

|                |              |               |
|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Gibson         | Lummis       | Roskam        |
| Gohmert        | MacArthur    | Ross          |
| Goodlatte      | Marchant     | Rothfus       |
| Gowdy          | Marino       | Rouzer        |
| Granger        | Massie       | Royce         |
| Graves (GA)    | McCarthy     | Russell       |
| Graves (LA)    | McCauley     | Salmon        |
| Graves (MO)    | McClintock   | Sanford       |
| Griffith       | McHenry      | Scalise       |
| Grothman       | McKinley     | Schrader      |
| Guinta         | McMorris     | Schweikert    |
| Guthrie        | Rodgers      | Scott, Austin |
| Hanna          | McSally      | Sensenbrenner |
| Hardy          | Meadows      | Sessions      |
| Harper         | Meehan       | Shimkus       |
| Hartzler       | Messer       | Shuster       |
| Heck (NV)      | Mica         | Simpson       |
| Hensarling     | Miller (FL)  | Sinema        |
| Hice, Jody B.  | Miller (MI)  | Smith (MO)    |
| Hill           | Moolenaar    | Smith (NE)    |
| Holding        | Mooney (WV)  | Smith (NJ)    |
| Hudson         | Mullin       | Smith (TX)    |
| Huelskamp      | Mulvaney     | Stefanik      |
| Huizenga (MI)  | Murphy (PA)  | Stewart       |
| Hultgren       | Neugebauer   | Stivers       |
| Hunter         | Newhouse     | Thompson (PA) |
| Hurd (TX)      | Noem         | Thornberry    |
| Hurt (VA)      | Nugent       | Tiberi        |
| Issa           | Nunes        | Tipton        |
| Jenkins (KS)   | Olson        | Trott         |
| Jenkins (WV)   | Palazzo      | Turner        |
| Johnson (OH)   | Palmer       | Upton         |
| Johnson, E. B. | Paulsen      | Valadao       |
| Johnson, Sam   | Pearce       | Wagner        |
| Jolly          | Perry        | Walberg       |
| Jordan         | Pittenger    | Walden        |
| Joyce          | Pitts        | Walker        |
| Katko          | Poe (TX)     | Walorski      |
| Kelly (MS)     | Poliquin     | Walters, Mimi |
| Kelly (PA)     | Polis        | Wasserman     |
| Kind           | Pompeo       | Schultz       |
| King (IA)      | Price, Tom   | Weber (TX)    |
| King (NY)      | Quigley      | Webster (FL)  |
| Kinzinger (IL) | Ratcliffe    | Wenstrup      |
| Kline          | Reed         | Westerman     |
| Knight         | Reichert     | Westmoreland  |
| Labrador       | Renacci      | Whitfield     |
| LaHood         | Ribble       | Wilson (SC)   |
| LaMalfa        | Rice (NY)    | Wittman       |
| Lamborn        | Rice (SC)    | Womack        |
| Lance          | Rigell       | Woodall       |
| Larsen (WA)    | Roby         | Yoder         |
| Latta          | Roe (TN)     | Yoho          |
| LoBiondo       | Rogers (AL)  | Young (AK)    |
| Long           | Rogers (KY)  | Young (IA)    |
| Loudermilk     | Rohrabacher  | Young (IN)    |
| Love           | Rokita       | Zeldin        |
| Lucas          | Rooney (FL)  | Zinke         |
| Luetkemeyer    | Ros-Lehtinen |               |

## NOES—170

|                |                |                |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams          | DeFazio        | Honda          |
| Aguilar        | DeGette        | Hoyer          |
| Amash          | Delaney        | Huffman        |
| Bass           | DeLauro        | Israel         |
| Beatty         | DelBene        | Jackson Lee    |
| Becerra        | DeSaulnier     | Jeffries       |
| Bishop (GA)    | Deutch         | Johnson (GA)   |
| Boyle, Brendan | Dingell        | Jones          |
| F.             | Doggett        | Kaptur         |
| Brady (PA)     | Doyle, Michael | Keating        |
| Brat           | F.             | Kelly (IL)     |
| Brown (FL)     | Duckworth      | Kennedy        |
| Brownley (CA)  | Edwards        | Kildee         |
| Bustos         | Ellison        | Kilmer         |
| Butterfield    | Engel          | Kuster         |
| Capps          | Eshoo          | Langevin       |
| Capuano        | Esty           | Larson (CT)    |
| Cárdenas       | Fattah         | Lawrence       |
| Carney         | Foster         | Lee            |
| Carson (IN)    | Frankel (FL)   | Levin          |
| Cartwright     | Fudge          | Lewis          |
| Castor (FL)    | Gabbard        | Lieu, Ted      |
| Castro (TX)    | Gallago        | Lipinski       |
| Chu, Judy      | Garamendi      | Loebsack       |
| Ciilline       | Gosar          | Lofgren        |
| Clark (MA)     | Graham         | Lowenthal      |
| Clarke (NY)    | Grayson        | Lowe           |
| Clay           | Green, Al      | Lujan Grisham  |
| Cleaver        | Green, Gene    | (NM)           |
| Clyburn        | Grijalva       | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Cohen          | Gutiérrez      | (NM)           |
| Connolly       | Hahn           | Lynch          |
| Conyers        | Harris         | Maloney,       |
| Courtney       | Hastings       | Carolyn        |
| Crowley        | Heck (WA)      | Maloney, Sean  |
| Cummings       | Higgins        | Matsui         |
| Davis (CA)     | Himes          | McCollum       |
| Davis, Danny   | Hinojosa       | McDermott      |

|             |                  |                |
|-------------|------------------|----------------|
| McGovern    | Pocan            | Swalwell (CA)  |
| McNerney    | Posey            | Takano         |
| Meeks       | Price (NC)       | Thompson (CA)  |
| Meng        | Rangel           | Thompson (MS)  |
| Moore       | Richmond         | Titus          |
| Moulton     | Roybal-Allard    | Tonko          |
| Murphy (FL) | Ruiz             | Torres         |
| Nadler      | Ryan (OH)        | Tsongas        |
| Napolitano  | Sánchez, Linda   | Van Hollen     |
| Neal        | T.               | Vargas         |
| Nolan       | Sanchez, Loretta | Veasey         |
| Norcross    | Sarbanes         | Vela           |
| O'Rourke    | Schakowsky       | Velázquez      |
| Pallone     | Schiff           | Visclosky      |
| Pascarell   | Scott (VA)       | Walz           |
| Payne       | Scott, David     | Waters, Maxine |
| Pelosi      | Serrano          | Watson Coleman |
| Perlmutter  | Sherman          | Welch          |
| Peters      | Sires            | Wilson (FL)    |
| Peterson    | Smith (WA)       | Yarmuth        |
| Pingree     | Speier           |                |

## NOT VOTING—11

|                 |               |          |
|-----------------|---------------|----------|
| Black           | Ruppersberger | Stutzman |
| Fortenberry     | Rush          | Takai    |
| Stivers         | Sewell (AL)   | Williams |
| Herrera Beutler | Slaughter     |          |
| Kirkpatrick     |               |          |

## □ 1748

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

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the votes held on December 1st, 2015, I was inescapably detained and away handling important matters related to my District and the State of Alabama. If I had been present, I would have voted “no” on Passage of S.J. Res. 24 and “yes” on S.J. Res. 23. Also, I would have voted “yes” on the Motion to go to Conference on H.R. 644.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote today for medical reasons.

Had I been present on rollcall vote 646, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 647, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 648, I would have voted “yes.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 649, I would have voted “yes.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 650, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 651, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 652, I would have voted “no.”

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1177, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-359) on the resolution (H. Res. 542) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the

conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1177) to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

# NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2015

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 8.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 539 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 8.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

## □ 1751

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8), to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, and for other purposes, with Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Chairman, today we commence debate on H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015. This bill culminates a multiyear, multi-Congress effort to ensure that folks in Michigan and every corner of the country have access to affordable and reliable energy. It has been nearly a decade since we last considered a broad energy package and a lot—a lot—has changed.

Back then, the energy situation looked downright dire: declining domestic oil and natural gas output, increasing reliance on imports, and energy prices that seemed like they had nowhere to go but up. Remember 7 years ago they were \$3.84 a gallon.

Manufacturers were leaving and fleeing overseas in pursuit of cheaper energy.

But thankfully, because of breakthrough innovation, a little American ingenuity, and a lot of hard work, we are now experiencing game-changing energy abundance that has, in fact, redefined America's standing at home, as well as around the globe. Now Michigan and many parts of the country are enjoying a welcome manufacturing renaissance thanks to reliable and affordable energy. It is well past time that our laws rooted in energy scarcity caught up to our newfound 21st century reality.

The first order of business is to allow the private sector to expand the Nation's energy infrastructure. The Keystone XL pipeline is certainly one of the most well-known examples of energy infrastructure projects being delayed and ultimately denied, but it is far from the only one.

We have a Federal permitting process that is not designed to expeditiously handle the many projects necessary to bring online the Nation's growing energy output and to meet energy needs of homeowners and businesses. How can it be that in this century we can't get energy to consumers in some parts of the country? We need to fix that problem. This bill does that.

H.R. 8 has several useful provisions to make the approval process more timely for projects such as interstate natural gas pipelines, LNG export facilities, and new hydropower, which we discussed during a hearing with the FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, just today. And I would add that these streamlining provisions were done so in a manner that keeps the environmental and safety protections intact.

Perhaps the biggest changes brought on by our energy abundance are geopolitical. Where we once feared rising dependence on the likes of OPEC, now we can, in fact, control our energy destiny and use our new standing as an energy superpower to help our allies and friends around the world and engage in energy diplomacy. However, this is a new role for the U.S., and we don't have in place the means to act globally on energy policy yet. This bill changes that.

Using the Department of Energy's Quadrennial Energy Review as a guide, this bill begins the process of incorporating energy security and diplomacy considerations into the decision-making process. It also creates forums through which we can coordinate with our North American neighbors, as well as our allies and trading partners around the world, on energy policy.

Unfortunately, the energy news over the last decade hasn't been all that good. Cyber threats and electromagnetic pulses pose a growing and more sophisticated risk to the Nation's electricity system. We need new measures to better address these and other threats to the grid, and this bill, H.R. 8, has a number of important provisions.

I would add that while our energy abundance is a real blessing, it does not in any way reduce the importance of energy efficiency. H.R. 8 again includes a number of updates to energy efficiency policy, including measures to help the Federal Government use energy more wisely, as well as improvements to existing energy efficiency programs that have proven problematic.

A decade ago, no one, no one here, could have imagined where we would be in 2015 and how much the energy script would be flipped in our favor. It is a new day, but now that we are here, it is time to bring our energy policy in line with those new realities. It is time that we put the scarcity mindset in the rearview mirror and say yes to energy and yes to jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, November 16, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write regarding H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015. This bill contains provisions under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this bill before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, I will agree that the Committee on Natural Resources will not seek a referral of the bill. I do so with the understanding that this action does not affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources, and that the Committee expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this, or any similar legislation. I ask that you support any such request.

Finally, I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response be inserted in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 8 on the House floor.

Thank you for your work on this bill, and for your cooperation and consideration on this and many other matters shared by our committees. I look forward to H.R. 8's enactment.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,  
*Chairman,  
Committee on Natural Resources.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, November 16, 2015.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,  
*Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write regarding H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015. As you noted, this bill contains provisions under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources.

I appreciate your willingness to agree that the Committee on Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of the bill. I agree that this action does not affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources, and that the Committee expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this, or any similar legislation. I will support any such request.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 8 on the House floor.

Thank you for your work and cooperation on H.R. 8.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, DC, November 18, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015. As a result of those consultations and text edits related to the role that the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Department of State play in energy diplomacy, I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further consideration of that bill, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding that, by forgoing consideration of H.R. 8, the Foreign Affairs Committee does not waive jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this, or any other, legislation. I also would appreciate your support for a request by the Foreign Affairs Committee for an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill, should one occur.

I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 8. Thank you again for your collaborative leadership on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, November 20, 2015.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for your assistance regarding H.R. 8, North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

I appreciate your willingness to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of H.R. 8 so that it can proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or any other legislation. In addition, I agree to support a request by the Committee on Foreign Affairs for an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill.

I will place a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 8.

Thank you for your work and cooperation on H.R. 8.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOV-  
ERNMENT REFORM,  
Washington, DC, November 19, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security

and Infrastructure Act of 2015. As you know, the Committee on Energy and Commerce received an original referral and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform a secondary referral when the bill was introduced on September 16, 2015. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego committee action on the bill.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 8 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Specifically, the Oversight Committee's jurisdiction is primarily triggered by provisions in the bill related to 5 U.S.C. 552, known as the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). I appreciate that our committees have had fruitful discussions regarding these provisions and have come to an agreement related to section 4122 of the reported bill. Negotiations regarding sections 1104, 1105, and 1106, the application of FOIA as it relates to critical electric infrastructure security, the Strategic Transformer Reserve and Cyber Sense, are currently ongoing. I have full confidence that our committees will arrive at a mutually agreeable compromise, which respects the Oversight Committee's interest in narrowing FOIA exemptions, prior to floor consideration of the bill.

I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation. Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, December 1, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,  
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ: Thank you for your assistance regarding H.R. 8, North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015. I appreciate your willingness to forego action on the bill in the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

I agree that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 8 at this time, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. I am confident that our committees will arrive at a mutually agreeable compromise on the ongoing negotiations between our committees prior to floor consideration of the bill.

I will support your request for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation. In addition, I will include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 8.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE,  
Washington, DC, November 24, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 8, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015, as ordered reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not alter or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, November 24, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,  
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and  
Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 8, North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015, as ordered reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. As you noted, there are certain provision in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on this bill in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration. I agree that forgoing consideration of the bill does not alter or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation. In addition, I will support your request for the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

I will place a copy of your letter and this response into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND  
TECHNOLOGY,  
Washington, DC, December 1, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 8, the "North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015," which your Committee reported on November 19, 2015.

H.R. 8 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your hav-

ing consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, December 1, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and  
Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 8, North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act of 2015.

As you noted, H.R. 8 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your willingness to forego action on the bill in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration. I agree that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I will place a copy of your letter and this response into the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, when Chairman UPTON and I first talked about energy legislation, I was encouraged that we would be working together to develop a consensus, bipartisan bill. In the tradition of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that is what we started to do, spending months negotiating over language and finally reporting a bill from subcommittee on a voice vote in July. That bill was modest but bipartisan and was the result of good faith cooperation.

Unfortunately, that effort fell apart. H.R. 8 is not a bipartisan consensus bill. Instead, the House is taking up a backward-looking piece of energy legislation at a time when we need to move forward. H.R. 8 undermines the progress we have made in deploying the sustainable clean energy economy of the future.

Although the title for H.R. 8 suggests we are authorizing improvements in energy infrastructure, the bill provides no funding or initiatives to address some of the significant energy infrastructure issues we are facing.

Meanwhile, the bill has only gotten worse since it left the committee. It

was in Upton's manager's amendment that strips out the few good provisions that remained from the committee markup. This so-called energy bill now does nothing for solar, wind, or any other clean energy technology.

On top of that, the Republicans deleted a whole title of the bill written primarily by the subcommittee ranking member, BOBBY RUSH, the 21st Century Workforce Initiative. That title created a new program at DOE to help minorities, women, and veterans find work and build careers in the energy industry. This was something that Republicans praised throughout the committee process. In fact, the Energy Subcommittee chairman even praised the title last night during testimony before the Rules Committee. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us doesn't have that provision.

What does that say about Republicans' so-called commitment to expanding job opportunities in the energy sector for minorities, women, and those who served our country? Unfortunately, it says all too much, and none of it is good.

□ 1800

H.R. 8 has one central theme binding its titles: an unerring devotion to the energy of the past. Provision after provision favors an energy policy that is dominated by fossil fuels and unnecessary energy use. It is the Republican Party's 19th-century vision for the future of U.S. energy policy in the 21st century.

Needless to say, the administration opposes this bill. If it reaches the President's desk, it will be vetoed. I, too, oppose H.R. 8, and I urge my colleagues to reject this attempt to roll back progress in energy efficiency and clean energy.

I have to say I don't usually pay much attention to comments that come from the media, but I was actually asked a couple of minutes ago to comment on the fact that some of the Republicans have said that this bill is actually something they can take to the Paris conference and talk about in a positive way. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Paris conference is seeking to address climate change and is seeking to move us towards less reliance on greenhouse gases, less reliance on fossil fuels, and more on renewables. Nothing in this bill accomplishes that goal, and it is hard for me to believe that my colleagues on the Republican side could even suggest that, somehow, this is something that they would want to bring up or talk about at the Paris conference.

Again, I can't say anything positive about this bill, and it is unfortunate that we have gotten to the point now at which there is no effort, really, to reach any of the Democrats' concerns. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the chairman emeritus

of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman UPTON for yielding me the time.

I want to commend him for his leadership on this initiative and for getting it to the floor. This has been a long process, and the gentleman is to be commended for going through the regular order of the subcommittee, of the full committee, and now to floor consideration.

I support H.R. 8, as reported out of committee and as amended in the manager's amendment that the gentleman presented to the Rules Committee.

I have requested—and I think it will be made in order—an amendment to that bill to include a provision that we passed as a stand-alone bill several months ago, H.R. 702, which would repeal the current ban on crude oil exports.

My amendment, if made in order by the Rules Committee—and I hope that it will be—takes what the floor passed with amendments—and we had a number of Republican and Democrat amendments that were added dealing with terrorism, national security, and things of this sort. I am asking that the Rules Committee make in order H.R. 702, as amended, and put it on the floor tomorrow as an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the United States, we currently produce a little over 9 million barrels of oil per day. That makes us number 3 in the world in terms of daily crude oil production, but we are not allowed to export any of that crude oil. We can export refined products and we do export up to 3 or 4 million barrels per day of refined products, but we cannot export crude oil.

If my amendment is accepted by the Rules Committee, made in order, voted on in a positive way by the House, sent to the Senate, and the Senate passes H.R. 8, and it is signed by the President, we could then begin to export our crude oil.

We have the capability to easily produce 15 million barrels a day, and some experts say we could go up to 20. That would be a strategic asset vis-a-vis OPEC, vis-a-vis ISIS, vis-a-vis the Russians, in that we could use our oil in the international oil markets.

It would help our economy, would literally create hundreds of thousands of jobs, and would, surprisingly, minimize or lower gasoline prices here in the United States because more U.S. oil in the world market would lower the world price, which would lower gasoline prices at the pump.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your support. I ask that the Rules Committee make my bipartisan amendment in order, which is cosponsored by Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. MCCAUL, and that we add it to your excellent bill on the floor tomorrow.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there is strong—certainly bipartisan—consensus that we need to update and modernize our energy infrastructure. Unfortunately, this bill fails to make meaningful advances in this arena.

It does not advance clean energy. The “energy efficiency” title would actually be a setback in reducing consumption and carbon emissions, and climate change is not addressed at all. Whenever possible, this legislation favors suppliers over consumers, consumption over efficiency, and the fossil fuels over renewable energy.

Most disappointingly, this bill could have been bipartisan. The Senate's energy bill, while far from perfect, at least acknowledges that we need to invest real dollars into upgrading our Nation's energy systems.

This bill has no shortage of flaws. I have offered two amendments to address some of these shortcomings. The first would reauthorize the Weatherization Assistance Program and the State Energy Program. These are two existing programs that have operated successfully for years.

The Weatherization Assistance Program supports State-based programs to improve the energy efficiency of the homes of low-income families. The Department of Energy provides grants to the States to deliver these services through local weatherization agencies.

The Weatherization Assistance Program helps those in our communities who do not have the financial resources to make energy efficiency investments on their own: the elderly, the disabled, and other low-income families amongst them who are struggling to make ends meet.

The second amendment would strike section 1101, an unnecessary change to FERC's natural gas pipeline approval process. Nothing has been done to cast FERC's role as the lead agency for siting gas pipelines in doubt, but the majority has used this pretense to make it easier for pipeline companies to have projects approved without extensive public consultation, requiring FERC to make a decision within 90 days regardless of the complexity of the application.

It would also allow for remote surveying instead of on-site inspections. This would allow companies to circumvent property owners' rights when surveying land. My amendment would strike this section to ensure Federal and State regulators have the time necessary to review any and all applications, but these issues are far from my only concerns with this bill.

Energy efficiency has a long history of bipartisanship, but, sadly, this has not continued in this bill.

According to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, this bill would actually net cost consumers and cause additional emissions.

Furthermore, the DOE is prevented from providing assistance if it finds

that a proposed code does not meet a payback period of 10 years or less. That is a return on investment that does not jibe with reality where 30-year mortgages are often the norm.

The bill repeals a section of the Energy Independence and Security Act which has been used to improve the efficiency of new Federal buildings.

There was an extensive hydropower section included during the full committee markup that was not subject to a hearing despite significantly changing the FERC licensing process.

It does nothing to address the public health and safety hazards created by old, leaky natural gas pipelines.

It does nothing to assist States' efforts to upgrade and modernize their electric grids.

It is silent on the infrastructure maintenance issues associated with the Strategic Petroleum Reserve that the administration identified in the Quadrennial Energy Review.

It has totally failed to recognize the growth in distributed renewable energy, such as wind and solar, and it should come as no surprise that this bill ignores the impact of climate change, which remains a major threat to our energy security, our economy, and human health.

These are just a handful of the serious issues with this bill.

I believe all of us started with the intention of continuing the Energy and Commerce Committee's long tradition of working on comprehensive energy legislation in a bipartisan fashion, but this bill is a far cry from the discussion drafts we actually held hearings on earlier this year. I understand we may not agree on everything, but this legislation fails to capitalize on those areas of agreement in any meaningful way.

This bill's focus is on the past, not on the future. It fails to make the necessary investments in our energy infrastructure to improve safety, public health, and reliability.

It rolls back efforts to improve energy efficiency, does nothing to encourage the expansion of renewable energy, and ignores climate change, as I indicated, altogether. It promotes a future that is economically and environmentally unsustainable.

I then urge my colleagues to reject this bill. We need to go back to the drawing board and craft a bill that actually makes investments and looks forward to America's energy future.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has become a leader in the area of energy production. But if we are going to maintain that leadership and be a true support for our allies, it requires certain actions that Chairman UPTON and his committee have recognized and have presented to us in this North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act.

This bill actually contains two provisions that were bipartisan provisions that passed in my Natural Resources Committee, both of which will ensure that the flow of energy to our Nation will be facilitated and will continue on in the future.

One, by Mr. MACARTHUR of New Jersey, illustrates the archaic provisions that will never be used to prohibit and use Federal land as a hindrance to pipeline production even if those pipelines are underground and if they are already in established corridors for energy production, especially those going into the northeast of this country. It is an extremely important position and point of view.

Mr. ZINKE of Montana and Mr. SCHRADER of Oregon also have a bipartisan bill that deals with the Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act, which would minimize the potential of wildfire risk in the over 100,000 miles of power lines we have going through national forest and Bureau of Land Management properties.

The provisions would require the agencies to actually work to come up with constructive policies and to make timely decisions so that the utilities have the ability to take out hazardous elements, like trees, and so that ratepayers are not going to be on the hook for the liability of a freak forest fire that would come because of Federal inaction.

American energy production has literally changed in less than a decade. There is no reason Federal lands should blockade any kind of pragmatic approach from having these resources moved from the places they are developed to where people can actually benefit from them.

This bill helps people, and it will move our country forward. I appreciate Chairman UPTON's and his committee's leadership. This is an essential one if we are actually going to forge a better future for the United States. I am proud to be down here to support it, and I appreciate adding these two important, bipartisan provisions as part of the overall package.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it is well past time that Congress update our national energy policy with a framework that includes clean energy technologies, reduces fossil fuel consumption, boosts energy efficiency in residential, commercial, and Federal buildings, and provides the funding necessary to advance our workforce and technological innovation, but, unfortunately, H.R. 8 does not meet these goals.

I do want to thank Chairman UPTON for working with me on several provisions that are intended to improve responses to physical and cyberattacks on the grid, that encourage the development and use of water and energy-efficient technology, that streamline hy-

dropower permitting, and that generally improve the modernization of our electric grid.

Unfortunately, the funding was removed for the electric grid grant program and for carbon capture sequestration, a provision promoting the next generation energy workforce is gone, and language that weakens energy efficiency in buildings has not been fixed.

This is a big disappointment, Mr. Chairman, because throughout most of the process there was real bipartisan cooperation, but in the final stages, the majority fell into partisanship and changed the bill to something most Democrats can't support.

So it is with great disappointment that I oppose H.R. 8, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1815

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 8, a bill that will help our Nation rise to meet growing energy demands and challenges.

Our energy policy is incompatible with the current state of domestic energy supply and production. The United States is now the world's largest energy producer, but our energy infrastructure is woefully inadequate. We have the innovation and technology to safely expand the electric grid and pipeline systems, but administrative red tape has severely hindered these projects.

As long as natural gas, hydroelectric, and nuclear energy projects continue to languish for years in drawn-out Federal permitting processes, nobody can benefit from the cleaner and more affordable energy these sources can provide.

Not only do we desperately need to expand our energy infrastructure to ensure reliable and affordable energy, but our national security depends on secured energy sources and updated infrastructure to protect against real threats.

Cyber attacks on electric utility systems and electromagnetic pulses are no longer things you only see in movies. These threats are very real and possible, and we need to be prepared. We need to improve energy infrastructure security now, not later.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill so Americans can continue to have access to an affordable, reliable, and secure energy supply.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in adamant opposition to H.R. 8.

I don't have much time, so I can't go into all the terrible provisions included in this legislation. To be clear, there are many.

I do want to address language that would give the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, what

amounts to fast-tracking power for pipeline approvals.

Setting arbitrary deadlines for the studies, research, and public comment periods for dangerous and volatile pipeline projects, regardless of how complicated the proposal or how sensitive the land these projects cuts through, doesn't give us what my colleagues across the aisle call energy security.

What it will do is put private, public, and protected land, clean water, and our environment at risk.

In my district, where we are already fighting just such a project, my constituents will be the first to tell you just how preposterous a provision of this nature is.

This bill deserves a resounding and unilateral "no," and I hope my colleagues will join me in defeating it.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 18½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak about the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act.

With new technology and innovations, the energy industry is growing rapidly, and this important legislation works to maximize America's energy potential.

The United States leads the world in energy production, but, sadly, due to Washington's bureaucratic red tape, projects like updating our pipelines and electric grid have fallen way behind.

This legislation will modernize our energy infrastructure, protect our electricity system, strengthen energy security and diplomacy, and improve energy efficiency.

Bolstering our energy security and making our infrastructure more resilient will, in turn, strengthen our national security and our economy. I support this important legislation because it is the next step in becoming energy-independent. Now is the time to dramatically increase our investment in homegrown American energy.

When I came to Congress, my top priority was growing the economy and creating jobs. Mr. Chairman, this bill will do exactly that. It makes no sense to place restrictions on the abundance of energy potential in America. The United States is an energy superpower, and it is time to step up and lead.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation and, in particular, a section of the bill that would create an opening to cause irreparable damage to our national parks.

H.R. 8 would establish national energy security corridors to short circuit

the approval process for natural gas pipelines that cross our Nation's public lands. In doing so, it eliminates longstanding protections afforded to our national parks and other historically significant areas that were set aside for the very distinct purpose of preserving our Nation's cultural and natural heritage.

This legislation also blocks the public from providing any input on where these natural gas pipeline corridors should be located.

My home State of Massachusetts, like many areas around the country, faces real energy challenges. In my district, a company is proposing to build a new 250-mile natural gas pipeline that crosses three States. I have heard from hundreds of my constituents expressing their concerns with the project, particularly with regard to its route.

Thanks to extensive public review and input, the pipeline route has already been adjusted to minimize some of the environmental impacts, but there are still many outstanding concerns that deserve careful scrutiny to be sure that the route does not adversely impact local farmland, State forests, parks, wildlife management areas, and wetlands.

The significant amount of interest in this proposed pipeline reflects the Commonwealth's longstanding history of preserving natural habitats and protecting open spaces for the public benefit, and we have invested enormous public resources toward these goals. This is also true of the investments that American taxpayers have made in our national parks.

By expediting approval of natural gas pipelines, H.R. 8 would directly erode the National Park Service's ability to meet its core mission of preserving and protecting our Nation's natural, cultural, and historic resources, unimpaired for the use and enjoyment of future generations.

I offered an amendment with my colleague from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) to remove this section from the bill. However, the majority blocked this simple amendment from coming to the floor and receiving an up-or-down vote.

Our national parks belong to all Americans and have been famously called "America's best idea." National parks protect, celebrate, and give access to the many places that have shaped and defined who we are as a people and a country.

Members should have been given the opportunity to vote on whether or not we should protect our national parks from natural gas pipelines.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chair, the North American Energy Security and Infrastructure Act does some important things to move us into the 21st century with our energy policy. It advances modernization, reliability, secu-

rity, and efficiency in our energy infrastructure.

I want to focus on one section of that bill, title 5, that "national energy security corridors" portion. I originally proposed this as a separate bill, and I am pleased to see it as part of this energy act. Simply put, it allows us to move natural gas from the western to the eastern United States.

Let me give you an example of why this matters. A couple of weeks ago, I visited Winteringham Village in Toms River in my district. It is a village comprised almost entirely of seniors, and their average income is slightly over \$12,000 a year.

These people are not getting a cost-of-living increase under Social Security, but they most certainly are facing higher energy costs. The reason is simple. While other States, western States, enjoy lower energy costs, States like mine are facing higher energy costs, and the reason is simple. We don't have the energy infrastructure to move gas from the West to the East.

Last winter, on one particular day, the cost of natural gas in New Jersey was \$22.35 for a million BTUs. It was \$1.50 at the same time in Pennsylvania, one State away from me.

The solution is this "energy security corridors" portion of the bill. It requires and empowers the Secretary of the Interior to designate 10 natural gas corridors across Federal lands.

Now, I just heard that it is across national parks. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Federal Government owns much land that is not park land, and this would allow the Secretary of the Interior to designate corridors so we can properly plan our energy needs.

It does a few things for us. It lowers energy costs. It protects the most vulnerable of our citizens. It would require thoughtful planning of where to put pipelines. It would be subject to a full environmental review under NEPA.

It would create jobs. The President of the North American Building Trades Union testified at our hearing that it would not only create jobs in building these corridors, but it would create jobs because of lower energy costs. Lastly, it would increase our security because energy security and national security are inextricably linked.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have this portion of the bill included, the "national energy security corridors" portion. I urge my colleagues to support this entire bill and move our energy policy into the 21st century.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I was disappointed to see the Rules Committee decided to add H.R. 2295, the National Energy Security Corridors Act, to H.R. 8.

There is no doubt that getting natural gas to where it is needed and to lowering electric and heating bills are

worthy accomplishments, but we shouldn't accomplish these by steam-rolling the concerns of residents who would see new pipelines built in their backyards.

Right now, there are multiple proposals to run natural gas pipelines from West Virginia through the Commonwealth of Virginia to the eastern seaboard. There is the Atlantic coast pipeline, the Mountain Valley pipeline, and more being considered.

Understandably, people who live along the proposed route of these pipelines are concerned. Once a pipeline route is approved by FERC, land can be taken by eminent domain. The companies involved, of course, want to draw the straightest, cheapest route they can. The communities in the way of these routes face huge impacts, environmentally and financially. They deserve a say.

Unfortunately, the legislation provides absolutely no method for the public to have their voice heard when it comes to the location of these corridors. It completely waives the Natural Environmental Policy Act for the corridor designation, shutting out the community's opportunity for public input.

Local governments are only allowed to speak to the extent that they can help identify the most commercially viable, cost-effective acreage. Individual resident concerns or environmental factors don't even come into play.

This is not a productive way forward. This doesn't simplify getting natural gas to the people who need it. This is a way that will lead to more opposition, more lawsuits, and an atmosphere of distrust and resentment.

I have another concern. H.R. 8 now contains a provision which will allow pipelines to be permitted across national parks without congressional approval. This is contrary to longstanding U.S. law. Every time we put a pipeline across a park, Congress has been involved.

My many friends in the Appalachian Trail community and the national parks conservation community are deeply worried about Congress abrogating its responsibility to approve such pipeline crossings.

We can't ignore the people and the parks that will be impacted by this bill. I encourage my colleagues to oppose H.R. 8.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This energy bill does nothing for solar, wind, or any other clean energy technology. It does nothing for energy infrastructure either since all funding in the bill was stripped by the GOP.

The bill contains an energy efficiency title that actually results in more energy consumption.

The bill contains provisions that will drive up electricity prices in the Northeast and mid-Atlantic by rigging the

markets to prop up old and uneconomical coal and nuclear plants that are losing out in the market to cost-effective natural gas and renewables.

□ 1830

It also has provisions to help gas pipeline companies and hydroelectric licenses that will roll over environmental laws—like the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the NEPA—and undermine the rights of consumers, tribes, and States.

Of course, the version that will be on the floor will have a couple of bad additions from the Committee on Natural Resources, including the MacArthur "pipeline through parks" legislation that would make it easy to run pipelines through Yellowstone, Yosemite, and every other national park.

Mr. Chairman, this is a terrible bill that demonstrates that the Republican Party is solely focused on the energy policies of the past and is committed to throwing up barriers to the development of a clean and sustainable energy future.

Every Democrat should join us and the Obama administration in opposing the bill's passage.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

My Committee on Energy and Commerce colleagues and I worked to create this broad energy bill and modernize our policies.

A generation ago, policymakers were concerned with managing a scarcity of energy resources, but times have changed. We are in the middle of a resurgence of American energy manufacturing. We should manage our surplus of energy resources with clear, straightforward policies that maximize our energy potential.

This bill is a necessary legislative step to ensure our energy infrastructure is robust and continues to create jobs in the years to come. Modern energy challenges demand modern energy policies. We must cut outdated red tape and ensure the energy markets remain nimble and secure.

With H.R. 8, America can continue to take advantage of recent technology advancements and encourage a growing market that yields jobs at home and more influence abroad. The world doesn't want to deal with unstable exporters, such as Russia or Iran, if they don't have to. We should be the secure and reliable trading partner that they can trust and they do trust.

H.R. 8 strengthens international partnerships and reforms processes for energy exports that will pay important dividends for generations to come.

I would like to thank my colleagues on the committee, especially Chairman UPTON, for their work on this very important bill.

This bill will keep energy affordable and ensure reliable electricity for consumers and families across the nation.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying I'm pleased that this bill includes several measures I have championed, including bills I've offered relating to energy efficiency and electric vehicles. However, I have to oppose this legislation because H.R. 8 fails to address climate change. In fact, the bill includes several controversial provisions that shift our nation's energy policy into reverse.

I'm very grateful to Chairman UPTON and Subcommittee Chairman WHITFIELD for including my legislation, the Energy Efficient Government Technology Act, in the base text of H.R. 8. This bipartisan, noncontroversial bill which I introduced with Rep. KINZINGER, received 375 votes on the House floor last year. This measure would save taxpayers millions of dollars and would make the federal government a leader in reducing energy use at data centers which can be highly inefficient.

I also appreciate that two amendments I offered at the Energy and Commerce Committee markup of this bill were agreed to by voice vote and are included in the Manager's Amendment. The first would allow federal agencies to offer electric vehicle charging stations to guests and employees, a practice that is not currently allowed. The second would add transparency requirements to ensure that only critical infrastructure information is protected from FOIA requests, and that this designation is periodically reviewed to ensure this authority is not abused. These provisions are incremental but important steps toward promoting innovation and deployment of clean and energy-saving technologies.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about the rest of H.R. 8. With historic international climate negotiations currently underway in Paris, this so-called "comprehensive" energy bill does not include a single reference to climate change or promotion of renewable resources. This represents the squandering of an opportunity to put in place a 21st century energy policy for our country that promotes clean energy and reduces our dependence on the fossil fuel resources that cause climate change.

H.R. 8 includes several controversial provisions that my colleagues and I opposed at Committee and that are also opposed by the Administration. For example, the bill contains unnecessary provisions to short-circuit the review process for exports of liquefied natural gas (LNG). The current process, which requires the Department of Energy to ensure that all exports are in the public interest of the United States, is working and already has us on track to be the largest LNG exporter in the world within a decade. H.R. 8 also includes provisions that would require a short-sighted view of energy efficiency investments in building codes, and it would repeal the requirement that all new and remodeled federal buildings phase out fossil fuel use by 2030. Lastly, the Manager's Amendment includes a highly controversial bill from the Natural Resources Committee that would limit public review and direct more natural gas pipelines to be built on public lands, including National Parks.

Again, I appreciate the Chairman's willingness to accept my bipartisan additions to this bill, but I cannot support this legislation and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

The CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MACARTHUR) having assumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8) to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 644, TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015**

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kuster moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 644 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in subtitle A of title VII of the Senate amendment relating to currency manipulation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXII, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my motion that will instruct conferees to include in the conference report language to combat currency manipulation from the Senate-passed version of H.R. 644.

Currency manipulation by foreign governments is one of the greatest challenges we face to creating the type of free and fair trade that will benefit all Americans from top to bottom and help us create more jobs right here at home.

I, like so many others, am highly focused on helping our domestic manufacturers grow and create good, strong, middle class jobs. Since taking office, I have made supporting job creation and economic opportunity my number one priority, and our State's manufacturers play an integral role in that conversation.

Unfortunately, U.S. manufacturers already face so many challenges that make it more difficult to compete with foreign companies. From the lower cost of labor to limited environmental protections, our manufacturers must compete with foreign policies that lead to an uneven playing field.

Unfair currency manipulation makes that competition even more difficult. Currency manipulation is when govern-

ments use monetary policy to devalue their currency, which makes their exports cheaper and foreign imports more expensive.

The good news is that we have the most talented workers and the most innovative companies in the world, and we can compete and win despite these challenges.

For example, right in my district in New Hampshire, I visited dozens of new manufacturing companies that are harnessing cutting-edge technologies, like precision manufacturing and healthcare technology, to revitalize the industry and create modern, 21st century jobs for our workers. We must support these American manufacturers by cracking down on unfair advantages overseas that hinder their success.

This motion will help to level the playing field for manufacturers in New Hampshire and across the country by directing the Department of Commerce to slap duties on goods that have unfairly benefited from undervalued currency. This is the only provision in either customs bill that will effectively deter currency manipulation by our trading partners.

Working to address currency devaluation has long enjoyed bipartisan support. In 2010, the House overwhelmingly passed legislation restricting currency manipulation by a vote of 348-79. Earlier this year, the Senate version of this legislation passed 78-20, in large part because of the critical language restricting currency manipulation.

However, the version of this legislation passed by the House does not include the bipartisan provision that so many agree is crucial for limiting the ability of U.S. workers and businesses to compete more fairly with foreign companies and workers.

I strongly support fair and open trade that will spur job creation back here in the United States. When 95 percent of global consumers exist outside the United States, we have to find new markets for our manufacturers and other producers to grow and create more jobs here at home.

But when U.S. manufacturers are already disadvantaged by foreign products that are subsidized by their home currency, it is difficult for them to compete both at home and abroad.

And the impacts of this unfair manipulation are real. The Peterson Institute estimates that, over the past decade, at least 1 million and as many as 5 million jobs have been lost due to currency manipulation.

Additionally, an analysis by the Economic Policy Institute estimates that by eliminating currency manipulation we can reduce our trade deficit by as much as \$500 billion, leading to a substantial increase in GDP growth and helping our American economy thrive.

Specifically, New Hampshire could expect to see roughly 13,000 new jobs as a result of an effective policy against currency manipulation.

The status quo is simply not good enough for U.S. workers, and that is why I am offering this motion today.

Our workers are already competing with foreign companies that pay their employees a fraction of what U.S. workers make. We should do whatever we can to help make it less difficult for U.S. companies to compete globally. Adding this currency manipulation language to the bill before us today will give us the best chance to do that.

Please join me in supporting my motion in support of American manufacturers.

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

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 644.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees.

There is no question currency manipulation is a real problem, and I and many other Republicans are committed to fighting it. The bill that we are going to conference on includes strong currency provisions, thanks to the hard work of Representative MILLER and members of the Michigan delegation.

In addition, earlier this year, we passed a trade promotion authority legislation that, for the very first time, raised fighting manipulation to a primary negotiating objective and provides the administration more tools to tackle the practice.

However, if the United States begins unilaterally levying tariffs, our trading partners will no doubt do the same, leading to a very dangerous cycle. This would undermine the very purpose of trade agreements: to break down barriers and to open economic freedom. More importantly, this would hurt American competitiveness and hurt our jobs.

I am also concerned that pursuing a unilateral approach could cause the United States to be a target for retaliation by countries like China, harming our businesses and their employees, and risk putting the United States in violation of international obligations and out of WTO compliance.

And the administration agrees.

□ 1845

Earlier this year, Secretary Lew sent a letter to Congress stating that the administration would oppose legislation that would use the countervailing duty process to address currency undervaluation because it would raise questions about consistency with our international obligations and that it would be counterproductive to our ongoing bilateral and multilateral engagement as well as to our efforts to