Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. ‘‘Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representa-
tives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the ex-
cuted government or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representa-
tives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.’’

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. ‘‘Thereupon Con-
gress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that pur-
pose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twen-
ty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the Presi-
dent shall resume the powers and du-
ties of his office.’’

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Amendment XXVI: 'Amendment to the Constitution for the purpose of overruling the holding of the United States Supreme Court in the case of United States v. Midwest Energy.'

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. 'Thereupon Con-
gress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that pur-
pose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twen-
ty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the Presi-
dent shall resume the powers and du-
ties of his office.’’

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Section 2: 'The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Amendment XXVII: 'No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.'

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to revise and extend remarks and insert omitted material in the RECORD during the reading of the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gent-
leman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program est-
ablished under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent re-
olution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is re-
quested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution au-
thorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 76–770, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HENRICH).

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 95–277, as amended by the appro-
riate provisions of Public Law 102–246, and in consultation with the Majority Leader, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the ap-
pointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a five year term:

George Marcus of California, vice Elaine Wynn.

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.

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 28 minutes a.m.), the House stood in re-
cess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 11 o’clock and 4 minutes a.m.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be excused for 5 minutes a.m. to review and extend remarks and include extra-

nectious materials on H.R. 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle-
leman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 19, I call up the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Key-
stone XL Pipeline, and ask for its im-
mediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
ant to House Resolution 19, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) In General.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Cor-
poration to the Department of State (includ-
ing any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.— The Final Supplemental En-
vironmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the envi-
ronmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Envi-
ronmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (in-
including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or au-
thorization issued before the date of enact-
ment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-
border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the Dis-

ctrict of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil ac-
tion for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in sub-
section (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.— Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in sub-
section (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally di-
vided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Com-
mmittee on Transportation and Infra-
structure and the chair and ranking majority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Or-

gon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the time is considered consumed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 3

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. —This Act may be cited as the “Keystone XL Pipeline Act”.

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL. — (a) In General.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.— The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.— Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally di-
vided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Com-
mmittee on Transportation and Infra-
structure and the chair and ranking majority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Or-

gon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the time is considered consumed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 3

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
January 9, 2015
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final hurdle has been removed, and that is that the Nebraska Supreme Court this morning has approved the pathway for the pipeline, the routing of the pipeline, the Keystone XL pipeline.

Again, the administration has said that it is a temporary job. It is not temporary. So I hope the President is not going to establish another hurdle, that being himself.

America is undergoing an energy renaissance and the prospect of securing North American energy independence is in sight. However, to achieve our goal of energy security, we need to make sure we have the infrastructure in place to keep pace with the changing energy landscape. Keystone will be a critical addition to the Nation’s pipeline network, increasing our supply of oil and helping to reduce its cost.

The State Department completed its environmental analysis a year ago. However, there has still been no action by the administration on the pipeline.

There is simply no reason to delay this important project. As I mentioned, the economic arguments are compelling. This premature veto threat is that the bill would authorize the pipeline despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska. Well, that uncertainty has ended this morning, and the Supreme Court of Nebraska has allowed the planned route to go forward in Nebraska. Again, there is simply no reason to delay. In fact, the southern leg of the pipeline has already been built.

In March 2012, in Oklahoma, the President expressed his support for expediting construction for the southern leg of the Keystone pipeline, and I agree with the President when he stated at that ceremony that he was directing his administration to cut through red tape, break through bureaucratic hurdles, and make this project a priority to go ahead and get it done. It was the right thing to do then, it is the right thing to do now, and I urge the Administration to make sure that bill becomes law.

We should move forward because this pipeline will be a tremendous boon to the economic development and one that doesn’t require a single Federal dollar. The very nature of infrastructure improvement creates jobs, and Keystone is no exception.

I know my colleagues have made the argument that it is only temporary, but every infrastructure job is a temporary job. When a road is completed, when a bridge is completed, when a pipeline is completed, those construction workers move on to hopefully other construction jobs.

Indeed, five unions representing over 3 million members nationwide support building the Keystone XL pipeline. I would like to thank my Democratic colleagues, five unions representing 3 million hardworking Americans—support this project, and I would like to submit their letter in the Record for support of this project.


Dear Senator Hoeven, Senator Landrieu:

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents over 420,000 skilled American and Canadian heavy-equipping operators and other craftworkers, including thousands of members who hope to build the Keystone XL pipeline. The IUOE is one of four unions signatory to the National Pipeline Agreement. To create jobs and improve America’s energy independence, the Keystone XL pipeline should become a key part of America’s energy infrastructure. The economic benefits of the project are uncontestable.

The State Department’s Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) says that approximately 10,000 construction workers would be employed building the pipeline, including thousands of Operating Engineers. A total of 42,100 jobs throughout the United States would be supported by the project, generating over $2 billion in total earnings. All told, this pipeline project would contribute approximately $3.4 billion to America’s Gross Domestic Product.

The Keystone XL will also be one of the safest pipelines ever built. According to the EIS, the fifty-seven special conditions developed by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration were unanimously agreed to by TransCanada: . . . would have a degree of safety greater than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline system under current regulations.” In addition, the Operating Engineers and other union construction trades tasked with building the 1,179 mile pipeline possess the safety and skill levels in the pipeline sector.

Operating Engineers have waited over five years to build the Keystone XL pipeline. We ask you to support this project.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLABAN, General President.


Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Washington, DC.

Dear Speaker Boehner and Leader Pelosi:

The International Union of Operating Engineers supports the passage of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and respectfully requests that you vote for the legislation on Friday when it will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

After five different Environmental Impact Statements and over six years of evaluation, the Keystone XL pipeline has been the most exhaustively reviewed pipeline in history. Of the federal studies have reached the same conclusion: The Keystone XL pipeline merits approval. It is time for Congress to act and approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

As you know, the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. We simply express congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The International Union of Operating Engineers supports the passage of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and respectfully requests that you vote for the legislation on Friday when it will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

After five different Environmental Impact Statements and over six years of evaluation, the Keystone XL pipeline has been the most exhaustively reviewed pipeline in history. All of the federal studies have reached the same conclusion: The Keystone XL pipeline merits approval. It is time for Congress to act and approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

As you know, the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. We simply express congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. We simply express congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The Keystone XL will be safer than any other domestic oil pipeline. According to the EIS, the fifty-seven special conditions developed by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration were unanimously agreed to by TransCanada: . . . would have a degree of safety greater than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline system under current regulations.” In addition, the Operating Engineers and other union construction trades tasked with building the 1,179 mile pipeline possess the safety and skill levels in the pipeline sector.

Operating Engineers have waited over five years to build the Keystone XL pipeline. We ask you to support this project.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLABAN, General President.


Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Speaker Boehner and Leader Pelosi:

The International Union of Operating Engineers supports the passage of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and respectfully requests that you vote for the legislation on Friday when it will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

After five different Environmental Impact Statements and over six years of evaluation, the Keystone XL pipeline has been the most exhaustively reviewed pipeline in history. All of the federal studies have reached the same conclusion: The Keystone XL pipeline merits approval. It is time for Congress to act and approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

As you know, the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. We simply express congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. We simply express congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The Keystone XL will be safer than any other domestic oil pipeline. According to the EIS, the fifty-seven special conditions developed by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration were unanimously agreed to by TransCanada: . . . would have a degree of safety greater than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline system under current regulations.” In addition, the Operating Engineers and other union construction trades tasked with building the 1,179 mile pipeline possess the safety and skill levels in the pipeline sector.

Operating Engineers have waited over five years to build the Keystone XL pipeline. We ask you to support this project.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLABAN, General President.


Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Speaker Boehner and Leader Pelosi:

The International Union of Operating Engineers supports the passage of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and respectfully requests that you vote for the legislation on Friday when it will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

After five different Environmental Impact Statements and over six years of evaluation, the Keystone XL pipeline has been the most exhaustively reviewed pipeline in history. All of the federal studies have reached the same conclusion: The Keystone XL pipeline merits approval. It is time for Congress to act and approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

As you know, the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. We simply express congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. We simply express congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The Keystone XL will be safer than any other domestic oil pipeline. According to the EIS, the fifty-seven special conditions developed by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration were unanimously agreed to by TransCanada: . . . would have a degree of safety greater than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline system under current regulations.” In addition, the Operating Engineers and other union construction trades tasked with building the 1,179 mile pipeline possess the safety and skill levels in the pipeline sector.

Operating Engineers have waited over five years to build the Keystone XL pipeline. We ask you to support this project.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLABAN, General President.
Well, it is Groundhog Day come early to the floor of the House. It is cold enough I guess for Groundhog Day, but this will be the 10th time in the last 4 years that the House of Representatives has moved this bill with the assertion that somehow it leads us to energy independence, energy security, lower prices at the pump.

Well, the reality is a Canadian corporation is going to build a pipeline from Canada to Texas. They are going to be exempted from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, unlike most other projects in this country, because of a stupid ruling by the IRS—but that is nothing new—regarding tar sands. So they will be exempt from paying into that. So if this thing bursts, there is an accident, the taxpayers of the United States get the bill, not the taxpayers of Canada. They don't get the bill. The taxpayers of the United States get the bill. Now, that is one of a number of problems regarding this project.

It is somewhat unprecedented, I believe. This may have happened at some other time in American history, but I do find it particularly ironic today, when we had the reading of the Constitution, of/or loyalty oaths, that this bill, if it were to become law—and the President has already said he will veto it. But if this were to become law, the effect would be to give a foreign corporation the right to take private property from Americans without their consent. I am not aware of any other time in the history of the Union where we have given a foreign corporation the right to take Americans' private property. And, yes, some people were happy to sell the rights, but many others weren't, including some in Nebraska and some in Texas. It has been quite contentious among landowners who are just having this corporation come.

I would like to put in the RECORD a letter from TransCanada. We have blacked out the name of the recipient of the letter, but it is a true copy of a letter to a person who will have their private property taken by eminent domain by a foreign corporation, and the foreign corporation informs them that they will begin proceedings this month, I guess because of the anticipated Republican action, to take their private property away.

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

The Chair: The gentleman yields an equal amount of time to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SHUSTER. I want to name them off. It is the Teamsters; it is the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; it is the Laborers' International Union. It is the Operating Engineers; it is the plumbers, fitters of the United States and Canada all supporting this project. Again, they see it as positive economic impact.

When these jobs are completed, they will have put not just thousands of Operating Engineers and other construction workers back on the job. The International Union of Operating Engineers respectfully requests your support for H.R. 3, legislation to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

James T. Callahan,
General President.

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

Well, it is Groundhog Day come early to the floor of the House. It is cold enough I guess for Groundhog Day, but this will be the 10th time in the last 4 years that the House of Representatives has moved this bill with the assertion that somehow it leads us to energy independence, energy security, lower prices at the pump.

Well, the reality is a Canadian corporation is going to build a pipeline from Canada to Texas. They are going to be exempted from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, unlike most other projects in this country, because of a stupid ruling by the IRS—but that is nothing new—regarding tar sands. So they will be exempt from paying into that. So if this thing bursts, there is an accident, the taxpayers of the United States get the bill, not the taxpayers of Canada. They don't get the bill. The taxpayers of the United States get the bill. Now, that is one of a number of problems regarding this project.

It is somewhat unprecedented, I believe. This may have happened at some other time in American history, but I do find it particularly ironic today, when we had the reading of the Constitution, of/or loyalty oaths, that this bill, if it were to become law—and the President has already said he will veto it. But if this were to become law, the effect would be to give a foreign corporation the right to take private property from Americans without their consent. I am not aware of any other time in the history of the Union where we have given a foreign corporation the right to take Americans' private property. And, yes, some people were happy to sell the rights, but many others weren't, including some in Nebraska and some in Texas. It has been quite contentious among landowners who are just having this corporation come.

I would like to put in the RECORD a letter from TransCanada. We have blacked out the name of the recipient of the letter, but it is a true copy of a letter to a person who will have their private property taken by eminent domain by a foreign corporation, and the foreign corporation informs them that they will begin proceedings this month, I guess because of the anticipated Republican action, to take their private property away.
tour of a pump station on the operating Key-
stone line in Nebraska.

Sincerely,

ANDREW CRAIG,
Manager—Land, Keystone Projects,
TransCanada Pipelines, USA.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Now, that is a bit
ironic, again, on the day we read the
Constitution and also of the party of
individual rights for property owners.

So that is also of concern.
Yes, there will be construction jobs,
and I am the first to admit we need
more jobs in America. In fact, I voted
against the President’s so-called stim-
ulus bill because it didn’t invest
enough in infrastructure in this
country. Instead, it did a whole
bunch of stupid tax cuts because of
Larry Summers, a highly acclaimed
hack economist, and we didn’t put a lot
of people back to work. Seven percent
went to infrastructure, that created
jobs; 42 percent went to tax cuts, didn’t
create jobs. But that is another agenda
the Republicans are pursuing is tax
cuts to create jobs, but we won’t get
into that here today.

So, that can happen, but there are
a lot of other investments we
should, could, and I believe the chair-
man supports making that will create
significant construction and infra-
structure jobs.

Now, we have this just in isolation and
it didn’t involve the total destruction
of the boreal forests of Canada, if I
were Canadian I would be pretty upset
about that; and perhaps the dirtiest,
most environmentally problematic way
of extracting fossil fuels from the
ground to get these oil sands, the con-
struction jobs might carry the day, but
sometimes you have to draw a line.

In this case, we also hear it is going
to lead somehow to energy security.
Well, that is interesting because the
crude, tar sand oil, or whatever you
want to call it, is going to come down
to Texas without paying into the Oil
Spill Liability Trust Fund—creating a
potential problem for the future tax-
payer of the States—so the trans-
finery in an export zone in Texas, and,
yes, it will be refined and then it will
be exported.

We are exporting millions of gallons
of fuel every day, so to somehow say
this is going to lead to lower prices at
the pump in America—maybe it is
lower prices at the pump in China or I
don’t know where else. Japan or some-
place, but it isn’t going to be here be-
cause the product is ultimately going
to be exported. So it is also not going
to do anything for our energy security,
and at the moment we have kind of a
surfeit because of fracking and other
things of fuels, and prices are down
considerably.

Mr. DEFAZIO. And by passing this bill, the House of
Representatives will attempt to pre-
empt the executive authority of the
President in this matter because this
pipeline crosses an international bor-
der. The President has authority, and
the State Department has been consid-
ering it.

And even with the Supreme Court of
Nebraska refusing to make a judgment,
they didn’t uphold the law of the Ne-
braska legislature. In fact, four of
seven majority judges found it uncon-
stitutional, but Nebraska has a peculiar-
ity that if the other three judges take a
walk—which they did—then even
though a majority found it constitu-
tional, it is unconstitution, and that is the end of the proceeding.

So that is the big news out of Ne-
braska. They need a little work on
their constitution, I think. So it hasn’t
received a stamp of approval there.
There are still aggrieved landowners in
Nebraska who object to the route and
who are going to have their private
property taken by a foreign corpora-
tion. So other than that, it is a great
idea.

And with that, I reserve the balance
of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself such time as I may consume,
and I just want to remind my Demo-
ocratic colleagues that, first of all, I am
not, as I am from Pennsylvania, Punnxsutawney is
several miles outside of my district. That
is where Punxsutawney Phil re-
side. So I am somewhat knowledgeable
on Groundhog Day. And I just
want to point out to my Democratic
colleagues that ‘‘allegedly in the movie
‘Ground-

hod Day,’’ Bill Murray learned from his
mistakes the day before and improved
his situation each day. So hopefully
today, your references to your learning
from yesterday and how we can move
forward—I think the Nebraska situ-
a
tion improves the whole situation
for all of us. And I certainly don’t question
the wisdom of the Nebraska Supreme
Court.

And with that, I yield to the gentle-
man from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today in support of this bill as vice
chair of the Pipeline Subcommittee.

Pipe
celines are the single safest way to
transport liquids—safer than rail, safer
than trucks. The State Department
says Keystone would have a minimal
impact on the environment.

President Obama and his administra-
tion have confirmed that Keystone will
create thousands of construction jobs.
These are men and women’s livelihoods.

Respectfully, I would remind the ad-
ministration, but by their nature, all
construction jobs are temporary. And
it is insulting to marginalize the value
of these jobs or the people who might
hold them.

Key
stone is supported by many
unions, including mine, Local 545, the
Operating Engineers, where I have been
for almost 35 years.

Prime
Minister Stephen Harper of
Canada said, and I agree, that Key-
stone is in both of our nations’ inter-
ests and that ‘‘the logic here is over-
whelming.’’

Keystone will help us stop sending
billions and billions of dollars overseas
to our enemies, many of whom would
harm us.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to start build-
ing this Keystone pipeline.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, could
you tell me how much time remains
of the 15 minutes that I had?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
DOLD). Each side has 9 minutes remain-
ing.

Mr. DEFAZIO. With that, I yield
4 minutes to the gentleman from Ari-
 zona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking
member of the Natural Resources Com-
mittee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank the gentle-
man from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition
to what can only be described as
an earmark for a Canadian corpora-
tion. It speaks volumes about the Re-
publican agenda, as this new Congress
continues, that the first order of busi-
ness in the House and Senate is to
rubberstamp the Keystone XL pipeline.

We have not dealt with unemploy-
ment benefits that the American peo-
ple need that have lapsed for more than
a year. Millions of Americans are suf-
fere
ing from a low minimum wage and
income disparity, but we are not help-

ing them. Women in this country still
only earn 77 cents to every dollar their
male counterparts earn, but we are not
trying to end that disparity.

Instead, they are trying to get Keystone
through without the proper approval
process. Building a pipeline clear
across the United States so that Trans-
Canada can sell its dirty tar sands oil to
the highest bidder—namely China—
is not in the American people’s best in-

terests.

We take on the risk to our lands, the
American people face threats to their
health, and TransCanada gets to reap
the rewards. That is not a winning for-

mula for our country or the economy.
In fact, it is a sham.

And yet the Keystone XL pipeline
continues to be sold to the American
people on blatantly false pretenses. We
are told by proponents that this is about
job creation, yet not a single
independent analysis supports these
claims.

The burden of proof is on the GOP.
They push fantastic claims out of thin
air, and yet they refuse to back them
cost. Instead, we are told to trust their
assertions at face value.

Here is what we actually know.
These are the facts that can actually
be substantiated:

The State Department found in its
supplemental environmental impact
study of the Keystone pipeline that it
will generate less than 2,000 jobs a year
for 2 years and only during the period
of construction. Once the pipeline is
built, these jobs will disappear, leaving
more than 35 permanent jobs that will re-
sult from this project.

Mr. DEFAZIO. To put that in con-
text, under President Obama, 353,000 jobs were generated in Novem-
ber and a total of 2.9 million in 2014.
There is also the claim that it is going to lower gas prices for the American people. But gas prices have been dropping for more than 100 straight days and are at the lowest level in more than 5½ years. They won't go any lower by allowing oil to be piped across our country just to be sold abroad.

In contrast to fantasy impacts on gas prices, the potential impacts on our environment are very real. Not only will burning these tar sands add to global climate change, but any leakage, failure, or, God forbid, explosion will have disastrous impacts on our environment.

And because tar sands importers are exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, the American taxpayers will have to bear the cost of cleaning up any spills.

The public needs to know these facts, and that is why allowing 1 hour of debate with not a single, solitary amendment today robs the American people of a full debate and discussion.

On top of all that, this bill is being pushed through despite the fact that it violates not one but two treaties with American Indian nations.

What does this say about the GOP's respect for the law?

If the Republicans truly want to generate jobs for the American people, they should fully fund the highway trust fund and support the GROW AMERICA Act to invest in the crumbling infrastructure all across this country, not help Canadians build a superhighway for their dirty tar sands oil.

We would be supporting not just 2,000 jobs per year for 2 years but millions of jobs for American families, across every congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have a chance to take an important stand today early in this Congress on behalf of taxpayers, the environment, Native American tribes, and the rule of law by supporting President Obama's veto and rejecting this toxic giveaway to foreign corporate oil interests.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I just want to say that there have been 15 hearings on the Keystone pipeline. This is the 10th time we have debated it on the floor. This, quite possibly, could be the most debated piece of legislation in the history of Congress. That for sure! I do know that it has been out there for 2,303 days, and 60 percent of the American people support it, while 20 percent don't support it. So I think the American people are fully aware of what is going on here. They understand it, and they do support it.

With that, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for your courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keystone pipeline, which will safely move 300 million barrels annually, strengthen our economy, continue to decrease our dependence on Mideast oil, and support thousands of jobs.

This body has shown tremendous leadership on this issue and last year passed bipartisan legislation to approve Keystone for the ninth time. Today, with strong support from unions, business, and the American people, we must pass it again.

I am grateful for Representative Cramer, Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman UPTON, and the leadership for their work on this vital legislation.

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

The gentleman just referenced safety transport. Of course that is a hypothetical. And let me give a real example:

In 2010, a Canadian company, Enbridge, had a pipeline burst in Marshall, Michigan, spilling 1 million gallons of tar sands oil.

Now, here is the thing. All oil has viscosity and other characteristics. The thing about tar sands oil, it doesn't float. It goes straight to the bottom. They are still dredging Canadian tar sands oil out of the bottom of the Kalamazoo River 4 years later. And so far, claims of millions have been made, which will have to be paid by American taxpayers against the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and not by Enbridge, the Canadian corporation.

Which is what we are setting up here: an even greater transshipment of energy foreign and native, of tar sands oil from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, creating even bigger potential for spills with this oil, which has unique characteristics which are much more difficult to clean up if it comes in contact with water and, God forbid, it gets into the aquifer in one of the States that are being transacted.

The chairman did reference the 15 hearings. We have a difference in counting. But let's say 15 hearings. Those aren't hearings. That is sort of a little star chamber where you take things before you bring them to the floor of the House. You don't discuss substance there. One was in the Senate. There were 30 in the House, but not a single one of those hearings was in the principal committee of jurisdiction, which would be the Transportation Committee. And of course the bill that was marked up by the Transportation Committee was the last session of the last Congress was very different than the bill that is being advocated for today, which has not been marked up.

And we heard a lot about regular order, read the bill, and all that stuff. It is fine to say; gee, we have voted on this a lot of times before. With 61 new Members of the House, gas prices are down by almost 50 percent, a lot of things have changed. I would even wonder about the viability of this project.

And just recently I learned that the Koch brothers, though, have a significant investment in tar sands in Canada. But that probably has nothing to do with an attempt to expedite this project.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would just like to remind the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation Committee, arguably the most knowledgeable man in Congress when it comes to transportation issues, with many years of service plus the project that is before us. I would never presume to tell him—I just want to remind him that the safest way to move product, to move oil is by pipeline. And I think the gentleman knows that, but I just wanted to remind him of that.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard a word that is almost hard to believe. We have been accused of expediting this process. Ladies and gentlemen, this is day 2,303 of this process. It is time now. It is time because it is good for job creation. It is time because it is good for the environment. It is not just the safest way, as the chairman said; the most environmentally sound way to move tar sands oil is in a pipeline. It is good for national security. It is good for economic security. It is good because 62.8 percent of labor force participation is the lowest since 1978. It creates jobs. And it is for these reasons that not only does the majority of the United States Senate and the majority of the United States Senate support it, but it is because of these reasons that the vast majority of the people of the United States support it, including the people of Nebraska. And for those reasons, I urge a ‘yes’ vote on H.R. 3.

Mr. DEFAZIO. At this moment, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the permitting for the Keystone pipeline has taken longer than it took for the United States to win World War II. Isn't that lovely? The pipeline will bring oil to my home State of Texas. Pipelines are the safest way to transport oil. The Keystone pipeline is the safest way to transport oil. And I think the American people want more, not less, work in our neighborhood. I would deliver as much oil as we get from Saudi Arabia. The United States should work more with our neighbors—our normal neighbors—Canada and Mexico to develop our national resources and compete with OPEC.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national security and energy security issue. We can make the Middle East, its politics, its oil, and its turmoil irrelevant. It is time to pick a horse and ride it. And that is just the way it is. Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

In response to the transport, yes, pipelines are generally safer, but the
Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Keystone XL pipeline, the most studied pipeline in American history.

After 6 years and 22,000 pages of review, the President’s own State Department tells us that construction of this pipeline will support over 42,000 good-paying jobs and do nothing to harm the environment. Pipelines have been shown to be the safest way to transport oil.

Keystone has bipartisan, widespread support—Democrats, Republicans, industry leaders, and labor. Unfortunately, the President issued a veto threat, putting the wishes of environmental activists ahead of creating jobs for the American public.

Mr. Speaker, let’s say “yes” to much-needed jobs and approve the Keystone pipeline without any further delays.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are exporting more than 16 percent of the oil that we produce every day, either as refined or even as crude product. In this case, Canadian oil, exempt from a tax, will flow...
through the United States to a refinery.

It will be processed and exported overseas. Somehow, that is going to lower prices farther at the pump. Somehow, that is going to lead to American security. But to do that, you have to blow the dust off those arguments. They are a little dated, so we have raised a number of concerns here today.

Minimally—minimally—the Republican Congress should require this Canadian corporation to pay the same tax that most U.S. corporations pay when they transport products through pipelines and not put American taxpayers at risk.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the final hurdle has been removed. The Nebraska Supreme Court has said that the Keystone pipeline can move forward. That should be enough for my Democratic colleagues. But there is also a myth. It is safe. It is the safest way to transport this oil, this natural resource. It is the most studied pipeline. It is going to be safe and environmentally sound. It will protect the environment. It creates jobs. Don’t listen to the divisive forces that represent 3 million workers. Three million union workers say the Keystone pipeline should be built.

Mr. Speaker, it provides energy security for us, it is good for our economy, and it helps our allies—our allies, and it weakens our enemies. The last point is it is fair to our best friends in the world, the Canadians, who have allowed us to build a pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48. We ought to return the favor to our best friends—our best ally—and say: “Yes, you can build a safe pipeline, you can build a pipeline that will help all of North America, that will help all of our allies around the world and weaken our enemies.”

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on H.R. 3, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Commerce Committee has shared jurisdiction over this issue with T&I, and we have a number of members that would like to speak on the issue as well.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Upton), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, do you like cheap oil? Most Americans would say “yes,” and a number of us have strongly pursued a North American energy independence plan for years, and our friend, Canada, is a big part of that.

In August of 2009, President Obama signed off on a new pipeline called the Alberta Clipper. Guess what? It brings approximately 400,000 barrels of oil a day from western Canada through the United States.

We have been waiting for the approval of the Keystone XL pipeline for years—over 6 in fact. I remember well when President Obama promised to do whatever it takes to create American jobs. That was followed by a so-called year of action; yet here we are, 6 years later, and nothing has happened.

By the administration’s own estimates, Keystone XL will support hundreds of thousands of jobs. Bringing oil from Canada to the U.S. displaces imports from Venezuela and the Middle East. Isn’t that a good thing?

I also note that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton signaled that she was inclined to support the project, and that was way back in 2010.

In fact, in the summer of 2011, the White House issued its first veto threat against congressional action on the Keystone XL, claiming that legislation was unnecessary because their process was working and a decision would be reached by the end of that year. Since then, we have upgraded new oil and gas pipeline standards, and Keystone will exceed those, Mr. President, as it should.

We used to be a nation of big ideas and big dreams. We imagined building the Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge and accomplished both in far less time than it has taken the President to muster the courage to simply say “yes” or “no.” We can do better.

The election, Mr. President, is over. There has been broad, bipartisan support for this project from the very first day. The President has been hiding behind the Nebraska court case to block the critical jobs project called Keystone XL, and with that contrived roadblock cleared, the White House is now out of excuses. Vote “yes.”

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3.

The energy crisis is one of the most significant issues facing America today. It is another indication why we are wasting precious time as we debate an energy policy that will not solve our energy problems, and it will not put American taxpayers at risk.

I rise in support of this bill because I support North American energy development.

Today, the Nebraska Supreme Court affirmed that Keystone XL should be built. Keystone XL pipeline not the first cross-border pipeline project built in North America.

But some opponents had their way. Keystone XL pipeline would be the last pipeline we built in North America.

Energy prices are at their lowest point in the last decade.

Energy imports from partners like Canada and Mexico, and domestic production, have plummeted to less than 30 percent a year in the pockets of the American people.

Keystone XL will continue this success in a time of struggle.

The United States still imports approximately 40 percent of the oil we use domestically.

The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has decided to directly challenge the new North American energy market by maintaining, and in some cases, increasing production.

This is a direct affront to North American producers and an all-out price war. This, however, is a struggle we can win, with the help of our North American partners. Lower energy prices for North American crude, including Canadian oil and United States shale oil, are as low as $40 per barrel. Our producers can support our domestic demand while further driving out more expensive competitors.

Unfortunately, our domestic producers cannot win without cost-effective and environmentally sound transportation. Keystone XL offers that advantage and I support it, although I do not believe H.R. 3 is the perfect legislation.

I believe that oil sands should be subject to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. Almost every other source of crude oil that transits the United States is subject to the Trust Fund tax and oil sands should be as well.

It makes fiscal sense, it makes environmental sense and it makes competitive sense. Oil sands should not be favored over any other sources in our country.

The Keystone XL pipeline is the most scrutinized project in as long as I can remember.

As we face the 114th Congress, we have record-highs that require us to build the Keystone XL pipeline. Keystone XL pipeline is good for the United States, it’s good for North America and we should support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are voting once again to grant special treatment—and I stress “special treatment”—to TransCanada’s Keystone XL pipeline. It is the 10th time since Republicans took control of the House.

American families face many pressing problems, and they want us to use this new Congress to work together to solve them. Unfortunately, we will begin this new year with a bill crafted solely to help the Canadian tar sands industry. The administration issued a statement in opposition to this legislation and indicated that the President will veto the bill. I heard my Republican colleagues talk about the action or inaction, whatever it was, by the Nebraska Supreme Court today; but I would stress that the White House press office still says in a statement that regardless of the Nebraska ruling today, the House bill still conflicts with longstanding executive branch procedures regarding the authority of the President and prevents the thorough consideration of complex issues that could bear on U.S. national interests, and if presented to the President he will veto the bill. So the bill will still be vetoed by the President, which is another indication why we are wasting our time today.

Mr. Speaker, oil prices are at their lowest level in more than 5 years. Gas prices are now below $2 a gallon. Domestic U.S. oil production is skyrocketing. Tar sands are among the dirtiest and most carbon-intensive of
Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Power Subcommittee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, this is a new year and a new Congress. We have new Members who will vote on this bill without the benefit of any hearings or markups or floor amendments, without the benefit of learning how our changing energy picture alters the need for this pipeline, and without considering whether our time might be better spent on efforts to promote other cleaner energy sources.

We need sound energy policy in these challenging times. As the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I am anxious to begin working with all of my colleagues on pragmatic energy policy; but we need a balanced energy policy, one that takes into account current circumstances, one that takes into account our need to combat climate change, and one that works with the President rather than against the President to actually deliver legislation that the President can sign rather than veto. This legislation doesn't meet any of these criteria, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman and friend.

Mr. Speaker, I speak today as a former naval aviator who flew alongside Canadian Armed Forces when we went to war in Afghanistan; they went with us. To date, nearly 200 of their precious sons have come home in coffins. That is a true ally.

When Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans in August 2005, within 3 days our neighbor to the north authorized three U.S. Navy vessels, a Coast Guard vessel, numerous planes, 25 military divers, and tons of tents, blankets, beds, water, and medical supplies. That is a true ally.

And yet this strong alliance is being weakened dramatically because President Obama has chosen to listen to a small group of wealthy radicals who want no drop of oil coming from our neighbor to the north—Canada.

In November, I met with officials from Canada, officials from all over, from Leeds-Grenville and Nova Scotia. They were dismayed because we are telling them: We don't want your oil; don't help us.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSON. It is a bad world, Mr. President, with terrorists in Paris, and ISIS. Terrorists hit our country from North Korea. We need strong allies.

In November, I met with officials from Canada, officials from all over, from Leeds-Grenville and Nova Scotia. They were dismayed because we are telling them: We don't want your oil; don't help us.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSON. It is a bad world, Mr. President, with terrorists in Paris, and ISIS. Terrorists hit our country from North Korea. We need strong allies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to vote "no." The Keystone XL pipeline is a Republican pipe dream.

Mr. RUSH. This bill is about seizing power away from the American people by seizing power away from our duly-elected President. It will prevent the thorough, sober consideration of complex issues that could have serious security, safety, environmental, and other ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to vote "no." The Keystone XL pipeline is a Republican pipe dream.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the floor debating a bill to approve the Keystone pipeline, we all need to admit that we shouldn't be doing this. We should not have to be here today.

It is 2,303 days after the application for Keystone was first submitted to the State Department. We shouldn't be debating it; we should be building it.

Mr. Speaker, for the longest time, the President hid behind the lengthy and delayed review process saying he wanted to wait to make a decision. He said he was waiting because of environmental and legal considerations. But Keystone won't harm the environment; it will help protect it. The people know that.

Mr. Speaker, before we even started the debate today, has submitted a threat of a veto. I take these seriously as a majority leader, so I wanted to read it. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why the President wants to veto it is because this bill also authorizes the project, despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska. Well, hallelujah, we have good news for the President, Mr. Speaker. The Nebraska Supreme Court solved that problem for him today.

So we should move forward just as we have done before on a bipartisan basis.
Why? Because of 42,000 jobs. Those are American jobs created here, an economy continuing to move forward.

And rest assured, the oil in Canada will be produced. The question before us today: Will that oil move down through America, refined in American refineries, that will create 200,000 jobs and put those 3 million men and women in our labor unions to work on good things that are going to rebuild this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong bill, it is passed in the wrong way, and at exactly the wrong time.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WILK. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman from Kentucky for his tenacious work on this issue. This is the 10th time this has come to the floor and he has been diligent and has continued to push it, and we thank him for those efforts.

I have to tell you, listening to this debate, it just goes to show you why the American people are so tired of what they consider to be the political games that are played here in Washington.

They said they wanted us to come and get some things done. This is getting some things done. It is appropriate that we take up this bill today. And here is why: Do you realize 88 percent of all Americans support energy independence—88 percent? Fifty-five percent of all Americans think that building the Keystone pipeline is what our country should do.

Now, I have to tell you, I listen to the President and to the excuses that come out of the administration, and I think that with the Supreme Court decision in Nebraska today the President is out of excuses. He is out of excuses. He has run the gamut on it. No more excuses. It is time that we pass it, the Senate passes it, and that this legislation goes to the President's desk.

One of my colleagues said that being here on the floor today is a waste of time. I really disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. The President vetoing this legislation is a waste not only of the American people's time, but of the resources and the taxpayer money that come into the coffers for this government to function.

Create 20,000 new jobs, increase our energy supply, move us to energy independence. Pass the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to how much time is available on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a labor economics jobs bill. The American people need jobs. Labor unions who founded and have built the middle class of this Nation need jobs.

But, ladies and gentlemen, nobody needs jobs like young Black men. I see this as a reality here today. The highest unemployment rate is with Black young men. For Black young men between the ages of 19 and 35, the unemployment rate is 38 percent—38 percent—and in some communities it is 50 percent.

That is why I come before you today. I support the bill. But I want you all to help me support an amendment. You know the American process is going on over in the Senate.

Over in the Senate, Senator McCONNELL said he is open to amendments. Here is the amendment: the amendment could just pass this bill that would put the apprenticeship programs, what they affectionately call "earn as you learn" on-the-job training—no Federal money—and target those and guide and direct and encourage in this language that our labor union partners bring in these young African American men to learn these trade building skills. Each of the labor unions are ready. They have the apprenticeship programs, they have them there.

We need this desperately, ladies and gentlemen. Do you know that sitting in the prisons right now are 1 million Black men. Every week, thousands of our Black men are going into prison. The number one problem we don't have jobs. This is a jobs bill. Yeah, it has got maybe, some people say, 4,000, some people say 2,000, but there will be other jobs that they can learn these skills from when we rebuild our infrastructure.

You all have seen the sign. Black lives matter, but Black lives with jobs. Help me get this amendment in on the Senate side and let's pass this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3 and the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Part of the existing pipeline system actually supplies the Wood River Refinery in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois.

In anticipation of the construction of this pipeline, the owners have spent $4 billion upgrading the facility and created about 2,400 jobs over a 4-year period. Construction of the Keystone XL extension would deliver similar benefits to other regions of the country, creating over 42,000 jobs in construction, manufacturing, transportation, and services industries.

It is for these reasons that a diverse coalition of businesses and labor unions in the construction and building trades industries have come out in support of H.R. 3, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, how does this one project, the Keystone XL pipeline, get so much outsized attention? We currently have a sprawling, 185,000-mile network of oil pipelines in the United States and a network of oil pipelines in the United States and a regulatory process to ensure that they are operating safely.
So why are we spending so much time trying to exempt a Canadian company from the environmental reviews that every other company in America has to abide by?

And the big question, Mr. Speaker: Will we pay for any future oil spills? Not Keystone. This bill exempts Keystone from contributing the same 8 cents per barrel that every other oil company is required to pay into the oil spill trust fund.

'Ftell me, Mr. Speaker, why is this? If the authors are so certain that this pipeline does not carry any environmental risk, won’t they allow the review process to run its course?

I stand with my colleagues. I want those jobs, I want them around the country. We can do this, we can do better.

I urge a "no" vote on this dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I also want to say congratulations again to my friend Congressman PALLONE for assuming the ranking position. We look forward to working with you.

Today is a great day. This pipeline should have been approved 6 years ago, like so many other transnational pipelines in our history. A pipeline is the safest way to move bulk liquid product, more than any other means. It will be from an ally, a trusted ally. More crude oil on the world market lowers prices for everybody. It is more money in the individual citizen’s pocket. It actually is a very good day.

Let’s just debunk this myth. This oil is going to go in refineries in my district, Mike Bost’s district, Ohio, Indiana, and in the gulf coast. We are going to get the double effort because we are going to have to refine this put it on the U.S. market, and lower energy prices for all our citizens. It is a great day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition. We opposed this bill throughout, but the U.S. State Department estimates that this will create only 35 permanent jobs. Yes, they will be construction jobs, but they are not permanent. They are for a year, maybe 2 years.

Let’s be clear about what we are getting with Keystone: a dirty and dangerous pipeline running through the heart of our country which will help Canadian oil companies export their oil, and it happens to be the filthiest possible energy form.

I would like to say that if we put the same time and energy into a transpor-
far, in the national interest. The President is just asking for more time to make that determination.

Vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address a couple of things.

First of all, I will place in the Record as well as I received from the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council and Caterpillar.

January 7, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Representative Cramer: The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) and our nationwide membership of business owners and entrepreneurs strongly support H.R. 3, the “Keystone XL Pipeline Act.”

Delays in approving this important project cannot be justified on any grounds. This is a critical energy supply and security issue, as well as being vital for U.S. economic growth, job creation and small business development.

This project means quality job growth, new business formation, and an increase in oil supplies from reliable sources. The building and operation of Keystone XL would benefit small businesses via affordable energy and economic growth. Small businesses within the energy sector would see growth opportunities as a result of the pipeline’s construction and operation. An underreported fact is that the U.S. energy sector is dominated by small businesses.

Consider the latest U.S. Census Bureau data:

Among oil and gas extraction businesses, 91.1 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among oil and gas pipeline and related structures construction businesses, 65.5 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

And among oil and gas field machinery and equipment manufacturing businesses, 57.6 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among support for oil and gas operations businesses, 83.3 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among drilling oil and gas wells businesses, 79.8 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

The message is all about small business. A new study released by SBE Council on November 13, 2014, found that small businesses are driving America’s energy renaissance. For example, from 2005-2012, construction businesses related to oil and gas pipeline and related structures grew by 12.2 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; oil and gas extraction businesses grew by 4.1 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; businesses drilling oil and gas wells grew by 7.9 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; manufacturing businesses supporting oil and gas operations grew by 29.1 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; and manufacturing businesses related to oil and gas field machinery and equipment grew by 8.5 percent among firms with less than 20 workers. It is important to understand that during this same period, the total number of small and mid-size employer firms declined, but the opposite was true in the energy sector. Construction of Keystone XL would mean increased small business growth, opportunities for entrepreneurs, and a stronger economy for America.

A vote in favor of H.R. 3 is a vote for small business and America. Thank you for considering America’s small business sector on this critical issue. SBE Council and its members look forward to House passage of H.R. 3.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President & CEO

January 8, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Congressman Cramer: On behalf of Caterpillar Inc., I write today in support of H.R. 3 the “Keystone XL Pipeline Act,” which would authorize construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Caterpillar has long supported the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline because of its significant economic and energy security benefits to North America.

As the world’s leading manufacturer of construction and mining equipment, diesel and natural gas engines, industrial gas turbines, and locomotives; along with our commitment to providing leading financial, rental, logistics and rail services, Caterpillar has been making sustainable progress possible on every continent for more than 80 years.

With energy related products and services accounting for over one-fourth of our business, Caterpillar, our dealers, and our customers are uniquely positioned to provide solutions to the U.S.’s energy challenges. Through our core business and through new innovative technologies, Caterpillar is one of the world’s leading technology suppliers to the diverse energy market and leverages its technology and innovation to meet the world’s growing energy needs.

In the United States, the approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline would result in billions of dollars of investment, create tens of thousands of jobs, and would allow for the movement of hundreds of thousands of oil per day. Pipelines are a safe, reliable, economical, and environmentally favorable way to transport oil and petroleum products, as well as other energy liquids throughout the United States. It already depends on thousands of miles of liquid pipelines to move the energy and raw materials our country relies on for everything from heating homes to powering manufacturing facilities. This additional pipeline capacity will help consumers and business throughout the United States and increase American competitiveness.

Caterpillar commends you for your leadership on this critical issue and looks forward to working with you on the approval of this important project.

Sincerely,

KATHRYN D. CAROL,
Vice President

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the climate change issue because I think it is an important issue to a lot of people.

The argument that the other side makes is based on the false idea that somehow oil sands are not going to be developed without the Keystone XL. It is. Moving anything by rail is 1.9 times more the emissions of CO2 than moving it by pipeline. Moving it by truck creates 2.8 times the CO2 emissions as moving it by pipeline. Moving it by barge to China is priceless.

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

In conclusion, I would like to point out a couple of things. First of all, this was a significant issue in the last election just a couple of months ago. This is a piece of legislation about the American people, not a Canadian oil company. In polls, 72 percent of the American people say they support this legislation.

This is about jobs for people in America who need jobs. This is about increasing the energy infrastructure of our country. This is also a project that would not include one dime from the Federal Government. It is going to be at a cost of approximately $7 billion of private funds that will create a lot of jobs and make us less dependent on foreign oil.

The application for the Keystone pipeline was filed in September of 2008. There are 2.6 million miles of pipelines in America. Most of those pipelines do not have to be approved by the President of the United States, but in this particular pipeline, since it crosses into the country from Canada to the U.S., the President must approve it.

The President has said that one reason he is not going to approve it is because of litigation in Nebraska, which ended today in favor of the Governor of Nebraska who supports this pipeline.

The second ostensible reason for the President to oppose it is CO2 emissions; yet the Secretary of State’s office under Hillary Clinton and Mr. Kerry in their final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement have said on three occasions that it will have minimal impact on the environment.

Today, we want to pass this legislation once again for the American people, and I think that they will pass it, and we would ask the President to join us and sign this legislation.

I would urge the passage of H.R. 3, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the majority has chosen the first week of the 114th Congress to relegate the battles of the previous two Congresses. This time, we’re here debating whether or not to approve a pipeline, through our nation’s Heartland, carrying Canadian tar sands.

There are many reasons why I’m opposed to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, the fact that oil produced from tar sands creates 17% more carbon emissions than other crude; the potentially devastating impact wrought by this heavy crude should a pipeline rupture occur; or that today, constituents of the Governor of Nebraska, who supports this pipeline, have the best prices at the pump in several years without the completion of this pipeline due to the record glut in global oil supply.

Without even getting into the disappointing number of permanent jobs created by this project, which is 50. Mr. Speaker, the President has already clearly stated that he will veto this measure should it ever make it to his desk.
So at the end of the day Mr. Speaker, what are we really talking about here? It would seem to me that instead of trying to score political points and refighting old battles, the 114th Congress should be using its first week to bring legislation to the floor that fosters an environment of innovation, energy diversification and an investment in clean, domestic forms of renewable energy. Policies that would create hundreds of thousands of new, permanent jobs while also ensuring energy independence for years to come.

While I understand that some of my Democratic Colleagues are in favor, I would strongly urge no vote today on this misguided legislation. Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. For far too long, President Obama has impeded construction of the Keystone XL pipeline—costing the American people thousands of good-paying jobs and blocking an affordable source of energy. In the face of his continued obstruction, I proudly joined a strong bipartisan group of my colleagues voting to put an end to Obama’s obstruction and approving the Keystone XL pipeline. This legislation is not only good for America, but it is also uniquely important to the 36th District of Texas. The pipeline will bring an economic boon to an area through construction and new energy supply. For six years President Obama has put politics above what is good for the American people and our local and national economy. This is an important step in putting more Americans back to work, creating opportunity to good jobs and growing our national economy.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of The Keystone XL Pipeline Act. The Keystone Pipeline represents a critical asset in our efforts to increase energy security and reduce our dependence on Mid-East oil. It would also further lower prices at the pump for American families.

Most importantly, the Pipeline would create thousands of jobs in Texas and across the United States. The President has threatened to veto this legislation if it ignores the will of the American people. Six years of stalling is enough. The Administration should stop standing in the way of a stronger energy future and thousands of new American jobs. Keystone must be approved immediately.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. While Mr. Babin and Mr. Marchant are correct in their efforts to create an open and transparent debate about whether building this pipeline is in our national interest, that is not what this legislation is about. Instead, we are being asked to circumvent the administration’s permitting process and pass legislation that has been rushed to the House floor, without consideration by any committee or proceeding through regular order. This is no way to legislate. The people of Michigan sent me to Congress to fight for our shared values. And no one knows better than the people of my state the importance of protecting our natural resources. This legislation puts those resources at risk by allowing operators of the pipeline from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which helps the federal government respond to oil spills. It also waives all the requirements of the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, both of which contain critical environmental protections that cannot be ignored. I simply cannot support legislation which sets these landmark laws aside.

Congress needs to have a real and thoughtful debate on how we promote clean energy in the United States. I am ready to have that debate, but until then, I cannot support flawed legislation that puts our natural resources at risk.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 3.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the previous question is ordered on the bill. 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. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit the bill at the desk.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am.

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. PAY FOR ANY OIL SPILL CLEANUP ON AMERICAN SOIL.

In the approval process authorized under this Act, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall certify to the President that diluted bitumen and other materials derived from tar sands or oil sands that are transported through the Keystone XL pipeline will be treated as crude oil for the purposes of determining contributions that fund the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit is rejected.

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.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: At the end of the bill, add the following:

Mr. GARAMENDI moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Mr. Speaker, I don’t know if a question is appropriate, but is this February 2? Is this Groundhog Day? I am curious. This is the 10th time this bill has been before the House, and those of us in opposition would argue, “Enough is enough. Let’s pass it and get on with it.”

Those of us in opposition would say, “Well, why haven’t you written a bill that is sufficient to the problems raised by the pipeline?”

Specifically, 10 times on this floor—and even additional times in committee—the issue of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund has been raised. We have raised that issue 10 times. It has been debated here on the floor. I have heard five, six people speak to that issue.

The chairmen of the committee are well aware that this bill has a huge loophole in it allowing one company that owns a pipeline to avoid paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Why in the world would we move a bill that allows this company, unique among all others, to not participate in a very, very important part of the protection of communities and the environment?

The Kalamazoo issue has been raised here—the spill. Over $60 million was paid for by the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and then reimbursed by the pipeline company.

Let’s do something right. This is great fun: back and forth, back and forth. We kick this thing around. We may get some political points on one side or the other. But why in the world don’t we write a decent piece of legislation? Why don’t we do it right? Why would we exempt one company among all of the others of hundreds of pipeline companies and allow this one Canadian company—and I love Canada, my son-in-law is a Canadian.

This is about doing what is right. This amendment would simply include this company being required to participate in the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. It is a lot of dollars. It is about $21 million a year. That is a pretty good tax break. Who among us would not like to have that tax break? I guess we are all going to stand up because we want to have it.

The rest of the story is this: we have spent an enormous amount of time on this issue when, in fact, as has been said here many times by proponents and opponents, we ought to get on to real infrastructure.

Consider the time spent on this issue when you consider the time that has been spent on transportation bills on this floor. Consider the time that we must spend figuring out how to pay for repairing our bridges, building our highways, our ports, our airports. Consider that time.

Ten times, this bill has been here. Ten times, this House has ignored a tax break that is not warranted. It will allow to move forward to the Senate a bill that, in its very substance, provides an unwarranted, unnecessary, and grossly unequal tax break to one company among all the other pipeline companies.

This amendment simply comes to the point of making sure that this pipeline
company, like every other petroleum pipeline company in America, pays its fair share of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which is essential.

I see some of my friends from Michigan here. You know how important this is. The Kalamazoo River was a big deal—$60 million thus far and more to come. The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund was there to provide the early money for the cleanup.

It is important, folks. My colleagues, this is important. Let’s do it right! This is our 10th hour. Let’s do it right.

Adopt this amendment. We clear up one problem in the bill. We remove one point of opposition, and we do what is right.

I ask for your “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the motion to recommit, and I would just say to all my colleagues: our side certainly views that as a procedural issue, not as a real amendment.

I would say that in the markup that we had on this bill in earlier years, I pledged to work with Mrs. CAPPS on our committee to find a solution that would be fair to the bill.

I support the concept of what the gentleman is doing, and in fact, I sent a letter in 2012 to the then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dave Camp, asking for help on this, and we were hoping that we would see comprehensive tax reform, and this would have been included as part of that.

But that did not happen. We didn’t get tax reform.

So as this bill comes forward, a review does have to be made in terms of how to treat crude oil derived from the purposes of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. But I have to say that really is a Ways and Means issue, not a comprehensive tax reform, and this would have been included as part of that.

I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Transportation Committee. Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

I am in agreement with the chairman of Energy and Commerce. This is, again, something to be dealt with on a tax bill.

Two things that are good have happened today. One, the Nebraska Supreme Court has removed the final hurdle to remove this bill forward; and number two, my good friend from California and I agreed today on something—that this thing should be dealt with. But this is not the place or the time to deal with it.

Moving forward, I want to make sure that this is dealt with in the proper way, and I believe that the Ways and Means Committee will do that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from California. Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much.

I have enormous respect for the two of you, and this issue has been before us many, many times. If we wait for a comprehensive tax reform, the tar sands may be totally eliminated and used up. We have an opportunity today to get it done.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, we understand that this will not be part of a comprehensive tax reform bill. We need to act earlier than that.

With the Senate now passing a bill, in all likelihood next week, likely with an amendment addressing this situation, we can deal with it as part of that conference report, and I look forward to supporting that and the inclusion of such in the final package.

I would again urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the procedural motion to recommit so that we can get to final passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 227, not voting 12. It was declared—

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—180

Adams Aguilar    Alsobrooks        Bass    Beatty    Becerra
Bera    Beyrer    Bishop (GA)    Blackburn    Blumenauer    Borofsky    Bonamici    Boyle (PA)    Boustany    Brown (CA)    Brownley (CA)    Buchanan    Buckley    Busch    Calvert
Grayson    Green, Al    Green, Gene    Grijalva    Gutiérrez    Hart    Hastings    Heck (WA)    Higgins    Honda    Hoyer    Huffman
Israel    Jacobs (Lee)    Jeffries    Johnson (GA)    Johnson (NY)    Kaptur    Keating    Kelly (MA)    Kennedy    Kildee    Kind
Kirkpatrick    Kirkpatrick    Kirkpatrick    Kildee    Kildee    Kilroy    King (TX)    King (NY)    King (OH)    King (Ala)    King (La)    King (Dak)    Kinzinger    Kinzinger    Kinzinger    Kildee    Kilroy    King (TX)    King (NY)    King (OH)    King (Ala)    King (La)    King (Dak)    Kinzinger    Kirkpatrick    Kirkpatrick    Kirkpatrick    Kirkpatrick    Kirkpatrick

NAYS—237


Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth    Yarmuth
Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. DELBENE, Messrs. PAYNE, NEAL, Mses. CASTOR of Florida and KAPTRU changed their vote from “nay” to “yay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS IN FRANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks in France.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 153, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, myself and other members of the New York delegation were not able to be here on swearing-in day because we were attending the funeral of former Governor Mario Cuomo in New York, and we were also not here to cast a vote for Speaker of the House.

Had I been present during that vote, I would have cast my ballot for the right Honorable NANCY PELOSI of California, and I would like the RECORD to reflect my vote for Ms. PELOSI.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEeks. Mr. Speaker, I was with Mr. CROWLEY attending the funeral on Monday of former Governor Mario