a Member, and he knows that he has approached me numerous times, as well as the Speaker of the House, who has offered the gentleman every opportunity, under the rules of the House, that any Member would have.

What this very clearly says is we will not start that clock while we are on recess. That is a normal and regular thing for the House to do, for the rules of this House to protect all the Members.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I see no reason to. The gentleman just had time and spoke his words. I thank the gentleman very much.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Grandfather Community, North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Each year, Washington imposes thousands of pages of rules and regulations on America's private sector employers, as well as State and local governments. Buried in those pages are costly Federal mandates that make it harder for businesses to hire and cash-strapped States, counties, and cities to serve their citizens.

There are some who may not understand why a bill to improve the regulatory process is also a bill about jobs. As a former small business owner, I understand firsthand the concerns job creators have about how lengthy, confusing rules affect their ability to conduct business and provide jobs and opportunities to their employees.

That is why I introduced H.R. 899, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, which we call UMITA, and am glad to see it included in H.R. 4, the Jobs for America Act.

The bill builds upon the bipartisan 1995 Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, also known as UMRA, and will ensure awareness and public disclosure of the cost—in dollars and jobs—that Federal dictates pose to the economy and local governments.

H.R. 899, as included in H.R. 4, does not seek to prevent the Federal Government from regulating. Rather, it seeks to ensure that its regulations are deliberative and economically defensible.

Asking regulators to thoroughly consider and understand the costs of a rule in addition to its benefits should not be

controversial—it is just plain common sense.

Regulators and legislators should know exactly what they are asking the American people to pay and whether the cost of compliance might make it harder for family businesses to meet payroll and stay afloat.

And no government body—on purpose or accidentally—should skirt public scrutiny when jobs and scarce resources are at stake.

In the nearly 20 years since UMRA's passage, weaknesses in the law have been revealed, weaknesses that some government agencies and independent regulatory bodies have exploited.

UMITA makes independent regulatory agencies subject to UMRA's requirements, ending a two-tier system that allowed regulations to be implemented without the required consideration, scrutiny, or public input.

H.R. 899 recognizes that the Federal Government's reach extends way beyond the taxes it collects and the money it spends. Regulations can advance government initiatives without using tax dollars.

Rather than count expenses for new programs, the government can require the private sector, as well as State and local governments, to pay for Federal initiatives through compliance costs.

This bill shines much needed light on the murky regulatory process and ensures the public has transparent access to proposed rules and regulations.

Both Democrats and Republicans recognize that appropriate regulations don't need to be issued in the dead of night or negotiated behind closed doors. That is why the House passed H.R. 899 with bipartisan support earlier this year.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I won't need 1½ minutes, but I want to be clear for Members. The privileges that are afforded to Members of this House to vote on the war, those privileges are taken away by this rule.

I want to assure the gentleman from Texas, my colleague and my friend, that I am not interested in grandstanding, and any such a suggestion I find offensive, quite frankly. What I am interested in is us doing our job.

And I want to remind my colleagues that war is a big deal. It is a big deal, and it is long past time that this House treated it as such. We have a constitutional responsibility that we are not living up to.

We voted in July overwhelmingly to say that if there are sustained combat operations in Iraq we are going to have a vote on that. Well, there are sustained combat operations in Iraq. We are much more deeply involved today than we were in July. And I predict by

the time we come back in November we will be even more deeply involved.

When are we going to do our job? When are we going to vote? That is what my complaint is about, I would say to the gentleman from Texas. My complaint is that we are not living up to our constitutional responsibilities.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With great respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I appreciate his insistence on the floor and respect that very much.

I think that this House is, respectfully, doing its obligations and duties. That is what we are doing here today, trying to work with the American people so that we can once again move a jobs package forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman for yielding.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this rule and the underlying legislation, which I support, because included in the underlying legislation is H.R. 1493, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlement Act, that I authored.

I support these bills that the House will debate and vote on because they will make a difference in the lives of and make them more affordable for families in Georgia and all across America.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Republican solutions that are offered in these bills that are being brought to the floor today are solutions for moms and dads who can't find full-time employment, who can't afford to buy a full tank of gas, who sit down at the kitchen table with a heavy heart because they can't afford the basics that they just heard their child talk about that they wanted.

Mr. Speaker, America is searching for the things that matter. They are wanting their government to work and they are wanting their government to put ideas to paper. It is not the ideas simply spoken on the floor, but it is the ideas and the dreams and the hopes of every family as they come together wanting a better life, and they want the government not to impede those areas and actually to encourage them.

These bills don't represent just the hard work of my colleagues. They represent the hopes and dreams of Americans who have given up on our government.

House Republicans stand united with one goal: to restore what has been lost. To restore the jobs, the affordable housing, the quality education, the ability to start a business in your home and to see it flourish.

I support these bills to expand domestic energy production because each job it creates equals a family that can put food on the table, buy school uniforms, and do the things that they

want to do, not what government dictates.

I am a Republican because I believe that government exists to help, not hinder its citizens. I support these solutions because I firmly believe every family in this Nation should be able to afford life and everything that it entails.

Remember, our Founders said it is the pursuit of happiness, not a guarantee of happiness. And too many times coming from Washington we want to say we will guarantee your happiness. That is not what the Founders said. In fact, what the Founders said is the government will provide the basis for you to go pursue your own happiness, to provide lifelong tools to those who have fallen on hard times, to help moms who are struggling to provide for their kids and have no one to help them. This is the type of government that I believe in, and this is the type of government Republicans in the House are committed to fighting for.

□ 1245

Unfortunately, many times what happens, I believe, is that the Republicans are the ones that have the ability and the track record to create a Federal Government who keeps our Nation safe from terrorism, who gives parents more control over their children's education, and encourages startups and businesses to grow and hire more and more people.

Unfortunately, many times in our debates over priorities and jobs, we come and paint with broad strokes. We paint with broad strokes, saying that if you want to get government out of the business of hindering businesses through regulation after regulation after regulation—not to destroy quality of life, but to improve business and maintain both—that you are simply destroying the things that built America.

Those are broad strokes that the American people, Mr. Speaker, are no longer buying. They are no longer buying a government that simply gets in the way and does not encourage.

I support these solutions on the floor today because I support a government that works, not a government that works against its people. The Republicans are putting forward on this floor today not just simply partisan bills that have been attacked, but these are bipartisan bills being put forward.

I agree with many on the floor today, but it is time that the system work, and it is time for the United States Senate to work. If they don't like our ideas, they should put their own ideas on paper and send them back over, instead of hindering what is going on and having a debate that simply rounds up in this room right here, with friends on both sides of the aisle frustrated with the process.

Before I came to Congress, I was a pastor. I am still a chaplain in the United States military. The greatest thing that I see for people today is that they have lost trust, unfortunately.

They have broke a breach of faith with us.

I believe when we decide that government should be about the people and for the people, then we are doing exactly what we are supposed to be doing; and that is to encourage, as our Founders said, the pursuit of happiness and not the guarantee of happiness.

When we do that, Mr. Speaker, that is Republican principles at play, that is Republican solutions, and that is what these bills offer today.

Don't buy the other argument. Buy the Republican principles that we will help those who need help, and that is the American citizen. That is what I believe in. That is the government I want to see work, not one that hinders people.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for asking and would respond back that I do not have any additional speakers.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, the comprehensive immigration reform bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thought it was worth a try here to reduce the deficit by over \$200 billion, create several hundred thousand jobs for Americans, secure our border and restore the rule of law but, apparently, going on vacation on Friday is more important.

These are likely the last votes that this Chamber will take before the election. Unfortunately, rather than move forward on protecting our borders, rather than move forward on reducing our deficit, rather than move forward on so many of the important national priorities we have, we are simply taking up bills that have already passed, reconsidering them under new and more sinister forms, and sending them nowhere at no time.

These bills are not going to be law. They didn't become law last time. It is even harder for them to become law when they are packaged together in new and different ways. There is a word for this kind of legislative activity, and it isn't "governing." It is called "pandering."

Rather than spinning our wheels, we should have taken up the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill. I was hoping that I could have gotten the permission under unanimous consent to bring that up. I am confident we have strong support from

Democrats and Republicans in this body to pass that bill and to send it on into law.

Unfortunately, more than a year after the Senate has passed immigration reform, the House still refuses to even allow a vote on our bipartisan immigration reform bill that secures our borders and restores the rule of law, reduces our deficit, and creates jobs for Americans; instead, the only votes the House has taken this year on the entire topic of immigration have been to subject DREAMers—who grew up here and know no other country—to deportation and send immigrant children fleeing violence back to their countries, where they face possible persecution or death.

Rather than continuing to waste the American people's time and taxpayer money debating recycled measures over and over again, I wanted to give this body, through my unanimous consent request, one more opportunity to tackle an issue that will get larger and harder to deal with the longer we wait, and that is immigration.

If there are 10 million people here illegally today, Mr. Speaker, if this body continues to object to every motion we make to bring up a law that would secure our borders and restore the rule of law, there is likely to be 15 million people here illegally in 10 years. You can count on it.

This Nation deserves to have secure borders, we deserve to restore the rule of law, and we deserve to reflect our values as a Nation in our immigration system. I know we have the votes for this bill.

I urge my colleagues to change their plans for tomorrow and, instead, allow us to come back and pass immigration reform so that we can finally solve this issue, reduce our budget deficit, create jobs for Americans, secure our border, and end this Congress on a positive note, a positive note of moving forward on solving an issue that the American people are screaming out for a solution to rather than rehashing and repackaging special interest bills into new and more sinister forms.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider six separate pieces of legislation that are true priorities for jump-starting the middle class: the Paycheck Fairness Act, the Fair Minimum Wage Act, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, the Healthy Families Act, the Strong Start for America's Children Act, and the Bring Jobs Home Act.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I encourage us to stay here and address immigration reform so that we can solve this issue for our country, reduce our deficit, and secure our borders.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this closed rule, number 76 and 77 of this Congress, allowing no allowed amendments from either side, including the very reasonable all-of-the-above energy amendments that I offered with my colleagues Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. BLUMENAUER that either would have eliminated oil and gas subsidies or provided a similar and corresponding subsidy for the production tax credit and wind energy, so at least it can compete on a level playing field with the oil and gas industry.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we have heard a number of speakers not only on the Republican side, but also the Democrat side, talk about the issues that need to be addressed today.

The Republican Party—the Republican majority—under the leadership of our great Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, has gathered together today a group of bills that have passed the House of Representatives, many of them with overwhelming majorities.

We heard the gentleman from Oregon, GREG WALDEN, talking about the plight of the West—and not just in Oregon—where men and women who live in rural communities have found themselves losing their jobs as a result of the administration's policies of how they would treat their own natural resources.

Mr. WALDEN, an Eagle Scout, just as I am an Eagle Scout, has the forestry merit badge. We understand healthy forests and how they can provide a product, a service, and enjoyment to the American people if well-managed; instead, this administration, because of their unwise management techniques, have allowed the West to burn down over the last 5 years.

At record levels, these forests and resources are up in smoke, not allowing those communities the opportunity to properly replant and take care of their own resources.

What I would like to highlight, if I can, is the Tax Code of America and how America is increasingly becoming less competitive with the world as a result of President Obama's and the Democrats' insistence to continually raise taxes and stand in the way of allowing us to be competitive with the world.

I would like to highlight, if I can, a chart here that comes from the Tax Foundation. They say America currently ranks 32nd among 34 major international nations in international tax competitiveness. This competitiveness, as you see here, starting at the very top, would find America 32nd out of 34th.

What does this mean? This means that, at a time when economies around

the world are growing, we are finding that our country is stuck at an average rate of 2.2 percent.

We have other countries, for instance, like India, which has a 5 percent growth; Russia has surpassed ours over the last 4 years; and China finds their GDP growth at 7.7 percent over the last 2 years; and we are finding that, quarter after quarter, American is even or below, only to “roar” back at a 2 percent level.

Ladies and gentlemen, Members of the House, what the package on the floor today is about is to talk about our ability—America—to be competitive with the world so that America's businesses and America's employers find work not only in America but compete on a global basis.

What Republicans are talking about today is a chance to have America gain back its footing, not with supremacy, but with competitiveness on a world stage, in a world market, where American products made by Americans—not just manufacturing, but other important intellectual properties—are sold to the world.

When America is at its very best, we are leaders in not just freedom but also in economic opportunity, and it spurs competitors around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, what we are about today in our closing is that the Republican Party, through our great Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, is sending a strong message to the American people that we in the United States House of Representatives recognize that for America to be competitive, for America's greatest days to be in our future, we must have a comprehensive view of not just the world and our competitiveness, but an opportunity for its citizens—as Congressman COLLINS has said today—to find work, to be entrepreneurial, and to move our country and the world forward. I believe that what we are talking about today makes a difference.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this resolution, “yes” on the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 727 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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. 377) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution 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.

visions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 joint resolution, 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 joint resolution.

SEC. 8. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 377, 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. 1010) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. 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 Education and the Workforce. 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. 9. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 1010, 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. 4582) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the chair and ranking 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. 10. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 4582, 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. 1286) to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. 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. 11. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 1286, 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. 3461) to support early learning. 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 Education and the Workforce. 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. 12. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 3461, 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. 851) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. 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. 13. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 377, H.R. 1010, H.R. 4582, H.R. 1286, H.R. 3461, or H.R. 851.

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: "Al-

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, September 18, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On September 17, 2014, pursuant to section 3307 of Title 40, United States Code, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider resolutions to authorize 12 prospectuses. These 12 prospectuses include two alteration projects, one construction project, and three leases included in the General Services Administration's (GSA) FY 2014 and FY 2015 Capital Investment and Leasing Programs. Six of the prospectuses were included in the Department of Veterans Affairs Construction, Long Range Capital Plans. At the request of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Committee authorized the leases to be executed pursuant to GSA's leasing authority in accordance with the provisions of the Public Buildings Act.

Our Committee continues to work to cut waste and the cost of federal property and leases. The resolutions include space reductions, consolidations into government-owned space, and reduction in project scopes, saving \$225 million in avoided lease costs.

I have enclosed copies of the resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 17, 2014.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

ALTERATION—EDWARD J. SCHWARTZ FEDERAL BUILDING AND U.S. COURTHOUSE, SAN DIEGO, CA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. § 3307, appropriations are authorized for repairs and alterations for the reconfiguration and alteration of space in the Edward J. Schwartz Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse located at 880 Front Street in San Diego, California to consolidate the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and backfill other tenant agencies, at a design and review cost of \$1,997,317, an estimated construction cost of \$16,042,940 and a management and inspection cost of \$1,688,743 for a total estimated project cost of \$19,729,000, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution authorizes the prospectus as amended by the FY2014 Expenditures Plans for Major Repairs and Alterations Program submitted by the General Services Administration on February 7, 2014 and the revised Housing Plan dated August 2014.

Provided, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.