deep and abiding faith in Jesus Christ. In his hand he held the rosary and also his beloved cell phone.

Vince educated America on the threat of Islamic jihad. We will forever remember his strength, courage, and his faith. He had a life well-lived. We will never forget the contributions to America by the wonderful and legendary Vince Flynn.

□ 1240

JUSTICE PREVAILS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, our amazing, time-traveling Supreme Court has truly surprised me this week. It was able to take us back to the 1960s on Tuesday and to step into the 21st century the next day by striking down DOMA.

Yesterday's ruling was a long-overdue affirmation that married same-sex couples deserve the same Federal benefits as everyone else. It's a major step towards marriage equality. But this victory comes on the heels of a dangerous blow to voting rights. On Tuesday, the Court struck down a provision that has been vital to guaranteeing the right to vote for all Americans. The Voting Rights Act is a crucial guard against States backsliding on the progress of the civil rights movement, and we must now work to restore its protections.

The struggle for voting rights and marriage equality are not so different. Both have been long fights with victories hard won. And in each we have seen freedoms and progress once thought impossible become inevitable. Yet even as we celebrate a victory for marriage equality, the Voting Rights Act ruling shows us that we cannot take these gains for granted, that maintaining these liberties requires constant vigilance and continued advocacy.

These fights are far from over; but in time, I know we will succeed. In the words of Dr. King: The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.

ANOTHER DAY AT THE IRS, ANOTHER SCANDAL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, another day, another IRS scandal is revealed.

The Inspector General has identified improper use of taxpayer money by the people who collect taxes—the tax collectors. While the IRS was targeting conservative groups for audits, over 100 IRS employees improperly used government credit cards. ''I'm shocked.''

Tax collectors have been sticking it to the taxpayers with spending only the IRS can get away with, including—listen to this—thousands of dollars on diet pills, romance novels, baby bottles, baby clothes, smartphones, a popcorn machine, bandanas, stuffed animals, sunglasses, ''swag'' like kazoos, and Thomas the Tank Engine wristbands and bathtub toys. There's a lot more. You can't make this up, Mr. Speaker. Were they ever disciplined by the IRS? Of course not. This is the IRS. They are the law. They are the government.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to audit the tax man and the tax collectors. The squandered money should be returned in full to the Treasury—with interest penalty, just like the tax collectors charge citizens when they audit us.

And that's just the way it is.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to warn my colleagues about the Corker-Hoeven amendment within the Senate's immigration bill.

To my colleagues who are concerned with the fiscal health of our country, I call your attention to this provision, which will commit $50 billion to double the size of the Border Patrol, add 700 miles of walls and fencing between the U.S. and Mexico at a time when we have record-low northbound apprehensions and net migration from Mexico is zero.

To my colleagues who cherish our civil liberties and our constitutional rights, can you live with a $50 billion militarized buildup within the United States where more than 6 million of your fellow citizens live?

And to my colleagues who care about human rights and the sanctity of human life, more than 5,000 people have died crossing the border into the United States over the last 15 years. Let's not perpetuate this problem; let's solve it. We need comprehensive reform, but we need comprehensive reform that's rational, that's humane, and that's fiscally responsible.

THANK YOU TO CARL MEYER FOR HIS SERVICE TO PARKLAND COLLEGE AND CHAMPAIGN COUNTY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Carl Meyer for his years of service to Parkland College and the Champaign County community.

Carl originally moved to Champaign County in 1971 when he came to the University of Illinois to work as an assistant football coach. Years later, he left to work for the Universities of Arizona and Cincinnati before returning to Champaign County in 1992.

In 1997, Carl was asked by then-Parkland College president Zelema Harris to serve as the executive director of the Parkland College Foundation. Throughout his 16 years with the Parkland College Foundation, Carl oversaw a major gifts campaign, raising more than $14 million, as well as seeing projects like the Tony Noel Agricultural Technology Applications Center and the Parkland Automotive Technology Center go from inception to completion. This is in addition to the more than 140 scholarships he established and the dozens of partnerships he created with businesses and academic departments.

Words can't express how much Carl means to Parkland College and Champaign County. I would like to thank Carl for his commitment to Parkland College and its students, and for his leadership in the community. Enjoy your retirement, Carl, and know you will be missed. You deserve it.

VETERAN SPOUSE EQUAL TREATMENT ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. For far too long, DOMA denied legally married same-sex couples access to Federal benefits, including those provided by the VA. But with yesterday's decisions, the Supreme Court sent a clear message that all Americans, gay or straight, must be afforded equal protection under the law.

There is no question that now we must implement the Court's ruling throughout every department of the Federal Government. Accordingly, I'm proud to introduce the Veteran Spouse Equal Treatment Act to amend the VA's definition of spouse as an individual of the opposite sex. This is a basic matter of aligning the VA with our Nation's laws, of living up to the principles of fairness and equality, of extending benefits to thousands of deserving military spouses, and of defending all those who have proudly worn the uniform of the U.S. armed services and their families.

Yesterday, justice and freedom prevailed over intolerance and hate. So today I ask my colleagues to work with me to see that this legislation is passed without delay, to implement the Supreme Court's decision, and leave no question about equal protection under the law for all Americans.

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during consideration of H.R. 1613 and H.R. 2231 pursuant to House Resolution 274, amendment numbered 1 printed in part A of House Report 113–131 and amendments numbered 5 and 10 printed in part B of that report be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the amendment numbered 1 printed in part A of the report, strike ''Noting'' and insert ''Nothing''.

In the amendment numbered 5 printed in part B of the report, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$999,999,999''.

In the amendment numbered 10 printed in part B of the report, strike ''Noting'' and insert ''Nothing''

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reserving the right to object, I'd like to understand the reasons—I understand the typographical errors and appreciate that the chair wishes to revise those, but I'm curious about one provision.

As the chair would remember, I came to the committee and asked that they not waive the rule for the Cassidy amendment because the Cassidy amendment will increase the deficit by $15 billion over 30 years. And of course the rules of the House don't allow us to engage in additional spending without an offset, and there is no offset. But the chair did waive all points of order, so the rules of the House don't apply to this additional $15 billion of deficit spending.

But now my understanding is that they want to substitute a different amendment, which, instead of $15 billion of additional deficit over 30 years, would only create $14,999,999,970 of new deficit.

□ 1250

I would like to understand why we're bothering to do this. I think over the span of 30 years, increasing the deficit by $14,999,999,970 versus $15 billion, which is easier to say because it has got a lot of zeros in it, what's the rationale? Why would we do this? Why do we need UC for this? I'm just curious.

Could the gentleman respond.

Mr. SESSIONS. If the gentleman will yield under his reservation, with the adoption of this modification of the explanation of waivers, I would say to him that what is contained in the report is going to be accurate.

What was printed the other day as the final report from the Rules Committee before it came to the floor was, in fact, not accurate. The gentleman knows and does understand that there were several modifications that were made as a result of the final approval of the Rules Committee print.

Then we discovered there were some typos and some inaccurate figures that were presented. The gentleman knows that there have been previous times when the gentleman's amendment from Louisiana has been offered in reports and has been voted on and we made that consistent.

I appreciate the gentleman asking me.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Continuing to reserve the right to object, so the bottom line here, if I can define it for our colleagues in simple language, is the net difference in waiving the rules of the House of $30, apparently the total waiving of the rules of the House to allow additional deficit spending. In contradiction of what the other side of the aisle normally proposes, there is somehow a dramatic difference between $14,999,999,970 of new debt and deficit and $15 billion, which requires a substitution of this amendment, because it's my understanding it would somehow then violate the Budget Act twice. Is that accurate? Even though you've waived the rule and we can go ahead with the amendment, you would be violating the Budget Act twice. So we just want to say we're only violating the Budget Act once; is that the difference?

Mr. SESSIONS. Once again, yielding to the gentleman's question, I appreciate the gentleman not only coming to the floor, but making sure that we work together on an understanding of what the final package will look like.

I will state once again, and I appreciate the gentleman's clarification, what the Rules Committee did is made an agreement of what would be made in order and there was a mistake therein. We are simply, Mr. Speaker, asking for unanimous consent on a bipartisan basis, we believe with the gentleman who will consent, to modify the report to where it accurately denotes the amendments that were made in order and any wording, including grammatical misspellings. That's what we're trying to do here.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Further reserving the right to object, if you're going to waive the rules of the House to create $15 billion in new deficit, I don't know why we need unanimous consent to waive the rules yet again to create $14,999,999,970 in deficit. I guess that makes a difference somewhere to someone, so I would not object.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendments are modified.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 274, I call up the bill (H.R. 1613) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1613

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 ''Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act''.

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

SEC. 101. AMENDMENT TO THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 32. TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—After the date of enactment of the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, the Secretary may implement the terms of any transboundary hydrocarbon agreement for the management of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs entered into by the President and approved by Congress. In implementing such an agreement, the Secretary shall protect the interests of the United States to promote domestic job creation and ensure the expeditious and orderly development and conservation of domestic mineral resources in accordance with all applicable United States laws governing the exploration, development, and production of hydrocarbon resources on the outer Continental Shelf.

''(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No later than 180 days after all parties to a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement have agreed to its terms, a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement that does not constitute a treaty in the judgment of the President shall be submitted by the Secretary to—

''(A) the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

''(B) the Majority Leader of the Senate;

''(C) the Chair of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

''(D) the Chair of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

''(2) CONTENTS OF SUBMISSION.—The submission shall include—

''(A) any amendments to this Act or other Federal law necessary to implement the agreement;

''(B) an analysis of the economic impacts such an agreement and any amendments necessitated by the agreement will have on domestic exploration, development, and production of hydrocarbon resources on the outer Continental Shelf; and

''(C) a detailed description of any regulations expected to be issued by the Secretary to implement the agreement.

''(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF SPECIFIC TRANSBOUNDARY AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO.—The Secretary may take actions as necessary to implement the terms of the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, signed at Los Cabos, February 20, 2012, including—

''(1) approving unitization agreements and related arrangements for the exploration, development, or production of oil and natural gas from transboundary reservoirs or geological structures;

''(2) making available, in the limited manner necessary under the agreement and subject to the protections of confidentiality provided by the agreement, information relating to the exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas from a transboundary reservoir or geological structure that may be considered confidential, privileged, or proprietary information under law;

''(3) taking actions consistent with an expert determination under the agreement; and

''(4) ensuring only appropriate inspection staff at the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement or other Federal agency personnel designated by the Bureau, the operator, or the lessee have authority to stop work on any installation or other device or vessel permanently or temporarily attached to the seabed of the United States, which may be erected thereon for the purpose of resource exploration, development or production activities as approved by the Secretary.

''(d) EXEMPTION FROM RESOURCES EXTRACTION REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Actions taken by a public company in accordance with any transboundary hydrocarbon agreement shall not constitute the commercial development of oil,

natural gas, or minerals for purposes of section 13(q) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (157 U.S.C. 78m(q)).

''(e) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(1) to authorize the Secretary to participate in any negotiations, conferences, or consultations with Cuba regarding exploration, development, or production of hydrocarbon resources in the Gulf of Mexico along the United States maritime border with Cuba or the area known by the Department of the Interior as the 'Eastern Gap'; or

''(2) as affecting the sovereign rights and the jurisdiction that the United States has under international law over the outer Continental Shelf which appertains to it.''.

TITLE II—APPROVAL OF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENT

SEC. 201. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO.

The Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, signed at Los Cabos, February 20, 2012, is hereby approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–131, as modified by the order of the House of today, if offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1613.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act.

This bill was introduced by my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee, and will provide the certainty needed to move forward with offshore energy development in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico along our Nation's maritime boundary with Mexico.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Mexican Foreign Secretary Espinosa signed this long-awaited agreement February 2012. Since that time, the House Committee on Natural Resources has repeatedly requested draft-implementing legislation from the Obama administration. But it was not until March 19, 2013, when the committee finally received just that—several short sentences to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to promote development of energy resources that lie along the boundary with Mexico.

Despite the Obama administration sitting on this agreement for over a year, that should not in any way downplay the importance of getting this agreement approved. This agreement is good for our economy, and it's good for our American workers.

Opening new acreage for energy exploration and development creates jobs, it creates more American-made energy, and it helps reduce our dependence on foreign countries for our energy needs.

According to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and the State Department, this agreement would open up nearly 1.5 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico. These areas are estimated to contain as much as 172 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

These areas are ready to be explored and developed, and this bill will give the U.S. job creators the certainty they need to move forward. Activity can begin once this agreement is enacted.

This bill executes the implementation of the U.S.-Mexico agreement, but it also looks to the future—providing a clear and transparent path for how future administrations should go about submitting future agreements with other countries with which we share international boundaries. Given the fact that this implementing legislation was bogged down within several agencies for over a year, I believe that Mr. DUNCAN's solution is a necessary step to ensure a smoother and more expedient process in the future.

H.R. 1613 also includes language to protect American workers by removing uncertainty surrounding the application of Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act disclosure requirements.

The agreement signed by the Obama administration and Mexico specifically provides what royalty payments Mexico would receive from energy developers. However, under current U.S. law, companies that commercially develop oil, natural gas, or minerals are required to disclose payments made to a foreign government. This could create a potential conflict because Mexico has yet to decide how they will collect royalties and could potentially set regulatory measures that prohibit disclosure of payments.

□ 1300

This would then block American workers from being able to develop these resources.

Waiving the Dodd-Frank requirement is necessary in order to help protect American jobs and American-made energy in this instance. Without it, foreign-controlled energy companies could develop this American energy resource. The royalty payments to Mexico would still be undisclosed and kept private, but the net result would be that Americans would lose out on this energy potential.

The Natural Resources Committee and Mr. DUNCAN have worked hard to advance this bill and get it signed into law. It's important to American energy, to American jobs, to American energy security, and it is important in order to support a positive relationship with our neighbor to the south, Mexico. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We could have done this bill as a suspension bill 2 days ago. That is, it probably could have passed the House by unanimous consent, which is very rare, if this provision had not been added.

There is consensus on both sides of the aisle that it's critical that we move forward with this agreement with Mexico to deal with shared resources in the western Gulf of Mexico. However, the Republicans have chosen to use this as a vehicle to launch yet another attack on Wall Street reform, on the Dodd-Frank reforms, which is totally unnecessary. Obviously, it was presented as: it's potentially, possibly, maybe a future problem for American oil companies if the Mexicans change their law. Under their existing law, there is no problem. We're going to see disclosure, and it will be disclosure by Mexican companies that are bidding or by American companies that are bidding or by any other foreign company that is bidding in the gulf. You will see full disclosure, so no one would be at a commercial or at an economic disadvantage.

But the premise here is that, someday, Mexico might change their law, and therefore our companies would have to disclose and theirs wouldn't. If that did happen at some potential possible future date by some potential possible future Mexican Government, then the Securities and Exchange Commission has adequate authority, even under the Dodd-Frank reforms, to waive that requirement because it would be in the public interest and commercial interest of the United States of America to waive that provision in this instance. Now, that's dealing with Mexico.

The second problem with what they're proposing here is that they actually want to totally repeal this section of Dodd-Frank for any future agreements with any other nations on a transboundary basis, which could certainly include Canada and, likely, with the conflicts that are looming over the Arctic Ocean and the resources up there, with Russia. Now, I get pretty

nervous when I start thinking that U.S. companies are going to be negotiating secret agreements with Russia and that somehow these are going to protect our taxpayers, that they're going to protect our shareholders, that they're going to protect our public interest. That, I think, is really a very, very, very disturbing trend with this bill.

So the issue is: do we want to get this done? If we want to get it done, this is not the way to do it, because this bill, as amended by the Republicans to change the agreement and waive the rules for oil companies so they can make secret payments to the Government of Mexico, that will not pass the Senate. So we'll have yet another one-House bill, and we will further delay what the Republican side wants to expedite, which is offshore oil and gas development.

I would suggest that, rather than expediting things here, we're messing them up, and I would suggest to my colleagues that we oppose this bill in this form, that we bring it back as a clean authorization with the existing agreement with Mexico, and that we move forward and get it done. I expect, if we got it done here, we could bring it up again and get it done in a day or under suspension or perhaps, I think, with unanimous consent, even between today and tomorrow. Then the Senate would pass it with unanimous consent, and we'd be done with it.

Instead, we're going to have yet another example of the dysfunction of the Congress because we're going to pass a version here that cannot pass in the United States Senate, and then, I guess, the Republicans will try and blame the Senate for not wanting to waive the rules and allow oil companies to make secret payments to the Government of Mexico in order to garner commercial deals.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of this legislation, a member of the Natural Resources Committee and of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I want to thank the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee for his leadership on this issue as well as to thank my friend, Mr. SALMON from Arizona, for his leadership in the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee on this issue because he understands what is at stake.

One thing this bill will do is attract jobs. It will help the United States Government create energy sector jobs. The second thing it will do is help meet our energy needs, and it will help lessen our dependence on foreign sources of energy by producing those energy resources here at home. That's a national security issue. By being less dependent on foreign sources of oil, we are less dependent on what goes on in that part of the world. There can be no national security without energy security, and this is a step in the right direction.

We are willing to say that the Obama administration got something right in forming this agreement and signing it. In February of 2012, Secretary Clinton signed this agreement with the Foreign Secretary from Mexico, Patricia Espinosa, to open up this area known as the ''western gap'' in the Gulf of Mexico so that both countries—Mexico and the United States—could explore and start producing oil and natural gas from this area.

What it does is to create a broader legal certainty along that U.S.-Mexico boundary area in order to foster more American energy development and job creation. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement estimates that this area contains as much as 172 million barrels of oil and 34 billion cubic feet of natural gas—shared resources. Yet they're shared under a common border, a border between the United States Government and Mexico. If you think of a border, think about it out in the middle of the Gulf of Mexico. It's a maritime boundary, and these resources lie underneath the Earth's Outer Continental Shelf. Underneath that border, who do they belong do? This agreement addresses that they are shared resources. They belong to both countries, and we ought to utilize this agreement in order to start harvesting those resources.

The gentleman talks about changes to Dodd-Frank and other things, but why is that necessary? Who will benefit? I'll tell you who won't benefit if we don't put this language in there. The people who won't benefit are the American consumers. They are paying almost $4 a gallon for gasoline. They won't benefit because we won't be producing American resources to meet their energy needs.

So why is this necessary? Without the changes to this agreement, the language in the agreement can create an impossible situation for American companies operating on transboundary hydrocarbon resources.

For example, Mexican confidentiality requirements may forbid the disclosure of the very information that the Dodd-Frank rule requires of American companies. This would lead to a situation in which companies that are regulated by the SEC have at the very least uncertainty about compliance with both Mexican and American disclosure laws. This uncertainty and potential disclosure conflict would place foreign state-owned oil companies, which are not regulated under Dodd-Frank or by the SEC, at a competitive advantage to the companies which operate under the United States' agreement and are regulated.

The change in this language will open up competition and allow American companies to actually go to work without the uncertainty as to which laws they need to comply with and which they don't. This is the right thing. The changes to this language will ensure that American energy development will go forward in the transboundary area and that those resources in that area will be harvested to provide the necessary energy for America, which drives our economy.

This is the right thing for America. We are willing to enact this agreement because we want to harvest those resources, and we want America to move toward American energy independence. Ultimately, we want to put Americans to work. We want to create jobs—good paying, long-term, energy sector jobs. We do that by moving toward American energy independence. We do that by enacting this agreement and by opening up 1.5 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico for energy exploration and development. It's the right thing for America. It's a movement toward an all-American energy policy, utilizing American resources to meet American energy needs and putting Americans to work.

□ 1310

I can only see a win-win for both Democrats and Republicans and for all Americans by moving this agreement forward. We asked, from February 2012 until now, for the United States Department of the Interior to send us the enacting legislation, to send us the enacting ability so that we could vote on something in the last Congress, and they failed to do that. So understanding that we need to do that, the Natural Resources Committee took the bull by the horns and said, We're going to do it. We're going to pass the implementing language to enact that agreement and put Americans to work and provide those resources that are so vital to moving this economy along.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That was very impassioned, and we can agree with the necessity of moving forward with the agreement. The problem is that the gentleman ignored the fact that the United States Senate will not pass this bill as written. They will not waive the Dodd-Frank disclosure rules to allow big oil companies to make secret deals with the Government of Mexico. They're not going to do that. So you're slowing things down by insisting on repealing part of these vital Wall Street reforms.

With that, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, who is an expert on this provision of law.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Financial Services Committee and a member of the conference committee that passed the Dodd-Frank reform legislation, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1613. I oppose the bill because of the exemption it includes for companies from the transparency requirements under section 1504 of Dodd-Frank Act.

Section 1504 of Dodd-Frank requires companies to disclose payments they

make to governments for oil, gas, and mining resources. It covers companies listed on U.S. exchanges, including the U.S., Chinese, Brazilian, Canadian, European, Australian and other companies.

Section 1504 has a long legislative history. The Financial Services Committee held its first hearing on extracted industry transparency in 2007. In 2008, our committee held a legislative hearing where we debated the specific provisions that eventually became law. The Senate introduced similar legislation, and they held hearings.

The provision was adopted into the Dodd-Frank Act through a bipartisan amendment. Then, before issuing a rule to implement the law, the Securities and Exchange Commission solicited input, held meetings, and considered hundreds of comments from industry, trade groups, Members of Congress, and civil society. Section 1504 was very carefully considered by Congress over the course of several years, with input from all quarters. It is now the law of the land.

Let me tell you why it's important.

Public disclosure of extractive industry payments help diminish the political instability caused by OPEC governance, which is not only a threat to investment, but also to our own national security. Resource revenue transparency also allows shareholders to make better informed assessments of opportunity costs, threats to corporate reputation, and the long-term prospects of the companies in which they invest.

Countries rich in natural resources are often developing countries that are politically unstable, many rife with corruption, with a history of civil conflict fueled, in part, by natural resources.

Opening the extractive industries to greater public scrutiny is key to increasing civil society participation in these countries. This is crucial in order for citizens in resource-rich countries to be able to demand greater accountability from their governments for spending that serves the public interest. This in turn can help reduce poverty and create more stable, democratic governments. It can also help create more stable business environments.

The provision in H.R. 1613 that exempts companies from the disclosure requirements under section 1504 is entirely unnecessary. The bipartisan Senate version of this bill includes no such exemption.

Also, the U.S.-Mexico agreement explicitly respects the domestic laws of both countries, so it already accommodates the Dodd-Frank disclosure requirement. Moreover, there are no laws in Mexico that would prohibit the disclosure of company payments.

Let's also listen to what the administration has to say about this. After all, this administration negotiated the terms of the agreement with Mexico. The administration very much wants legislation to implement the agreement, and they know what they need to do this. And they don't want this bill.

The White House issued a statement strongly opposing H.R. 1613 precisely because of the provision waiving the requirements for the public disclosure of extractive payments to governments. The exemption in this bill is nothing more than an effort to undermine transparency and to undo good public policy that has become an international standard.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill in its current form. Members deserve the opportunity to vote on a clean bill that they can support, and I urge the leadership to give the House that opportunity.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard talk from both sides of the aisle about how important this bill could be without this exemption. Why would you undo the work of both sides of the aisle, the conference committee, the Senate, and all in working out this agreement by putting this exemption in?

I want you to know that those of us who are working very hard to make sure that we implement reform, those of us who are very much involved with Dodd-Frank, we not only understand all of the ways that people are trying to get around Dodd-Frank, to get under Dodd-Frank, to undo the reforms of Dodd-Frank, why does this exemption show up in this bill? It has no place in this bill. This is another attempt to get around Dodd-Frank and not to comply with the law, and you're messing up a good agreement. It does not make good sense.

I oppose this bill in this form. The administration opposes this bill in this form. And if you want the kind of agreement that you say you want with Mexico, if you're interested in sharing those resources, if you're interested in what you claim can be done creating jobs, you would not move forward with this bill. You would not try to force this exemption on this agreement.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), who worked very hard on this agreement.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to address Congress today.

I'm very pleased, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere for the Foreign Affairs Committee, that we held a hearing on this issue. Afterwards, we decided—after some extensive consultation with folks from the Obama State Department, we worked with the chairman of the Resources Committee and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) to develop this language.

There is an old axiom that says ''let no good deed go unpunished.'' Nowhere in America could that be more true. Actually, nowhere on Earth could that be more true than here in Washington, D.C.

The fact is that this language reflects the agreement that the Obama administration signed almost a couple of years ago. Maybe there's some buyer's remorse and maybe there's an idea now that we don't like the fact that we agreed to this language a couple of years ago, but this reflects the agreement that was signed.

One other thing I'd like to mention is another great axiom, and that is that ''the road to hell is paved with good intentions.'' Unfortunately, I didn't know that that road went smack-dab in the middle of Washington, D.C.

The fact is, this is a good bill, and every American out there who is paying too much for their energy costs, paying too much every time you go to the pump and you fill up your car with gasoline or you go on a vacation and you curse those gasoline pumps, knows full well that we are trying to do everything we can on the Republican side of the aisle to lower your gas prices.

□ 1320

We're trying to do that by forming this agreement with Mexico. A win-win. You've heard that term a lot today, because it is. It will create jobs both in Mexico and the United States.

Pemex, the Mexican oil company, does not have the deepwater drilling capabilities that our oil companies do, and so Mexico reached out to us and asked us if we would agree to a treaty to work together with them so that we could jointly drill.

And isn't it about time that America looks to its neighbors, its friends, its allies in the region, like Mexico, instead of having to rely on the thugs in the Middle East for our oil.

I think it is about time that America and the Western Hemisphere become energy independent, that we produce our own oil in this country and in this continent. And when we do so, what's going to happen? We will reduce the likelihood that we will have to get into a war because of some oil issue. We reduce the likelihood that some of these despots from other countries, like Venezuela or other countries in the Middle East, literally hold us—excuse the pun—but hold us over the barrel, and ask us to commit to things that maybe we would rather not commit to, or play their silly games.

Wouldn't you much rather rely on a country and a friend and a neighbor like Mexico to be able to jointly drill, develop that oil, lower gas prices, and create jobs for American and Mexican citizens. This is truly a win/win. Let's not let, in some minds, the perfect be the enemy of the good. The fact is this is the language that Mexico had asked us to agree to, and we're simply trying to move the ball ahead. We can do a lot of gamesmanship today and spout off about this or that, but this is the agreement that was signed almost a couple of years ago. And again, the administration dragged their feet for the last couple of years to get this ultimately to the floor. Thank goodness we

have a chairman over here that took the bull by the horns and said, We're going to do this. We're going to do this for the American people because it's a no-brainer. So it's basically time, I agree, for us to do this in a bipartisan fashion, get off our dead derrieres, and get the job done.

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

If the gentleman would go to the microphone, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and I will yield to him.

Your assertion is that Mexico asked the Government of the United States to include a waiver of our financial services reform provisions in section 105 in this agreement, and the Obama administration didn't agree to that but Mexico signed the agreement anyway, and now you're trying to help out the government of Mexico to get something that you claim they wanted but didn't get from this administration; is that correct?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Actually, that is not correct.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, that's what you just said.

Mr. SALMON. No, that's not what I just said. I don't appreciate having words put in my mouth. That's not what I said.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, please clarify.

Mr. SALMON. What I said was that the language that we've agreed to here is the language that I believe embodies the spirit of the agreement between us and Mexico. I believe it's exactly what the President has been asking for.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Okay. With that, I would reclaim my time. I could ask to have the record read back, but I won't because it would delay things. But you said this is what Mexico wanted. You did say that just before as you spoke. Now you're saying that you believe that this is reflecting the spirit of the agreement. Now I will accept that. You believe that changing the agreement by waiving our financial services law is in the spirit of the agreement. I don't believe that. MAXINE WATERS, who serves on the Committee on Financial Services, doesn't agree with that. And, unfortunately, the President of the United States doesn't agree with that, so this bill is going nowhere. It's not going to get out of the Senate. They have a bipartisan bill over there that doesn't waive Dodd-Frank that they could pass by unanimous consent. We could be done with this. But no, we're not going to do that; we're going to play games.

So here's what the President said. He's got something to say about this in the end, he really does:

The administration cannot support H.R. 1613, as reported by the House Committee on Natural Resources because of the unnecessary, extraneous provisions that seriously detract from the bill. Most significantly, the administration strongly objects to exempting actions taken by public companies in accordance with the transboundary hydrocarbon agreements from requirements section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act and the Securities and Exchange Commission's natural resource extraction disclosure rule. As a practical matter, this provision would waive the requirement for the disclosure of any payments made by resource extraction companies to the United States or foreign governments in accordance with a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement. The provision directly and negatively impacts U.S. efforts to increase transparency and accountability, particularly in the oil, gas, and minerals sectors.

So if we proceed with this bill in this form, the President will veto the bill, and we'll be back again. And how many months that'll take, I don't know. But to assert that somehow Mexico wanted this, or the administration wanted it, and they just kind of forgot to put it in the agreement, and now we're helping them out, even though the administration says they don't want it, and I don't know what the government of Mexico says—and then there was another issue raised about confidentiality provisions.

In fact, the SEC has more than adequate capabilities to do general exemptions in sections 12(h) and 36 of the Securities and Exchange Act. They could issue exemptions from this disclosure requirement under this authority, should it be warranted. In fact, the SEC today confirmed with us that there is nothing that would prevent the SEC from issuing exemptions should they be warranted. Now, the objection here is to waiving any and all future agreements from any public disclosure of payments to foreign governments. That's what you're doing here today. It's not about this one agreement or problems that might crop up with Mexico. That could be accommodated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. It's about doing away with a critical section of Dodd-Frank. And if you want to do that, why not bring it up in the Financial Services Committee, have a hearing, have a debate, send us a bill and repeal it. But don't try and do it in the dark of night in the hope that if you attach it to this agreement, which we all agree should be entered into, Mexico wants, U.S. wants, that you're doing anybody a favor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

Mr. RADEL. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ultimately, we would hope that the Senate can agree on this, and the administration, regardless of what we hear. We would love to have some compromise, although it is important to debate this here today.

Here's what I know, and it's important to you—how much you're paying at the pump every single time you go and fill up. What you're paying at the pump is eating into what you pay for groceries, your rent, your mortgage. But House Republicans, right here, right now, have a plan to help you put more money in your pocket and save on the important stuff like your gas and your grocery bill.

We started by approving the Keystone pipeline, and what we're debating here today is an energy agreement with Mexico. The agreement encourages development of energy resources in both countries—development in the U.S. and in Mexico. You know, it strikes me, right now we have all of this talk about illegal immigration and how we're going to prevent it here in the United States. The best way is to make sure that we have a strong economy south of the border. Not only do I know that as the vice chair on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, but I've lived in Mexico.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows.)

There are mothers and fathers today looking for opportunities for their children.

Hay madres y padres buscando opportunidad para sus hijos.

Because at the end of the day, this is about jobs, jobs, jobs, and it's about improving our national security. Think about it: In terms of national security, do you really want to send your money to countries who really may not have our best intentions in mind? Or do you want to partner with our energy allies to the north and south of us, making us energy independent for generations to come, working with our neighbors and our friends.

Now Mexico ratified this agreement over a year ago. They sent it to the President. Now we are calling on the President to help us lower your price at the pump. This is as bipartisan as it gets. What we're trying to do here in Washington is just help make everyday life a little easier for you. Our goal is to save you money so you can spend less time worrying about your budget and enjoying more time with your family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The gentleman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks, and Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1330

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I hear my friends on the opposite side of the aisle keep talking about this is as bipartisan as you can get. It was bipartisan before you sneaked in the exemption that would allow companies to bribe governments and pay under the table and create chaos in other countries. It was a bipartisan agreement.

I keep hearing reference to this having the support of the administration. Let me be clear. This bill, in this form, does not have the support of the administration. It did have before you sneaked in the exemption.

Dodd-Frank made it very clear. It is the law. We worked very hard. Both

sides of the aisle, in the conference committee, worked on this part of the bill. And now we have you coming in the dark of the night, one more time trying to undo Dodd-Frank. And this is awful. It is really, really awful because we have the opportunity to have an agreement with Mexico where we could both benefit from the drilling, and we all support that.

But, no, you have decided to undermine the work of both sides of the aisle by putting this exemption in this bill, and so it does not have the support of the administration. It is no longer bipartisan. We no longer support it. And you have the possibility of a veto on your hands.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. May I ask the Chair, how much time remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 13½ minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Okay. Does the gentleman have more speakers or would he be closing?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, what we've heard here today is that by modifying this agreement, by preventing disclosure of payments by big oil companies to foreign governments which could essentially constitute under-the-table agreements, bribes, however you have it, will somehow lower gas prices for the American people.

Now, I think if you went out and asked the American people, ''Do you think allowing ExxonMobil or any of the other big companies to enter into secret agreements with foreign governments to exploit jointly held resources is going to benefit you at the pump?'' I think they'd kind of laugh at you. I mean, no offense, but they would.

The bottom line is there's also a further assertion that somehow this possible future development of this area will lower the price at the pump. It won't and it hasn't, and today the prices are excessive.

Why are they excessive?

Well, there's this funny little thing that happens just around Memorial Day every year. The refiners—and the refinery industry has been dramatically consolidated over the last few years because there's been buyouts and closures and everything else—they decide that they've got to do periodic maintenance.

It's got to happen at the beginning of the driving season; and, of course, they all schedule it at the same time and they limit refinery capacity, and then they say there's a shortage and the price jumps up 50 cents a gallon, like it did in Oregon just a month ago—50 cents a gallon in a week.

Whoa, what happened? Did you see anybody waving red flags saying, We don't have any gas, or yellow flags?

Anybody remember the seventies? No. Everybody had gas. They just jacked up the price, because that's the way that the oil companies celebrate the beginning of the summer vacation season for the American people, by increasing their profits with extraordinary and unwarranted increases in the price claiming there's somehow a shortage because somehow they're cleaning their refineries, or one of them had a problem. They are actually exporting gasoline from the west coast.

What does that mean?

There's actually a glut of oil in the gulf region right now that they can't refine. We've got refineries closed in California with oil sitting in storage tanks that can't be refined. And somehow, if we just had more oil to add to the glut, to add to the full storage tanks because the refineries are shut down to drive up the price—or maybe they're not shut down. There was actually an investigation last year. When they claimed they were shut down, they weren't. So we don't really know.

But to say, well, gee, we trust the oil companies. Let's let them negotiate secret agreements with the Government of Mexico, with Canada, with—ultimately, perhaps with Russia and that will benefit the consumers at the pump, it does not meet the laugh test.

Ms. WATERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to, if I can, engage you in a little colloquy here.

What reason would the Members of Congress try and protect the oil companies from simply sharing how much they're paying to governments? What reason would they have for doing that?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, we heard earlier the assertion that that would protect American workers. I'm not quite certain how that's going to work out. And probably it doesn't even help stockholders, because they might really want to know what's going on. I'm not sure.

Ms. WATERS. Well, I just want to make clear what this exemption is they're trying to do. It's a very simple request that's in law that says just tell us what you're paying. And we have now included in this bill, where there is an agreement, an exemption that will not allow them or keep them from being able to share that information.

As you said, they would now, if this passed, they would be able to make payments in secret. They would be able to make bribes. They would be able to maybe even be disruptive to countries that they are paying bribes to when they get into these conflicts in other countries.

So why would they want to do this? I don't understand it. I thought maybe you may have some additional information that I don't have. But to mess up an agreement simply because you want to protect the oil companies from saying how much they're paying is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlelady.

The bottom line here is it's simple. If we pass this bill in this form, the President would veto it if it came out of the Senate. It will not come out of the Senate.

They are actually acting in a true bipartisan way in the Senate, and they have a bill which could receive probably unanimous consent that does not contain this provision, that does not provide this waiver of the Dodd-Frank Act in favor of the big oil companies.

It's simple. I can see, you know, and I can count, and in all probability the Republican side will prevail here, but they are not furthering the cause of expediting the signing of this agreement and the execution of this agreement between Mexico and the United States by sending a bill to the Senate that the Senate will not pass.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 14½ minutes.

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

Let me clarify just a few major points here. First of all, the President did not say he would veto it. He said he had a concern. I accept that. But the President did not say he would veto this legislation. After all, it was his Secretary of State that negotiated the agreement. Why would he veto an agreement negotiated by his Secretary of State?

Secondly, if this could pass so easily out of the Senate, as my friend from Oregon asserts, why hasn't the Senate passed it?

We always ask that question over here. In fact, sometimes we get ourselves in a gridlock because we're so, maybe, frightened of what the Senate may or may not do.

Listen, if the Senate wants to pass this agreement without this provision, do it. Nobody is preventing them from doing it. Nobody.

Now, let me make another observation here that I think is probably more important in this debate than anything else that has been said, and that is, as was pointed out several times—I mentioned it in my opening remarks; Mr. DUNCAN mentioned it; Mr. SALMON mentioned it—in 2012, this agreement was signed. None of the information was given to us because we had to implement it. Now, I wonder why. Could it possibly be that the mindset of this administration, which, by the way, has consistently been nonresponsive to more exploration on the Outer Continental Shelf offshore—if I may, Mr. Speaker, go back just a bit.

When this administration took office, there was no moratoria on the Pacific or Atlantic coasts. One of the first actions of this President was to lock up 85 percent of those potential resources. So maybe they do have a bit of a bias against offshore drilling.

So here's an amendment, here's an agreement that was signed over a year

ago. It took over a year for it to come here. Because of no action on their part, it was going nowhere legislatively until Mr. DUNCAN said, Listen, this is something we ought to do.

So perhaps, Mr. Speaker, perhaps, is the reason why they're taking this one element—and I'll talk about that in a moment—as a reason to oppose this legislation really because they're trying to cover up the fact they don't like any offshore drilling?

□ 1340

I'll let somebody draw whatever conclusions they want. I simply ask the rhetorical question.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will be more than happy to yield to my friend on that point. I assume he wants to talk about that, and I'm more than happy to engage in that debate.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding.

I believe Ms. WATERS stated very clearly that there is substantial, if not unanimous, support on this side for this agreement without this provision, which would ultimately lead to the development of these resources.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, I think if you go back and look at the bills that have come in front of this body before in the last Congress—in fact, later on today—you will find that the overwhelming opposition to that legislation, if it's going to mirror what happened in the last Congress, was to oppose offshore development. So I'll just make that observation. Others can draw the conclusion.

But here is something that is very curious about this debate on why we should defeat this legislation because of this provision dealing in disclosure.

Anybody could have offered an amendment to take that provision out of the bill. It would have been perfectly in order. There's no parliamentary problem with striking from a bill. And there was an amendment, by the way, that was offered by a Member from the other body but was withdrawn. Both of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that are arguing against this because of this provision, they could have offered the amendment. It would have been made in order, and we could have debated it. But the amendment wasn't offered. I don't know why.

Ms. WATERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will be more than happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Just as you have come to some conclusion that maybe we are opposing this bill because we're opposed to offshore drilling, which is not true——

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, I simply said that there is a pattern in this administration and with my friends on the other side that they oppose that. I'll let others draw that conclusion.

I will be glad to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much.

When you raised the question about why didn't we offer an amendment and the Senate can offer an amendment, I have drawn a conclusion. Why are you trying to get credit for putting this in the bill with the oil companies?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, we believe that this provision in Dodd-Frank is contrary to the agreement because the only moneys—and I'll get to this point. I was going to get to it later, but I'll get to it right now. The only moneys that go to Mexico are what the Obama administration agreed to for these royalties or leases. That is the only money that goes to Mexico. So we believe that there's no reason to have this particular requirement in the bill, and that's why we did it.

Now you can disagree with that, of course. You have every right to do it. But if you really believe that this bill should be defeated because of that provision, why didn't you offer an amendment? Wait, there was an amendment that was offered and then withdrawn. Curious? I don't know what their reasons are.

So all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a good piece of legislation. It deserves bipartisan support. And if the Senate, to conclude, has a different view, let them pass their different view and we'll work it out. Isn't that the reason our Founding Fathers had two bodies? So we can work out the differences?

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: On May 15, 2013, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, as amended, to be reported favorably to the House. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1613, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1613, as amended, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and/or in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2013.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on May 15, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Financial Services will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1613 at this time, the Committee on Financial Services does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Financial Services represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS: Thank you for sharing the amended text of H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act, as marked up by your Committee.

Based on the portions of that text within Foreign Affairs jurisdiction, I am writing to confirm the agreement of the Foreign Affairs Committee to be discharged from consideration of H.R. 1613 in order to expedite its consideration on the House floor. In agreeing to waive consideration of that bill, this Committee does not waive any jurisdiction that it has over provisions in that bill or any other matter. This also does not constitute a waiver of the participation of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in any conference on this bill. I ask that you include a copy of this letter and your response in any Committee report on H.R. 1613, and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill.

Thank you again for your consideration and collegiality in this matter.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2013.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon

Agreements Authorization Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on May 15, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1613 at this time, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Foreign Affairs represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ___— MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ___. STATE RIGHTS AND AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED.

Nothing in this Act and the amendments made by this Act affects the right and power of each State to prohibit management, leasing, developing, and use of lands beneath navigable waters, and the natural resources within such lands, within its boundaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. I want to thank the Rules Committee for ruling that this amendment is in order. I want to also thank the committee chair for giving me the opportunity to discuss this with him briefly before this matter came up before the House.

This amendment should not be controversial. It reads as follows:

Nothing in this Act and the amendments made by this Act affects the right and power of each State to prohibit management, leasing, developing, and use of lands beneath navigable waters, and the natural resources within such lands, within its boundaries.

This language may sound familiar to those who are familiar with the current division of authority between, on the one hand, the Federal Government and, on the other hand, the States. It's a reaffirmation of 434 U.S.C. 1311(a), and 43 U.S.C. 1311 has a very notable title. It's called, ''The Rights of the States.'' That is the guarantee and purpose of the amendment before us today: to make sure and to reaffirm the rights of the States.

The concept is simple. If land, or resources within those lands, falls within a State's boundaries, that State should have the right to manage that land and those resources in a manner that it sees fit. This is a principle that we in Florida hold dear, and it's an important principle in every State, and, in fact, an important principle to federalism itself.

This principle has been enshrined in law since 1953, when the House passed H.R. 5134 to amend the Submerged Lands Act. A majority of Democrats supported that bill, as did an overwhelming majority of the Republicans. The final vote within the Republican caucus that year was 191 in favor and only 12 opposed. It's my hope that we'll see similar bipartisan support—in fact, overwhelming support—today for this amendment to simply reaffirm that principle.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I support transboundary agreements in general, and I hope that any dispute between the United States and any adjoining neighboring nation can be settled peacefully.

This bill could be misconstrued without our amendment as potentially disturbing states' rights under the status quo. It calls for the ''expeditious . . . development . . . of domestic mineral resources,'' on page 3, and limiting the ''authority to stop work on any installation . . . attached to the seabed of the United States,'' including those erected ''for the purpose of resource exploration, development, or production activities'' to ''inspection staff'' at the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, which is on page 6 of the bill. Without our amendment, a future court that is unfamiliar with this subject might wrongly conclude that this statute has, in fact, curtailed State prerogatives.

I don't believe that it was ever the intention of the Natural Resources Committee to make such a dramatic change to the status quo, to the detriment of the States and to states' rights. Therefore, this amendment today should not be controversial. It's merely a reaffirmation of existing law—a section of the United States law entitled, ''Rights of States''—and it's an effort to ensure that the States can choose to do within their own boundaries, and that that which they choose to do is that which will happen.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I find this amendment offered on this bill to be rather strange because the amendment usurps itself as an effort to protect states' rights. Well, the underlying bill is about an international agreement between the United States and Mexico, and that boundary is about 200 miles from the nearest shoreline. There is no jurisdiction of any State that goes that far out, particularly in the Gulf of Mexico. So I can assure the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that would change any existing laws as it relates to states' rights and their waters.

But this amendment isn't necessary. It's simply restating the status quo. The sponsor of the amendment and all those concerned with upholding states' rights can be assured that the existing rights of the individual 50 States are fully respected and in no way undermined by this bill, as I just mentioned. However, adopting this amendment could impact international relations with foreign states. And the reason why is because in foreign law, as I understand it, the term ''state'' means foreign government. There's no explanation in the amendment about states, so that raises a concern.

□ 1350

So by adopting this amendment, you could potentially destroy the agreement that we have in place. And what will that do? Well, it would delay American energy production, and it would delay the creation of American jobs.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. I appreciate the comments of the committee chair, but I must respectfully disagree with him on the merits.

First, with regard to the Gulf of Mexico, the restrictions on current development stretch 100 miles off the shores of Florida, a matter that is of great import in my State. Furthermore, the fact is that we cannot specifically restrain a future court from deciding contrary to the gentleman's opinion unless we do so in this bill.

Now, we've already had the experience this week that, on Tuesday, a certain number of Members of this body were disappointed by a Supreme Court decision; and on Wednesday, other Members were disappointed by a Supreme Court decision. Both of those decisions had to do with federalism; both those decisions had to do with the construction of legislation. If we want to ascertain and commit to the fact that we're not changing current law, the only way to do that is to say that we are not changing current law. By not doing so, we would be giving, in effect, a hostage to future courts for the end of time.

It's in the nature of the supremacy clause that unless we say we are not taking away states' rights, we might do so inadvertently. And that's exactly what this amendment would prevent.

Now, with regard to the second point, I don't know what foreign law may provide with regard to States, but I do know what American law provides. In fact, not only in this title, not only in this chapter, but in this subchapter there's a definition of ''state,'' and that

definition is as following—this is 43 U.S.C. 1301, under the heading Definitions, and that says, G: ''The term 'state' means any state of the union.''

Now, while I respect the gentleman's opinion, it's clear—from a clear and plain reading of the statute that we are amending—that in fact his position has no merit. Therefore, I urge the adoption of this amendment so that we can protect states' right, and in particular the rights of coastal States.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Let's just be clear, America, what we're talking about and where we're talking about.

This chart shows the Western Gap, the only area covered under the transboundary hydrocarbons agreement—the agreement negotiated by the Obama administration—to open up this area; 1.5 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico that's so far away from the shore of Florida that really makes this amendment not applicable.

This is the area we're talking about, this 1.5 million acres that would produce American jobs and American energy resources.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just simply to close, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This amendment is really unnecessary, and I think that chart points that out. You're talking hundreds of miles offshore, and yet the amendment asserts itself to protect states' rights. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot connect the dots on that.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON), as modified.

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON), as modified.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1613 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1409

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1613 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the House recessed, the Chair had declared that the noes prevailed on the Grayson amendment, as modified.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of a motion to recommit H.R. 1613, if ordered; passage of H.R. 1613, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1864.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 213, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—213

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

NAYS—213

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Fincher
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Payne
Smith (WA)
Waxman
Young (FL)

□ 1438

Messrs. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, KINGSTON, FORTENBERRY, CONAWAY, COLLINS of Georgia, and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CHU, Messrs. NUGENT, CROWLEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. LOEBSACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker. During rollcall vote No. 291 on Grayson Amendment, H.R. 1613, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1440

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. GARCIA. I am opposed to the bill in the current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____ — MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. __01. AVOIDING ANOTHER BP DISASTER.

(a) SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.—In implementing a transboundary agreement implemented or approved under this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall require that drilling operations conducted pursuant to such an agreement meet requirements for—

(1) third-party certification of safety systems related to well control, such as blowout preventers;

(2) performance of blowout preventers, including quantitative risk assessment standards, subsea testing, and secondary activation methods;

(3) independent third-party certification of well casing and cementing programs and procedures;

(4) mandatory safety and environmental management systems by operators on the outer Continental Shelf;

(5) procedures and technologies to be used during drilling operations to minimize the risk of ignition and explosion of hydrocarbons; and

(6) procedures and technologies to protect the health and safety of workers.

(b) INCREASED LIABILITY FOR SPILL CLEANUP.—As a condition of any lease issued pursuant to any such agreement, the Secretary may require increased liability for any damages related to an oil spill occurring as a result of activities under such a lease, for activities in water depths of 1000 feet or deeper.

(c) CIVIL PENALTIES TO ENSURE POLLUTERS PAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) PENALTY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any person who fails to comply with any provision of law with respect to any action under any term of such a lease or a license or permit issued under such a lease, or any regulation or order issued under this Act, shall be liable for a civil administrative penalty of not more than $80,000 for each day of the continuance of such failure

(B) THREAT OF HARM OR DAMAGE.—If a failure described in subparagraph (A) constitutes or constituted a threat of harm or damage to life, property, or the marine, coastal, or human environment, a civil penalty of not more than $150,000 shall be assessed for each day of the continuance of the failure.

(C) ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.—The Secretary of the Interior may assess and collect any such penalty.

(D) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The Secretary of the Interior may increase the maximum amount of any penalty established pursuant to this subsection.

(2) REVIEW OF MAXIMUM PENALTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall review the maximum amount of each penalty established pursuant to this subsection, including any amount increased under paragraph (1)(D), every 5 years and determine if such maximum amount is appropriate.

(B) NOTICE OF INCREASES.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress notice of the reasons for each increase by not later than 60 days after the increase takes effect.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Just over 3 years ago, the Deepwater Horizon drilling rig exploded, killing 11 workers and spilling 200 million gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. Our Nation was gripped with images like this and this, of oil gushing into the gulf, washing up on to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, this was the worst environmental disaster in our Nation's history, with economic costs of over $40 billion.

While other Gulf States suffered more, Florida's tourism and fishing were hurt. Mr. Speaker, it could even be worse, more damaging next time. That's why my amendment that I am offering today is so important. The amendment will prevent another BP oil spill by imposing safety standards for drilling based on what we learned from this terrible accident. If such a disaster is to occur again, this amendment will also make sure that the polluter pays for the cleanup.

As the BP oil accident shows, something happening hundreds of miles away affected Florida's coast and can easily bring oil to our State's shores. In south Florida, we know that these spills are not just a threat to the environment; they are a threat to our economy.

An oil disaster off Florida would affect the lives of millions, including local fishermen, hotels, restaurant owners, small businesses, and families that depend on these businesses for their jobs and livelihoods.

With approximately 90 million visitors per year, Florida is one of the top destinations of the world. Our tourism industry generates nearly $70 billion annually, supporting over 1 million jobs throughout the State. People from all over the country, in fact, all over the world, travel to Florida to enjoy our incredible beaches, our unparalleled sport fishing, and our State's unique natural treasures.

Anglers from all over the world come to my district, to the village of Islamorada, the sports fishing capital of the world, to enjoy sports fishing that cannot be matched anywhere else in the world. My district also includes the Florida Everglades, the largest wetland in America and a jewel in our National Park System.

In south Florida, we know our economic future depends on preserving our environment. This is why protecting Florida's coast from the dangers of offshore drilling has always drawn support from both sides. This is not a Democratic issue. This is not a Republican issue. It's a Florida issue, and, in fact, it's a national issue.

At a time when we face so many important issues, we here in Congress need to work together to do what's right. While I am new to the ways of Washington, I hope and believe that we can put party pressures aside and put America's people first.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to ensure that we can protect our environment, our economy, our Nation from another disaster like the BP oil spill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I urge opposition to this motion, Mr. Speaker.

What we have here in this motion to recommit is just the latest attempt by a few on the other side of the aisle to cater to special interests instead of the needs of the American people.

Behind me, I have a copy of the transboundary area that we're talking about, the Western Gap. You'll notice in that map you don't even see the State of Florida.

This bill enacts an agreement between the United States Government and Mexico to open up a million and a half acres to offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, an agreement negotiated by and signed by the Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, in February 2012.

We want to make sure this agreement will help create American jobs. We want to make sure that we're developing our resources in a safe and responsible way. We want to make sure that this bill puts us on the path toward North American energy independence.

This bill does all of those things, yet the gentleman that offers the motion says he is against the bill. Actually, he said he's for it, but for a lot of different reasons. But this is an attempt to delay the fact that we need to make changes.

The time for delay is over. The time to come together in a bipartisan way to create jobs through energy is at

hand. We want to develop these resources to achieve North American energy independence and end our dependence on Middle Eastern sources of energy, and we want to reduce the cost of fuel for all Americans.

□ 1450

We want this bill to be part of an all-of-the-above, all-American energy strategy. We want to provide the regulatory clarity and the certainty that energy producers need to explore the area, create the jobs, and produce the energy that we need. And for all of you still on the fence about whether or not to support this bill, let us remember that this is the administration's agreement, and we actually want to get it enacted.

So let's get to work creating American jobs while producing American energy. Let's defeat this motion and let's pass this bill to put Americans back to work.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—194

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

NOES—232

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Ellison
Fincher
Lamborn
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Smith (WA)
Young (FL)

□ 1457

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 171, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—256

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem

Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—171

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

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Fincher
Gutiérrez
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Smith (WA)
Young (FL)

□ 1504

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NEAL was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRATULATING THE HONORABLE ED MARKEY ON ELECTION TO SENATE

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 25, our colleague, ED MARKEY, was elected to the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, from the Adams family to the Kennedy family, Massachusetts has sent great talent to the United States Senate, and always a reminder that John Kennedy served in this House and thought it was a privilege before he went to the United States Senate.

I also will just say a couple of personal things about our colleague. Nobody ever walked away from ED MARKEY and said he didn't know what he was talking about or that he was uninformed. He engages the debate fully. And I must tell you, having known him for more than three decades, he is fulfilling a personal ambition—in addition to which he has promised me that he will take the humility of this institution and bring it to the United States Senate.

The last point that I think is very important and a reminder to all of us, in the polling data that led up to Ed's victory, by 15 points the people said they thought it was his experience that would serve him well. That was the deciding factor in why they sent him to the United States Senate.

A round of applause for our friend, ED MARKEY.

INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS OF RETALIATORY PERSONNEL ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO MAKING PROTECTED COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING SEXUAL ASSAULT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1864) to amend title 10, United States Code, to require an Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—423

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)