United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014 No. 138

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 13, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN LANE EVANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am here to join the distinguished delegation from Illinois, especially Congresswoman BUSTOS, who represents a district in Congress that was once magnificently also represented by Congressman Lane Evans. So it is with great sadness that I come to the floor to join his colleagues, Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, who served with him, Congressman LUIS GUTIÉRREZ, and others who will be here.

Thank you, Congresswoman BUSTOS, for bringing us together to honor the life and service and leadership of Lane Evans, who passed away this month at the age of 63, my colleagues.

He was the ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and served our veterans so well. He served our country in uniform. He served our country in the Congress. He served our country in the community. He was just a great person. We were honored to call him colleague, many of us privileged to call him friend.

The son of a firefighter and a nurse, Lane Evans was born and raised in the district he represented here for 24 years. From his service in the Marines—and he was proud of that—to his work as an attorney with the Western Illinois University Legal Assistance Fund, to his time in the House, Lane spent his life fighting for those who could not fight for themselves.

Each and every day, Lane Evans fought to strengthen the middle class and to expand the ladders of opportunity that define the American Dream. He stood strong and resolute against efforts to privatize Social Security. That was one of his fights here.

As a Vietnam-era veteran who served on Okinawa, Lane took the struggles of our military families personally. It is especially fitting that we honor Lane today and this week as we observe Veterans Day, for he was one of the House's most dedicated legislators of those who served our country in uniform and, as I say, a leader in the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

From that position as ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Lane worked relentlessly to ensure that veterans of all generations would receive the support and benefits they deserve. He championed veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury. He was instrumental in passing legislation to assist veterans exposed to Agent Orange.

But on the subject of posttraumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, Lane had whatever symptoms he had of his service to our country.

As the ranking member, he traveled the country. I had the privilege on a number of occasions to welcome him at Fort Miley, our veterans hospital in San Francisco. The way he connected with the veterans, because he understood, he shared their pain—literally, shared their pain—he fought for all kinds of research, whether it was the hidden injuries of war that we now know so much more about. But there in that hospital we had not only met the needs of our veterans, but we had tremendous research, whether it was about Parkinson's or other traumatic brain injury.

He was a champion for our veterans and military families, hardworking people across America. Many of us who had been invited by—he was so proud of his district, and many of us had the privilege of being invited there to join his constituents in honoring him. It was just an all-American experience to see people from all walks of life honoring this great man and, of course, his colleagues from the military being a very important part of it.

Diagnosed with Parkinson's in 1995, Congressman Evans continued to serve the people in his district for almost another 12 years. He was determined to make a difference and help create a better world for the next generation. He surely has left our country stronger for having served it. He was a pioneer in terms of the hidden wounds of war for our soldiers.

Today we remember his courage, his commitment, his vision, his beautiful smile, his lovely personality, his gracious being, his strong commitment to our vets. We hope it is a comfort to his brothers and loved ones that so many here in this body and around the world

Printed on recycled paper.

mourn their loss, pray for them, but we feel very strengthened as a country because of the blessing of Lane Evans' life to us.

So again I thank Congresswoman CHERI BUSTOS for bringing us together to honor this great man. It is my privilege to join the members of the Illinois delegation and other Members who will be on the floor to honor Lane.

He was a proud son of Illinois, that is for sure. I remember seeing him in Moline just so proud, so proud of his district, of his constituents, and they were all, in turn, as we are, proud of him.

Thank you, Congresswoman BUSTOS.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. CLEMENT ALEXANDER PRICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Clement Alexander Price, a shining figure in New Jersey society and culture, a respected professor and historian, and a beloved family member and friend, who died last week and leaves behind an extraordinarily distinguished record of public service.

Dr. Price was a true ambassador for his beloved Newark, our State's largest city. He was a widely respected public intellectual whose eloquence and wisdom helped heal a city at a crossroads, educate the next generation of civic leaders, and shape the decisions that have advanced New Jersey.

A native of the then-segregated Washington, D.C., Dr. Price rose to receive degrees from the University of Bridgeport and from Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and spent his life in helping to transform America to a brighter, fairer, integrated society.

As a Board of Governors Distinguished Service Professor at Rutgers Newark, Dr. Price's gifts as a teacher were valued by hundreds of students who sought him out as a mentor and by faculty and administration who respected his expertise and energy.

Dr. Price was an accomplished author and the State's foremost authority on African American history.

He wrote ''Freedom Not Far Distant, A Documentary History of Afro-Americans in New Jersey,'' and other works that explored the history of race and culture in Newark and in New Jersey. He most recently coauthored ''Slave Culture: A Documentary Collection of the Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project.''

Dr. Price was also a major presence on the civic stage. President Obama appointed him as chair of his transition team for the National Endowment for the Humanities and as vice chair of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. He was Newark's official historian. He chaired the New Jersey State Council on the Arts. He was a trustee of the Fund for New Jersey, the Newark Public Library, the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, the Newark Education Trust, and the Save Ellis Island Foundation.

He was chief historical consultant for the Jewish Museum's Exhibition, ''Bridges and Boundaries: African Americans and American Jews.'' He cofounded the Marion Thompson Wright Lecture Series, the oldest, largest, and most prestigious Black History Month event in the State. He was a member of the Scholarly Advisory Committee to the National Museum of African American History and Culture, Smithsonian Institution, which is currently being built here on The Mall in Washington.

Dr. Price is survived by his wife, Mary Sue Sweeney Price, who is widely respected for her outstanding leadership for almost a generation as director and CEO of the Newark Museum, our State's greatest museum.

My wife, Heidi, and I are grateful to have known Clement Price. We and the people of our State mourn his untimely passing. We extend our deepest sympathy to Mary Sue and to his legions of friends and admirers in Newark, in New Jersey, and across the United States.

When he last visited me on Capitol Hill several months ago, he was, as usual, filled with optimism and good cheer. On behalf of the Congress of the United States, I celebrate the distinguished life of Dr. Clement Alexander Price in service to the Nation.

WAITING FOR CONGRESS TO TAKE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, we have not been back in D.C. for a full 24 hours and the immigration shenanigans have already begun.

Republicans, even a few unhelpful Democrats, have been saying the President should not take executive action on immigration and should not act yet, as if his intention to use his executive power under existing law is a surprise.

David Axelrod, safe in the confines of the University of Chicago, has no sense of urgency because none of his family members or neighbors are facing deportation. But it is a little different on my side of Chicago, where people live in nearly constant fear that a loved one or a friend will be detained and then strapped into an airplane for deportation.

My Chicagoans have been waiting for the Congress to act and take action for over a decade. Polish, Ukrainian, Irish, and Mexican have been waiting, Jamaicans and Filipinos. They have been waiting for family members to get visas in backlogs that stretch to 20 years because Congress refuses to act. They have been heartbroken by laws that say, on the other hand, they can apply for a green card because they are married to a U.S. citizen, but, on the other hand, they must wait in exile outside the country, away from their husband or wife, their loved one, for 10 years in order to get that green card.

Two hundred thousand, 300,000, 400,000 deportations a year. These statistics represent people, people disappearing from their churches, from their kitchen tables, from parent-teacher conferences. Why? Because Congress is doing nothing to make it stop or make any progress towards an immigration system based in reality and common sense, where people come legally with visas rather than smugglers.

Now the GOP Conference in the House is saying, after a decade of delay, a decade of defying the American people, and a decade of demonizing immigrants, that they are so anxious to work on immigration reform. But there is just one thing stopping them: the President. The one thing preventing Republicans from taking action, they say, is that the President may also take action to keep families together and address the destructive nature of the deportation.

But here is how one commentator in Atlantic magazine described it: ''Boehner's effort to hold congressional immigration reform hostage if Obama acts unilaterally is so absurd. Boehner killed the hostage long ago. Now he's hoping that if he pretends it's still alive no one will notice the corpse lying on the floor.''

To put it another way, it is a little late for the mayor of Chernobyl to say he is worried about someone poisoning the well.

The President stood right there and said that if this Congress failed to act on important national priorities, he will use his pen and phone within current law to do so. Republicans heard him just as well as I did. Republicans had more than 2 years to address the bill and a year to schedule a vote on the Senate bill. I do not see one scheduled today, tomorrow, or next week. I doubt before this Congress expires will we see a bill scheduled.

□ 1015

Let's just look at the record. Republicans said we can't do immigration unless it is done piecemeal; we can't do immigration unless people are denied citizenship; or, we need more border security spending; we need a parole officer assigned to each immigrant who gets to stay and work. And every Democrat, from the President of the United States on down, all the way to me, said, ''Yes, yes, and yes. Compromise and progress are more important than gridlock and making every Democratic constituency happy.''

Governing means when Democrats say ''yes'' to Republican demands, Republicans actually move forward and we work together. But none of that happened, despite the door being open, the table being set, and Democrats saying, in effect, Republicans can order anything off the menu. And yet here we are with no action, no vote, and the Republicans threatening to double down on no action if the President, acting within the letter and spirit of the

laws passed by this Congress, takes action to help the Nation.

The President will act as he should—boldly, broadly, and soon—to help people. And when he acts, tens of millions of our fellow American citizens will support him. Why? Because they care more about justice and practicality than they do about partisan politics and the blame game. Because a policy based on driving out 10 million immigrants is neither a sensible one nor one that we should be spending billions of dollars on.

The President will act because Presidents before him have acted to solve immigration problems when Congress acted too slowly. The President will act because he believes, as the American people do, that families are more important and children should be raised without the government coming along and ripping their mommy and daddy away from them.

I am tired of the manufactured excuses for inaction. The U.S. Congress can still debate, vote, and pass an immigration law if it wants to, and the best way to get it done will be if leaders on both sides of the aisle work together. If you don't like it, then do something. There is nothing in your way but yourselves.

RECOGNIZING THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF JORDAN CLARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when you are provided the privilege and honor of representing people from home and you come to Washington, the very first decision you make is probably one of the most important decisions, and that is who your chief of staff will be. Today, I am blessed to stand here to recognize a man who I think is among the best of the chiefs who has served any Member of Congress.

I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Jordan Clark, who has served as my chief of staff and is retiring from the House this month. Jordan is a man with a deep love of politics, public policy, and people, including his family and most especially his wife, Mary Therese, and their seven children.

A one-of-a-kind personality and wit as sharp as his record of public service is long, Jordan will be dearly missed by friends and colleagues from Capitol Hill and beyond. It is these qualities, combined with a distinct sense of humor and an unmatched work ethic, that took a young boy from Pittston, Pennsylvania, to the halls of power in Washington. But it wasn't power that Jordan sought. It was public service.

Before beginning his career in Washington, Jordan served in the United States Army. He served his commission after completing Infantry Officer Candidate School. Shortly following this, he was assigned to the Kennedy Center for Military Assistance at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, where he served in special warfare and psychological operations.

After completing Active Duty, he served for 3 years as a captain and company commander in the Maryland National Guard.

Following Jordan's service in uniform, he began a career in Washington with the United States Department of Labor, creating employment opportunities for veterans. Because of his efforts, he was assigned to the President's veterans commission to coordinate job programs between Federal agencies and the private sector, and was chosen by the Secretary of Labor to participate in the Department's career management program.

Jordan later was hired as chief of staff to former United States Congressman Joseph McDade, at the time Pennsylvania's 10th Congressional District Representative and also a senior member of the House Committee on Appropriations. In the House, he also served as a staff member on the Government Operations and Small Business Committees, where he played an integral role in establishing the first White House Conference on Small Business.

Following the OPEC oil embargoes, Jordan accepted a position in the Office of the Secretary of Energy and was responsible for the administration of the country's conservation and renewable energy programs. During this time, he helped develop the Department's Technology Transfer Program, promoting the sharing of research and information between the Federal Government, private sector institutions, and corporations. He was also the first Department of Energy official to visit Brazil to evaluate its ethanol programs and production.

Following his time in the Energy Department, Jordan served as CEO of communitypath.com, a homeowner advocacy group and successor to the nonprofit United Homeowners Association, which he founded. Before founding the UHA, he was director of operations and assistant vice president for congressional relations for the 180,000-member National Association of Home Builders, where he created the Congressional Contact Program, an industry model for grassroots advocacy.

Upon his return to Capitol Hill, Jordan served as chief of staff to Representative John E. Peterson, my predecessor, until Mr. Peterson's retirement in 2008. At the time, he also served as senior staff member on the House Appropriations Committee, during which he initiated and coordinated efforts to eliminate the 24-year-old congressional moratoria on oil and gas production in the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf.

In 2009, I was first elected to represent Pennsylvania's Fifth District. Having worked with Jordan in various capacities over the years, I have come to respect his judgement and his work ethic. He is a man who is acutely aware of the needs and challenges facing our men and women in uniform. He is an expert in energy policy, which is fundamental to the history and economy of Pennsylvania's Fifth District, the birthplace of the oil industry in 1859 and today home to the emergent Marcellus Shale Natural Gas Play. He is someone with insight and understanding of the Fifth District, with its diverse geography, residents, and economy.

Mr. Speaker, I could not have made a better choice for chief of staff. I know I speak for generations of close friends and colleagues when I say: Thank you, Jordan Clark, for decades of committed public service in pursuit of a stronger Nation. We wish you, Mary Therese, and your family the very best on the road ahead.

MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there were many close elections across America last week, but there was one clear winner: ending our failed prohibition on marijuana and instead legalizing, regulating, and taxing adult use.

Alaska and the District of Columbia voters joined Colorado and Washington from 2 years earlier with strong votes to legalize. Nowhere was that more emphatic than in my home State of Oregon. Marijuana legislation passed in Oregon by a greater margin than it did in Washington and Colorado. It got more votes than United States Senator JEFF MERKLEY, who was overwhelmingly reelected. And this was in a low-turnout, non-Presidential year, which experts predicted would depress the ''yes'' vote.

In a few minutes, I will be joined in a press conference with ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, whose constituents resoundingly approved legalization, and will make the case that Congress needs to stay out of the way of its implementation. JARED POLIS, who has been my partner on efforts at modernizing and reforming marijuana laws, will give a snapshot on the progress in Colorado 2 years after legalization. Congressman DANA ROHRABACHER from southern California, the first State to legalize medical marijuana 18 years ago, has been a tireless champion of the Federal Government not interfering with decisions of local voters to modernize and reform local marijuana laws. He has helped dozens of his Republican colleagues understand and support marijuana and hemp reform.

Perhaps just as important as those votes that passed was one that failed: the vote to legalize medical marijuana that failed in Florida. But it should be noted that it garnered 57 percent of statewide voters, again, in a low-turnout, non-Presidential election where many of the people, polls show, who

were supporters did not bother to vote. It got more votes than any statewide candidate in Florida on the ballot this year. Because it was a constitutional amendment that requires a 60 percent voter approval level, it was not approved at this time. But there is no question that medical marijuana is in the immediate future for Floridians. If it were back on the ballot in a Presidential year, it would exceed the 60 percent threshold.

In the meantime, we are going to work hard to implement the Oregon law and take advantage of the next 2 years to learn from the experience of others and refine our approach. We will raise new revenues to help education, addiction treatment, and law enforcement. And most important, we have already stopped prosecuting people for items that will be legal under the law, and we will be better able to protect our kids than the current vast underground black market.

Now Congress needs to do its part. We need to act now in Congress to solve two serious problems, not just for those States that have legalized adult use but the 23 States and counting that have legalized medical marijuana.

A narrow reading of Federal banking regulations requires that these perfectly legal marijuana businesses be on an all-cash basis. Restricting them from having bank accounts is absolutely insane, unfair, and unwise if you care about money laundering, tax evasion, or theft.

Additionally, I have legislation that will permit legal marijuana businesses to be able to deduct their business expenses from their income tax. Because of the quirk in the law—the 280E provision—small and emerging businesses face punitive Federal taxation that is unfair, unwise, and certainly unjustified. Regardless of how people feel about legalizing marijuana, these businesses are here—and here to stay.

Passing H.R. 2240 and H.R. 2652 will help treat this emerging sector of the economy fairly and further protect the public. I am hopeful that as the reality of these elections and future changes set in, we will be able to do a better job of permitting them to operate and allow this rapidly emerging area of commerce to serve the public and thrive.

OBAMACARE ARCHITECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the disturbing remarks that have recently surfaced from one of the key architects of ObamaCare.

It is no secret that the ObamaCare was built on broken promise after broken promise. Millions of Americans' insurance plans have been canceled; they have lost access to their doctors and hospitals; and instead of reducing premiums by $2,500, like the President promised, premiums are skyrocketing across our Nation. And now we have seen one of the key designers of the Affordable Care Act candidly discuss the smoke and mirrors that went into getting this disastrous law passed in the first place.

Indeed, Mr. Gruber bragged about the lack of transparency involved in the process of passing this 2,000-page bill, even gaming the bill language so that it could not be scored properly by the Congressional Budget Office. Mr. Gruber refers to the ''stupidity of the American voter'' as a necessary component to getting ObamaCare passed and signed into law. This is outrageous. On behalf of my constituents in Tennessee's Sixth District and Americans across this country, I reject this assertion from one of ObamaCare's key architects.

The American people are much wiser than this. After all, at no point in time has ObamaCare been popular with the public. Before it was even passed, the American people did everything they could to stop it, even electing a Republican senator in the blue State of Massachusetts to be the deciding vote against it. But the Democrat majority maneuvered their way around the will of the people, passing it anyway. And despite the underhanded efforts of this law's designer, it was still unpopular with the American voters when it passed. The law has remained unpopular to this day, and dozens upon dozens of Democrat lawmakers who were responsible for its passage have lost their jobs since its passage.

American voters aren't stupid, as ObamaCare's designer says. To the contrary, they have repeatedly raised their objections to this government takeover of our health care system. In fact, a majority of Americans still say they wish ObamaCare had never passed. And that is why as recently as last week they sent majorities in both Chambers of Congress to Washington to dismantle this maliciously conceived boondoggle.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is arguably the worst piece of legislation to be passed in a generation. The law is such a mess that it may collapse under a review by the Supreme Court next year. The American people get this even if the law's designers do not. That is why they continue to send my colleagues and I to Washington to fight to protect them from this disastrous law.

□ 1030

HONORING THE LEGACY OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN LANE EVANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to honor the legacy of former Congressman Lane Evans who passed away just this past week.

Lane Evans served the 17th Congressional District of Illinois, the district I now have the privilege of serving myself, and he served it with honor, dignity, humility, and hard work for more than two decades.

A Marine Corps veteran himself, Lane Evans was a steadfast champion for our men and women in uniform. A veteran of the Vietnam war era, he served on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee from the time he arrived in Washington, to rise to the position of ranking Democratic member, a post that he held for a decade.

Lane Evans' record on behalf of veterans earned him praise and respect from veterans service organizations and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of former Congressman Lane Evans by designating the Department of Veterans Affairs Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located in my congressional district in Galesburg, Illinois, the Lane A. Evans Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

I first got to know Lane when I was a young newspaper reporter covering our region. Lane was always warm, friendly, and accessible, and as a rookie reporter, I always appreciated that.

I interviewed him many times about a variety of topics, and while he was young and with his trademark boyish haircut, his quiet courage and drive made him seem older than his age.

Through my interactions with him over the years and with those who worked with him and those who he touched through service, I learned a lot about the man and what he stood for.

A proud native of Rock Island, the son of a firefighter and a nurse, and an Alleman High School and Augustana College graduate, Lane truly represented everything that is right about public service. He will be sorely missed by all those he touched, but his legacy of service will never be forgotten.

The dedication of a veterans facility in the heart of the district he represented is a fitting tribute and acknowledgment of his career-long fight to ensure all veterans get the care and the benefits that they have earned and deserve.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this bipartisan legislation to honor the memory of Lane Evans.

IRAN NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we are now just 11 days away from the November 24 deadline for the Iran nuclear negotiations.

President Obama and the P5+1 have fallen for Rouhani's stall tactics, despite having every reason to suspect that Iran was never serious about a deal, and that is precisely why it is imperative that Congress use the mechanisms at our disposal to prevent the

administration from making any nuclear agreement with Iran that seeks to go against our national security interests.

The administration and the P5+1 started with a weak hand, and that has only gotten weaker. That is precisely why the Iranian regime feels emboldened to make proclamations that it will never agree to stop its enrichment and why it insists that it has a right to enrich and that it must be part of the final agreement.

In just the past few days, the IAEA, the U.N. agency that is tasked with monitoring Iran's nuclear program and ensuring its compliance with the joint plan of action, has said that Iran refuses to answer questions about its nuclear program and that it is impeding its investigation into the possible military dimensions of the program. This is amazing.

A former IAEA chief inspector said recently that he believes that Iran lied about the number of advanced centrifuges that it possesses. Iran itself has confirmed that it has tested a new centrifuge that could speed up its enrichment process even further; yet the administration is so desperate to get us to a ''yes'' that it will overlook these very serious and dangerous transgressions.

The President has also failed to include in the negotiations Tehran's ballistic missile program, its support for terror worldwide, and its abysmal human rights record. The Supreme Leader right now is calling to arm Gaza and the West Bank to fight against Israel, and it calls for the democratic Jewish state to be eliminated.

Had the administration come to Congress before it mistakenly entered into these discussions and asked us what we needed to see for an acceptable deal, we would have said keep the sanctions against the Iranian regime. Keep the sanctions, and threaten to even expand them.

We would have kept the only leverage we had against the regime until it agreed to abandon its enrichment and other illicit activities, but the President opted to not do that and, instead, mistakenly eased the sanctions, injecting money into the Iranian economy and giving away our leverage, and he still doesn't look to us for any input.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's idea of consultation is a one-way street. It comes to brief us and our staff on the Iran nuclear deal, but it isn't interested in hearing our input and having that reflected in its approach to the negotiations with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must not allow this administration to continue to circumvent us and ignore our concerns about this weak negotiating position. We have been saying from day one that this approach was a mistake and that the joint plan of action was a signal that the administration has conceded on the enrichment aspect of the Iran nuclear program.

Iran has already emerged as the clear winner in this whole charade, and the P5+1 nations, especially the United States, look more foolish, more pathetic, and weaker than we did when the North Korean regime implemented the same tactics.

If the President continues to ignore our warnings on signing a nuclear deal that we believe goes against U.S. national security interests, then it is incumbent upon us in Congress to take firm action.

Simply put, we must take action and get serious about preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and that means ensuring that Iran cannot enrich any uranium at all and that it must dismantle its nuclear infrastructure.

We must start right now by sending an unambiguous message to the administration that we will not accept any deal that leaves Iran with even the slightest capability of producing a nuclear weapon.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF LANE A. EVANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, in 1982, in the State of Illinois, a 31-year-old man announced his candidacy for United States Congress from the 17th Congressional District. His name was Lane Evans. He was a Marine veteran and a young legal aid attorney helping poor people in his home community.

It was viewed initially as kind of a suicide mission that he was not going to be able to win, but some of us decided that we were going to get involved in that campaign even though we weren't necessarily from his district and, gathering with people who supported him from his area, ran a campaign that elected the first Democrat since the Civil War from that area, a young man who impressed the people of his district with his incredible modesty, but also clarity.

Lane Evans was so clear that his mission was to represent the ordinary people of that section of western Illinois, to represent unions and veterans and poor people, and to be their voice in the United States Congress. It turned out to be one of the most important elections in my view, in history, certainly in the history of the State of Illinois.

Lane served for 25 years in the Congress. Again, this was a district that was considered kind of a swing district, but year after year, election after election, Lane Evans would be elected with very wide margins.

Lane Evans was fearless. He would stand up for what was right even when some of us would say, ''Lane, are you sure? This may not go over so great in your district. What do you think?''

He would look at us and say, ''Absolutely. This is the right thing to do. I don't have any qualms about it.'' He would vote his conscience, and people respected that, whether they totally agreed with every vote or not.

Lane Evans was the first member—or maybe DANNY DAVIS—the second—in our delegation to endorse for Senator a young Barack Obama. Lane proudly brought him to western Illinois and was always a great supporter.

When Barack Obama won his election for President in 2008, he sat next to Lane Evans, who was already somewhat debilitated by Parkinson's disease, a disease that finally took his life after two decades, holding his hand and telling him that, if it weren't for Lane Evans, that Barack Obama wouldn't be President of the United States of America.

He was diagnosed with Parkinson's disease almost two decades ago. Lane Evans lived so modestly. I think some people have impressions of Members of Congress as having drivers and black limousines or something. Lane Evans lived exactly like the ordinary person in his district.

As his funeral procession led through the Quad Cities, we went down, in Rock Island, Lane Evans Way. It was a neighborhood of very modest, middle class—I would even say working class—homes. That is where Lane Evans grew up, and that is where his heart and his mind always were.

Lane Evans was honored by the Marines as he was leaving Congress with the tattoo that they do, an amazing performance and then an honor for Lane.

Lane, as a Vietnam era veteran, was the first really to talk about agent orange and the impact that it had on the long-term health of many of our Vietnam veterans and, finally, to get care for our veterans for agent orange.

He was one of the early people to understand the unseen injuries of PTSD and to call attention to that as ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

He was such an inspiring person, such a fearless fighter for the middle class, for veterans; and it is apt that we now name the VA clinic in Galesburg, Illinois, in the 17th Congressional District, for Congressman Lane Evans. It is part of his legacy, but only part of his legacy.

For many of us, we will always believe that, because of Lane Evans, it is good politics as well as good policy to stand up for the principles that you believe in for a just society, for an equal society. And I am sure DANNY DAVIS will talk about that.

Before I was elected to anything, we went to El Salvador, so Lane Evans' sense of justice extended beyond the borders of the United States of America to major conflicts in Central America.

Lane Evans will be sorely missed but ever remembered.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE LANE EVANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to former Congressman Lane Evans, to convey condolences to his family and friends, and to urge the naming of a VA outpatient clinic in Galesburg, Illinois, in his name and in his honor.

I had come to know and revere Representative Lane Evans long before I became a Member of Congress. As a matter of fact, he was known not only in the area that he represented, but throughout Illinois and especially among individuals who considered themselves to be political progressives.

As a matter of fact, I had the good fortune to travel with Lane and a group to El Salvador under his leadership and under the sponsorship of a group at the time known as People to People.

□ 1045

As a matter of fact, in that same group was Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY, and that is where I felt that I really got to know JAN and her husband, Bob.

Lane Evans spent most of his adult life in public service except for the time he was in college or law school. Not only did he enlist in the Marines during the Vietnam era and comported himself extremely well during his tenure, but Lane also was a legal aid attorney. That is an attorney who works specifically to represent those who otherwise would not have had any legal representation. After being elected to Congress in 1982, he established himself as a strong voice for veterans and championed other progressive causes. During his entire time in Congress, he served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and rose to the commission of ranking member.

Lane gave us his physical and mental capabilities until he could actually give no more. That is, he would often come to work barely able to sit, sometimes barely able to walk in, at the time when others would have just given up and said, ''I can't do this anymore.''

Lane did us proud. Therefore, I am proud to join in this tribute, and I am proud to support the naming of the VA medical facility in Galesburg, Illinois, as the Lane A. Evans Community-Based Outpatient Clinic. Lane is absolutely deserving of this honor. I have never, ever known anyone who worked as long and as hard as Lane did with his illness, and he simply worked, as they sometimes say in Christian churches, until his days were done.

Lane, I am proud to have known you, proud to have served with you, and proud to call you my friend.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Imam Hamad Chebli, Islamic Society of Central Jersey, Monmouth Junction, New Jersey, offered the following prayer:

Peace and blessings of Allah be upon you. Assalaamu'alaykum. In the name of Allah, the most gracious, the most merciful. Praise be to Allah, the cherisher, the sustainer of the worlds, the most gracious, the most merciful master of the day of judgment. Thee do we worship and Thine aid we seek. Guide us to the straight path.

The God of all the prophets and the messengers says in the Koran, He does not place a responsibility on you greater than you can bear. Everyone will receive the good they have earned and vice versa.

Let us pray:

O God, bless us as we begin a new day. Bless this assembly, bless the people and Nation it represents. O God, at this time in our history, the challenges for our Nation and the world are many. O God, grant these men and women the wisdom, the guidance, and the strength to pursue compassion, justice, and sound judgment. O God, in Your wisdom, You have placed upon them great responsibility and honor. O God, please help them with Your guidance and Your light. O God, grant them the will and the means to improve the well-being of all inhabitants of this great Nation and beyond.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING IMAM HAMAD CHEBLI

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Imam Hamad Ahmad Chebli, the Imam of the Islamic Society of Central Jersey in South Brunswick, New Jersey. Imam Chebli has been both a friend and an ambassador of Islam to me and many others in New Jersey, and we are all honored that his prayer has opened this session of Congress.

Imam Chebli is a native of Lebanon and attended one of the most prestigious Islamic institutions in the world, Al-Azhar University in Cairo, Egypt, where he received his master's in Islamic Canonical Law. He has been the religious leader of ISCJ since 1986, where he makes Muslims and non-Muslims feel welcome.

The depth of his faith and scholarship, his commanding dignity, and the warmth of his personality make him the most prominent and attractive figure of Islam in our region. In a period where the public understanding of Islam has grown greatly, we are fortunate to have Imam Chebli in our community.

He has worked hard to build interfaith dialogue and public understanding, serving as a member of the North and South Brunswick Diversity Committee and of the regional clergy association. Most recently, New Jersey's Governor appointed Imam Chebli to the Governor's Leadership Summit on Diversity.

He and I have a friendship and association that has lasted many years, especially since September 2001, and I greatly value our friendship.

Imam Chebli is the proud husband of Mona Rich, and he is the loving father of their six children; Ahmad, Muhammad, Maryam, Mahmood, Khalid, and Marwa; and the loving grandfather to seven grandchildren.

Through his inspiring prayer this morning, we can all gain wisdom and guidance.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ROSE MOUNTAIN BUTCHER SHOPPE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to Lansing, North Carolina, I stopped in Rose Mountain Butcher Shoppe and met its proprietor, Ann Rose. Ann is a pioneer in the region's local foods movement, delivering meat

and organic produce from small farms in Ashe, Alleghany, and Watauga Counties to her community.

In addition to running her farm and butcher shop, Ann graciously shares her extensive knowledge with other local farmers. A former nurse, Ann is a strong believer in the importance of an active lifestyle and homegrown diet. She is on a mission to see her neighbors embrace the healthy foods grown in the region.

If she didn't have enough on her plate already, Ann is also helping coordinate the creation of a 66-acre park in Lansing so local residents have access to a community garden and green space for recreation.

Ann is doing tremendous work in her community, and I look forward to seeing her efforts on behalf of the people of Lansing continue to grow and flourish.

PANCREATIC CANCER

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on World Pancreatic Cancer Day in solidarity with those who have been affected by this deadly disease. I join Members of Congress, my staff, and many others walking the Halls of Congress today wearing Purple for a Purpose to convince my colleagues that we must increase funding for pancreatic cancer research.

Too often a pancreatic cancer diagnosis is a death sentence. We can change that. Fifty years ago, breast cancer was also killing women at an alarming rate, and women are now fighting and beating breast cancer because well-funded scientific research has vastly improved screening and treatment.

I am thinking today of my friend Larry Clark, a former Rancho Palos Verdes mayor, who has found the strength to fight pancreatic cancer and advocate for others. Let us answer their call today. Let us wage hope, and let us try to double the pancreatic cancer survival rate by 2020.

JONATHAN GRUBER

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, ''Lack of transparency is a huge political advantage. Call it the stupidity of the American voter or whatever.'' That was ObamaCare architect Jonathan Gruber speaking last year at the University of Pennsylvania.

The broken ObamaCare promises are now legendary: ''If you like your health plan, you can keep it; if you like your doctor, you can keep them. The law will save American families money.''

Don't tell that to the 16th District business owners like Nelson Sensenig and Ron Fritz, who both recently contacted me to talk about their struggle to continue affording coverage for their employees. Both of them used to cover 100 percent of their employees' coverage. Now they can't afford to do so.

Gruber, the MIT professor consultant, can jet around the country bragging about pulling one over on the American people—again, his quote: ''The stupidity of the American voters.'' What liberal arrogance.

What he and the President did with ObamaCare has done tremendous harm to Americans struggling to provide for themselves and their families. That is why we must continue to fight for real health care reform.

SIX YEARS AGO TODAY: THE ECONOMY

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago this week, the economic situation of this country was so perilous, we announced that the TARP program was going to be expanded to cover auto loans and credit cards. The housing bubble had burst, household wealth was slashed by over $16 trillion, banks tottered, lending was frozen, the Dow was about to plunge to 7,000, the GDP was sinking at a rate of 6.3 percent.

Today much has changed. The TARP has been repaid, the Dow has climbed 10,000 points, businesses are growing, unemployment has fallen to 5.8 percent, GDP is expanding at a rate of 3.5 percent.

As this Congress considers how to move forward, it would be beneficial and helpful if we would always remember to look back at what worked and what didn't. Let's do more of what works.

With 56 months of private sector job growth—not enough, but the best record that we have ever had in history—we must build on this progress by investing in infrastructure, raising wages for middle class workers, committing to make it in America, and making sure our schools are preparing for the next generation.

PANCREATIC CANCER

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize the first ever World Pancreatic Cancer Day in an effort to shed a light on this disease as well as the determination to eradicate it.

Pancreatic cancer is the only major cancer that still has a 5-year survival rate in the single digits, at just 6 percent. That is in stark contrast to the overall survival rate for cancer, which is now 67 percent. Even more alarming, pancreatic cancer is now estimated to become the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths in the United States by 2020.

While the threat of this disease is real, pancreatic cancer does not have to be a death sentence. But we need to act now. Working together, we can push back against this diagnosis. With the combined efforts of leaders on Capitol Hill, including the many physicians who serve in this body, medical professionals, community groups, survivors, and families, we can generate awareness and renewed focus on beating pancreatic cancer once and for all.

I urge my colleagues to reach across the aisle to support these goals through commonsense funding proposals and legislation that benefits all.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FALL OF THE BERLIN WALL

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the anniversary of a pivotal event in history. Twenty-five years ago, November 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall fell, heralding the end of the Cold War. Today Germany is the vibrant financial, economic, and political heart of all of Europe. Germany is an important ally of the United States and central to European integration and a unified Atlantic community.

Today a large segment of the Berlin Wall, accepted by former Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and James Baker, as well as Atlantic Council's Fred Kempe, will be unveiled at the German Embassy until a permanent location for the public is found here in Washington. It is signed by the statesmen and activists whose vision in leadership made this possible and led to the fall of the Berlin Wall. It will serve as a very important reminder of the diplomatic ties between our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge to continue working with my colleagues to ensure that our two countries continue to strengthen our diplomatic, economic, and strategic partnership into the 21st century.

□ 1215

THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring American energy to Americans. The Keystone pipeline is the answer.

For over 6 years, the administration has been saying no to energy independence. Six years. That is longer than it took us to win World War II.

Oil is the most reliable and cost-effective source of energy the United States has. The Keystone pipeline, from Canada to Texas, will bring as much crude oil as we get from Saudi Arabia. It will begin energy security

and national security. It will bring jobs.

The pipeline will make Middle Eastern politics and energy irrelevant. It won't cost the taxpayers any money.

I have previously introduced the KFAST bill which will directly and immediately approve the permit for the Keystone XL pipeline. Instead of leaving Americans at the mercy and the questionable loyalties of unstable Middle Eastern countries, we should take care of ourselves.

If the administration continues to be obstinate and politically stonewall the pipeline, the Canadians will simply sell it to someone else, like China. Now, isn't that lovely?

Build the pipeline. It is the right thing to do.

And that is just the way it is.

THE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES EPA REGULATION

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for months I have said how detrimental the new Waters of the United States EPA regulation would be to the people of my district. We have long protected some of the most beautiful waterways in the world, but once again, bureaucrats think that they know better.

I have many questions about the regulation, but when the Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on this rule back in June, the Federal agencies did not even show up. How can we trust them to work with landowners if the rule is implemented?

Earlier this year, the House passed a bill to protect Americans from the huge regulatory burden, but like so many others, it is stuck in the Senate. Luckily, there is still time to do something to stop this disastrous power grab.

The EPA is accepting comments on the proposed Waters of the United States rule until Friday, November 14, so join me in telling the EPA how terrible this ill-considered regulation would be for Missouri and the United States.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1224

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

ALASKA NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE FEDERAL LAND CONVEYANCE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5167) to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey certain Federal property located in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5167

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE FEDERAL PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and after completion of the appraisal described in this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Corporation by quitclaim deed for the consideration described in subsection (c), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property described in subsection (b).

(b) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a) consists of approximately 1,518 acres and improvements comprising a former Distant Early Warning Line site in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska near Wainwright, Alaska, and described as United States Survey Number 5252 located within the Umiat Meridian in—

(1) Sections 3 and 4 within Township 14 North, Range 31 West;

(2) Sections 17, 18, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, and 35 within Township 15 North, Range 31 West; and

(3) Section 13 within Township 15 North; Range 32.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of the property under subsection (a), the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary an amount not less than the fair market value of the conveyed property, to be determined as provided in subparagraph (B).

(B) APPRAISAL.—The fair market value of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined based on an appraisal that—

(i) is conducted by a licensed, independent appraiser that is approved by the Secretary and the Corporation;

(ii) is based on the highest and best use of the property;

(iii) is approved by the Secretary; and

(iv) is paid for by the Corporation.

(2) PRE-CONVEYANCE ENTRY.—The Secretary, on terms and conditions the Secretary determines to be appropriate, may authorize the Corporation to enter the property at no charge for pre-construction and construction activities.

(3) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) EXEMPTION.—Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) shall not apply to any conveyance of property under this section.

(e) CORPORATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Corporation'' means the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Wainwright Short Range radar site is an old Distant Early Warning station, commonly referred to as the Wainwright DEW Line site.

Historically, the U.S. Air Force maintained a radar site on the property, but it is no longer operational. The Air Force is in the final stages of cleaning up the property, which is expected to be finished this summer, and the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation, is collaborating on the effort.

When it finishes the cleanup, the Air Force is set to relinquish its right to the property, which is owned by the Department of the Interior and managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

The Native corporation has been working with the Bureau to acquire the site which sits in the middle of land already owned by the Native corporation. However, language in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska Act of 1976 prevents the Bureau from conveying this land.

H.R. 5167 directs the Secretary of the Interior to sell the site at fair market value to the Native corporation. This will allow the Alaska Natives to incorporate the land into their existing land use management plan and policies, thus turning a potential abandoned and unused parcel into a useful property.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill as reported unanimously from the Natural Resources Committee.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5167 directs the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey 1,518 acres of Federal land in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to the Olgoonik Corporation.

The parcel in question was previously used by the U.S. Air Force and is no longer needed by the Department of Defense. It contains a pipeline to the Chukchi Sea and would likely be used to support offshore energy extraction. It is surrounded by land already owned by the Olgoonik Corporation that was conveyed under the Alaska Native Settlement Claims Act.

Transferring the isolated parcel would help simplify BLM management of the preserve and provide needed economic development for the Alaska Native Corporations.

While I have some concerns with this legislation, including an unrealistic 180-day timeframe for survey and conveyance of the parcel, the waiver of requirements to provide an environmental review according to NEPA, and the use of a non-Federal appraisal agent, we support the passage of H.R. 5167.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5167, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal property located in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRINITY COUNTY LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3326) to provide for an exchange of land between the United States and the Trinity Public Utilities District of Trinity County, California, involving a parcel of National Forest System land in Shasta-Trinity National Forest, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3326

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, TRINITY PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT, TRINITY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND THE FOREST SERVICE.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE REQUIRED.—If not later than three years after enactment of this Act, the Utilities District conveys to the Secretary of the Interior all right, title, and interest of the Utilities District in and to Parcel A, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may require, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey Parcel B to the Utilities District, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may require, including the reservation of easements for all roads and trails considered to be necessary for administrative purposes and to ensure public access to National Forest System lands.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—Maps are entitled ''Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014 – Parcel A'' and ''Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014 – Parcel B'', both dated March 24, 2014. The maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service and the appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management. With the agreement of the parties to the conveyances under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may make technical corrections to the maps and legal descriptions.

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—

(1) LAND EXCHANGE PROCESS.—The land exchange under this section shall be an equal value exchange. Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the land exchange in accordance with section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716).

(2) APPRAISAL OF PARCELS.—The values of Parcel A and Parcel B shall by determined by appraisals performed by a qualified appraiser mutually agreed to by the parties to the conveyances under subsection (a). The appraisals shall be approved by the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and conducted in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land.

(3) CASH EQUALIZATION.—If the values of Parcel A and Parcel B are not equal, the values may be equalized through the use of a cash equalization payment, however, if the final appraised value of Parcel A exceeds the value of Parcel B, the surplus value of Parcel A shall be considered to be a donation by the Utilities District. Notwithstanding section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)), a cash equalization payment may be made in excess of 25 percent of the appraised value of the Parcel B.

(d) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any cash equalization payment received by the United States under subsection (c) shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90–171 (16 U.S.C. 484a; commonly known as the Sisk Act).

(2) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, without further appropriation and until expended, for the improvement, maintenance, reconstruction, or construction of a facility or improvement for the National Forest System.

(e) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of Parcel A and Parcel B shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

(f) COSTS.—As a condition of the land exchange under subsection (a), the Utilities District shall pay the costs associated with—

(1) the surveys described in subsection (e);

(2) the appraisals described in subsection (c)(2); and

(3) any other reasonable administrative or remediation cost determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(g) MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.—Upon the acquisition of Parcel A, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Redding Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, shall administer Parcel A as public land in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and the laws and regulations applicable to public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, except that public recreation and public access to and for recreation shall be the highest and best use of Parcel A.

(h) COMPLETION OF LAND EXCHANGE.—Once the Utilities District offers to convey Parcel A to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture shall complete the conveyance of Parcel B not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) PARCEL A.—The term ''Parcel A'' means the approximately 47 acres of land, known as the ''Sky Ranch parcel'', adjacent to public land administered by the Redding Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management as depicted on the map entitled ''Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014 – Parcel A'', dated March 24, 2014, more particularly described as a portion of Mineral Survey 178, south Highway 299, generally located in the S1/2 of the S1/2 of Section 7 and the N1/2 of the N1/2 of Section 8, Township 33 North, Range 10 West, Mount Diablo Meridian.

(2) PARCEL B.—The term ''Parcel B'' means the approximately 100 acres land in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest in the State of California near the Weaverville Airport in Trinity County as depicted on the map entitled ''Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014 – Parcel B'' dated March 24, 2014, more particularly described as Lot 8, SW1/4 SE1/4, and S1/2 N1/2 SE, Section 31, Township 34 North, Range 9 West, Mount Diablo Meridian.

(3) UTILITIES DISTRICT.—The term ''Utilities District'' means the Trinity Public Utilities District of Trinity County, California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time so the sponsor, the gentleman from California, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN, may explain the bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, the Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014.

This bill is a very straightforward, bipartisan bill. It simply facilitates a land exchange between the Trinity Public Utility District, the United States Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management. I am grateful that my bill is cosponsored by my friend and district neighbor, Congressman DOUG LAMALFA, who represented Trinity County when he was in the State legislature.

Trinity County, located in northern California, is one of the poorest counties in the entire State; and although it is very large, much of it is rugged and remote, and more than 75 percent of the total land base is held by the Federal Government, which leaves very little land suitable for economic development.

This legislation before us today will help stimulate Trinity County's economy. The bill grants Trinity County a much-needed 100-acre parcel from the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. It is accessible by the highway, uniquely suited for economic development; and in exchange, the county's public utility district will convey a 47-acre parcel west of Weaverville that will improve public access to the Trinity River, which is a Wild and Scenic River.

The bill guarantees a fair return for Federal taxpayers as the United States Forest Service will receive a cash equalization payment for the improvement, maintenance, reconstruction, or construction of a facility or an improvement for the National Forest System.

This is a win-win bill all the way around. Partnerships with land management agencies are really critical to Trinity County's economic development, and I am so glad that the county has been able to develop this win-win partnership with the Federal agencies that meets everybody's needs. This land swap is a great example of bipartisan legislation that furthers our shared priorities of economic development and environmental protection in our Nation's rural communities.

Again, I especially want to thank Chairman HASTINGS, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Chairman BISHOP, Ranking Member GRIJALVA, and my neighbor, DOUG LAMALFA, for all of their assistance and collaboration and the many staff who have worked hard on this bill, especially my Sea Grant fellow, Zach Penney.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative JARED HUFFMAN of California, the sponsor of the bill, for the legislation and the hard work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support and congratulate Congressmen JARED HUFFMAN and DOUG LAMALFA. This is a good piece of legislation, and I have to go back through history a little bit.

Being originally from California 63 years ago, I remember Trinity County as one of the richer counties when we had a timber industry, and Weaverville was one of the largest timber cities in the country, but it is no longer. It is really a very poor county because of the management of Federal lands and how they do not manage them.

Again, I compliment the two Congressmen for working on this legislation, and I urge the passage of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3326, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARAPAHO NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4846) to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4846

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. ARAPAHO NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Arapaho National Forest in the State of Colorado is adjusted to incorporate the approximately 92.95 acres of land generally depicted as ''The Wedge'' on the map entitled ''Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment'' and dated November 6, 2013, and described as lots three, four, eight, and nine of section 13, Township 4 North, Range 76 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado. A lot described in this subsection may be included in the boundary adjustment only after the Secretary of Agriculture obtains written permission for such action from the lot owner or owners.

(b) BOWEN GULCH PROTECTION AREA.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall include all Federal land within the boundary described in subsection (a) in the Bowen Gulch Protection Area established under section 6 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 539j).

(c) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l–9), the boundaries of the Arapaho National Forest, as modified under subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the Arapaho National Forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

(d) ACQUISITION.—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire only by donation or exchange non-Federal lands within the boundary described in subsection (a).

(e) PUBLIC MOTORIZED USE.—Nothing in this Act opens privately-owned lands within the boundary described in subsection (a) to public motorized use.

(f) ACCESS TO NON-FEDERAL LANDS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6(f) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 539j(f)) regarding motorized travel, the owners of any non-Federal lands within the boundary described in subsection (a) who historically have accessed their lands through lands now or hereafter owned by the United States within the boundary described in subsection (a) shall have the continued right of motorized access to their lands across the existing roadway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2014 would adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest in the State of Colorado to incorporate 92 additional acres. This land, if it is acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture, will become part of the Bowen Gulch Protection Area that was established by Congress in 1993.

At markup, the Natural Resources Committee amended the bill to require the written permission of the landowner before a parcel of private land could be included within the expanded boundary. The amendment also requires that any land acquisition in the added area would be achieved only by donation or exchange, and the motorized use provision was clarified to ensure that the bill does not open privately owned land to trespass. With these added property rights and fiscal responsibility provisions, the committee was able to report the bill by unanimous consent, and I support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado, Representative JARED POLIS, the sponsor of the legislation. I thank him for his hard work on this boundary adjustment, which reflects current management and authorizes the acquisition and protection of this pristine land.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation that I was proud to author, the Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2014, H.R. 4846.

This legislation involves a parcel of 10 lots that we call the ''wedge'' in Grand County, Colorado, in the Second Congressional District. The wedge is located just north of the town of Grand Lake and west of the famous Rocky Mountain National Park. Come visit. It is called the ''wedge'' because it is actually a wedge of land which divides the Arapaho National Forest from the Rocky Mountain National Park. Although this parcel is integral to the successful management of these public lands, the wedge is currently outside of the national forest boundary.

I drafted this bill after receiving a lot of feedback and strong local support to incorporate the wedge into the Arapaho National Forest to make sure that this undeveloped land is enjoyed by the millions of visitors who travel west from the top of Rocky Mountain National Park on the Trail Ridge Road scenic byway.

The U.S. Forest Service already owns seven of the 10 parcels, which are already being managed as part of the Arapaho National Forest. There is a nonprofit, the Rocky Mountain Nature Association, that owns one lot, and two lots are owned by private landowners. We have worked with the landowners and the other adjacent landowner, in order to craft this legislation, as well as local government. As a result, all interested parties have sent in letters of support.

The bill is simple. It incorporates the wedge into the Arapaho National Forest boundary; it adds the lots owned by the Forest Service to the adjacent Bowen Gulch Protection Area; and it authorizes the Federal Government to purchase land in the designated area from willing sellers.

The bill is important because the development of the wedge parcel has an important impact on the scenic beauty of the Rocky Mountain National Park. It is also a key driver of our economy in northern Colorado, and it could negatively harm the adjoining Colorado River headwaters if we don't appropriately deal with the wedge parcel. As such, the surrounding communities and landowners all support this idea that preserves the scenic qualities that the wedge has for the area.

The bill is a community-driven effort. I received letters of support from the Grand County Board of County Commissioners, the Town of Grand Lake, the Headwaters Trails Alliance, Conservation Colorado, all three affected landowners, and, of course, many aspects of the tourism industry strongly support this bill as well.

I am very grateful that the House Natural Resources Committee quickly considered this legislation and unanimously passed this legislation on September 18. I urge my colleagues on the floor to similarly support this legislation here today.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4846, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THROUGH TRIBAL LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4867) to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4867

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) BANNING.—The term ''Banning'' means the City of Banning, which is located in Riverside County, California adjacent to the Morongo Indian Reservation.

(2) FIELDS.—The term ''Fields'' means Lloyd L. Fields, the owner of record of Parcel A.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled 'Morongo Indian Reservation, County of Riverside, State of California Land Exchange Map', and dated May 22, 2014, which is on file in the Bureau of Land Management State Office in Sacramento, California.

(4) PARCEL A.—The term ''Parcel A'' means the approximately 41.15 acres designated on the map as ''Fields lands''.

(5) PARCEL B.—The term ''Parcel B'' means the approximately 41.15 acres designated on the map as ''Morongo lands''.

(6) PARCEL C.—The term ''Parcel C'' means the approximately 1.21 acres designated on the map as ''Banning land''.

(7) PARCEL D.—The term ''Parcel D'' means the approximately 1.76 acres designated on the map as ''Easement to Banning''.

(8) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) TRIBE.—The term ''Tribe'' means the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF LANDS; TRUST LANDS, EASEMENT.

(a) TRANSFER OF PARCEL A AND PARCEL B AND EASEMENT OVER PARCEL D.—Subject to any valid existing rights of any third parties and to legal review and approval of the form and content of any and all instruments of conveyance and policies of title insurance, upon receipt by the Secretary of confirmation that Fields has duly executed and deposited with a mutually acceptable and jointly instructed escrow holder in California a deed conveying clear and unencumbered title to Parcel A to the United States in trust for the exclusive use and benefit of the Tribe, and upon receipt by Fields of confirmation that the Secretary has duly executed and deposited into escrow with the same mutually acceptable and jointly instructed escrow holder a patent conveying clear and unencumbered title in fee simple to Parcel B to Fields and has duly executed and deposited into escrow with the same mutually acceptable and jointly instructed escrow holder an easement to the City for a public right-of-way over Parcel D, the Secretary shall instruct the escrow holder to simultaneously cause—

(1) the patent to Parcel B to be recorded and issued to Fields;

(2) the easement over Parcel D to be recorded and issued to the City; and

(3) the deed to Parcel A to be delivered to the Secretary, who shall immediately cause said deed to be recorded and held in trust for the Tribe.

(b) TRANSFER OF PARCEL C.—After the simultaneous transfer of parcels A, B, and D under subsection (a), upon receipt by the Secretary of confirmation that the City has vacated its interest in Parcel C pursuant to all applicable State and local laws, the Secretary shall immediately cause Parcel C to be held in trust for the Tribe subject to—

(1) any valid existing rights of any third parties; and

(2) legal review and approval of the form and content of any and all instruments of conveyance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4867 authorizes an acre-for-acre land exchange between the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and a non-Indian landowner to resolve a land use and access dispute.

Under the exchange, the private landowner would transfer clear title to a 41-acre parcel of land he currently owns within the Morongo Reservation, which is located in the State of California, to the Secretary of the Interior, who would then hold the land in trust for the benefit of the tribe. The Secretary would simultaneously transfer to the private landowner clear title to a 41-acre parcel of the tribe's trust land on the edge of the reservation, affording reasonable access for his economic use of the property. The bill additionally authorizes conveyances of easements by the tribe and the city of Banning to address certain city and tribal needs.

The Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 4867, which was followed by Natural Resources Committee approval by

unanimous consent. This legislation is noncontroversial, and I urge the House to pass this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to commend my colleague, Representative RUIZ of California, for sponsoring this legislation, for working so hard to bring all of the diverse interests to the table, and for coming up with a noncontroversial, bipartisan solution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) to speak on his legislation.

Mr. RUIZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of my bill, H.R. 4867, the Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act, which is a noncontroversial, bipartisan bill that passed unanimously out of the House Natural Resources Committee and is supported by the Department of the Interior.

The bill would aid economic development in the city of Banning, California, through a land swap, supported by all of the parties involved. Currently, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and a private landowner, Mr. Lloyd Fields, would like to exchange two parcels of land which are nearly identical in size and value, but they are restrained from doing so because one of the parcels is currently held in trust by the United States on behalf of the tribe.

My bill facilitates an equitable land swap between the Morongo Tribe and the landowner to provide more consolidated reservation land for the tribe and commercial development opportunities for the landowner, the city of Banning and Riverside County.

The bill is consistent with the Department of the Interior's policy of promoting land consolidation within Indian country and facilitating economic development. We can all support this type of commonsense, bipartisan legislation for the simple reason that it benefits all parties involved and spurs job creation.

This bill serves as a model for how land use issues can be addressed by a community's coming together while upholding the sacred government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

I would like to thank Chairman Robert Martin of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians in the city of Banning for bringing this issue to my attention; my colleague, Representative PAUL COOK from California, for being an original cosponsor; and Senator BOXER from California for introducing the companion bill. I would also like to thank the Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs' Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member HANABUSA for holding a hearing on this bill as well as to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for considering this bill in committee and for their help in bringing it to the floor today.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 4867, the Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4867, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1617

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5682, APPROVAL OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 748 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 748

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5682) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. POLIS, my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years, President Obama, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State Kerry, and Senate Democrats have made sure that the American people would continue to wait for the Keystone pipeline.

The Keystone pipeline provides jobs, energy security, and perhaps most of all a closer and better relationship with our friends from Canada.

Mr. Speaker, quite honestly, the bottom line is we need to do business with our friends in Canada rather than friends in other places around the world who may be using that money that they receive for reasons that are not in America's best interest. We trust the Canadians.

Today we have a bill on the floor because we believe that House Republicans, being led by Dr. BILL CASSIDY, can lead us to a way to construct the Keystone pipeline, provide us with a closer relationship with Canada, and make sure that the TransCanada application to construct the Keystone XL pipeline will be done. That is why we are here on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

With that said, I rise in support of not only this rule that will provide the context for the bill but also the legislation.

Let me be perfectly clear today: this bill to approve the Keystone pipeline is a jobs bill. Over the last few years, too many Americans have been out of work, not always in the right places where jobs were available, but too many Americans are out of work, and this is an area where people are out of work and need the work and can get it.

Wages have been stagnant, and median incomes for American families have fallen because this administration and the policies of the Democratic Party have led to a stagnation of the free enterprise system, and an opportunity in particular in the area of energy has been a political issue rather than a jobs issue for the American people.

The Keystone pipeline would support tens of thousands of great-paying jobs and help resolve some problems in this area and across a multistate area of the West. Yet President Obama, Secretary Hillary Clinton, and Senate Democrats have stood constantly and consistently in the way of job-creating, shovel-ready projects.

For 6 years we have known that the impact of the Keystone pipeline would be positive on the American economy, with positive benefits that it would provide for the American people. For 6 years, we have known that the pipeline would add over a billion dollars of revenue to a tepid economy, a billion dollars in places where people are out of work, need work. And it can be done through efficiency and effectiveness of this pipeline.

Americans have been looking for leadership to secure energy independence, energy independence to where we no longer have to go across the oceans to receive the energy that we need. With this pipeline, it is an important step, I believe, in the right direction.

When completed, the Keystone pipeline will transport over 800,000 barrels of oil every single day. That is equivalent to half of our daily oil imports from the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, that is competition with the current system. That is how you get prices lower at the gas pump, by having competition, competition with the Middle East for the oil that we will use in this country.

This will further help lower energy costs for American families while helping to bolster our national security by weaning us off oil from nations that sometimes do not have our best interests in their own mind.

Instead of partnering with countries in the Middle East, the Keystone pipeline lets us work together with our dear friends from Canada.

By approving the Keystone pipeline, the Federal Government will reduce our dependency overnight while creating much-needed jobs and providing billions of dollars in economic opportunity in the USA.

We all know that Keystone can accomplish what the American people want, and that is that we need to work together. Mr. Speaker, we need to work together.

Finally, what has happened is that the Senate Democrats are asking for this bill. Regardless of the reason, what we are doing here today is to work together on ideas that we have been trying to push for a long, long time.

In September of 2008, TransCanada submitted their application to the Department of State to construct the Keystone pipeline. Yet the Obama administration has blocked and delayed construction of the pipeline at every single turn. Excuse after excuse after excuse rather than getting it done.

The State Department, led by Secretary Hillary Clinton and Secretary Kerry, has stood firmly in the way of jobs created by this project. They have held dozens of meetings and issued study after study, each of which confirms what Republicans have said all along, and that is, the pipeline will create jobs and inject billions of dollars into the American economy while doing so in a safe and limited environmental impact way.

Beginning in 2011, with Republicans, as soon as they won this body and became the majority, we started passing laws to jump-start the pipeline. Time after time I have been on the floor of this body—and, Mr. Speaker, you have stood faithfully in your chair to listen to the debates. It is you, Mr. Speaker, who has been behind this idea to make sure that we would keep it as a part of our objective. An objective for the American people, opportunities for the American people, and a friendship with the Canadians. Sadly, Senate Democrats have refused to allow even a vote.

Yet just yesterday the Keystone pipeline suddenly became a hot topic on the Senate floor. A hot topic because they want to get it done now.

Well, so what has changed? Last week, after 6 long years, Members of the Senate finally decided to listen to the American people. The House has been listening and acting for 4 years now, but now that the Senate is prepared to join us, we are here to work together.

The House is prepared to pass this bill from Dr. BILL CASSIDY, oh, yes, from an energy State called Louisiana. A dear friend of not only this body but a dear friend of consumers and families who understand that we need to reduce even further costs at the gas pump, that we need to be concerned about where we buy our oil and our energy and to make sure we are doing business with the friends and people we know.

So they can pass it and they can send it to the President's desk. We are going to send the same bill. Same bill they are doing in the Senate is the same one we are going to do here. We are going to get it to the President. No more delays, no more excuses. It is actually time to make the Keystone pipeline a reality.

Said another way, the election is over; let's get our work done.

I am proud that the House has led on this issue. I look forward to the Senate joining us. I hope the President will do the same thing. I hope we will sign another jobs bill that has been passed by the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

Last night, we got a notice that the Rules Committee was going to have an emergency hearing to expedite very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I was very excited. I thought we were going to deal with an emergency. Perhaps it was Ebola, perhaps it was dealing with the use of force overseas, or emergencies here at home like the thousands of families that are separated because of our broken immigration law or the emergency of balancing our budget before we leave the next generation with a burden of debt. I was really hopeful that the majority was ready to take on a pressing issue facing the country.

Sadly, I was too optimistic. I found out that the bill that was such an emergency, that was expeditiously brought before the Rules Committee and now to the floor is actually a bill that we have already voted on this Congress to bypass the administration's review policy and streamline the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Turned out last night's Rules Committee meeting was far from an emergency. The majority should not have waived clause 11 of rule XXI that normally requires 3 days to review legislation before we vote on it.

To be clear, we have not had 3 days to read this bill. Now, one could argue, since we have pretty much passed the darn thing before and it hasn't changed much, maybe we didn't need the full 3 days, but why are we doing another bill?

□ 1630

I truly hope we are not setting the tone for the 114th where great Representatives, Democratic and Republican, come from all parts of the country to tackle the issues facing our great Nation, balancing the budget, fixing our broken immigration system, and getting our economy moving; and we vote on the same bill, in the case of repealing the Affordable Care Act, 53 times in the 113th Congress.

One time, I understand. The House wants to do it, that is what the people were elected to do, if they believe that, and that is what a majority says, then do it. But what are the other 52 times besides a waste of taxpayer money?

The Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act being revived today is nothing new. Again, it bypasses the pending review process and would immediately authorize the TransCanada Keystone pipeline company to build an 875-mile pipeline from Canada through the United States to the Gulf of Mexico for the exportation of oil.

This bill would expedite a tar sands project without requiring a Federal environmental or administrative review process basically saying that those are automatically concluded and/or sufficient.

I asked Chairman WHITFIELD in our Rules Committee what their discussion with the administration was on this. When did they last have testimony, formal or informal, from the administration? Where is the administration in this approval process?

Mr. WHITFIELD informed me that there had been no updates from the administration that they have requested for 6 months, so for all we know, the President might be ready to approve or not approve this project tomorrow, next week, next month—I don't know—but it seems like the two branches of government aren't talking to one another.

Normally, if Congress is interested in where a particular approval process is,

we would hold hearings, and we would ask the relevant questions—what are the current sticking points, are there issues that are still pending—rather than bypass any legitimate issues that might still be there around the routing.

As many of you know, the routing has already been changed so as not to impact the Ogallala aquifer, and there could very well be other important issues that affect residents of the States through which the Keystone pipeline would pass.

Clearly, this project is a great favor to our friendly neighbors to the north, the great nation of Canada. The question that we need to figure out as a country is: Does it benefit America? Does it benefit Americans?

There are pros and cons. Obviously, if it goes in your neighborhood, it is not a particular benefit to you—or through your farm—and that was some of the issues that we heard from in the impact statements that are currently being reviewed by the administration.

There is a review process underway. We all wish that review process went faster. We all wish that NEPA would go faster. We all wish that a wide variety of review policies would go faster, but we don't know how that is going to be concluded, and I think it is important that, while they get through it as soon as possible, they are able to do so and take all factors into account.

If Congress wants to change the approval process for these kinds of projects, I think that is a legitimate discussion to have. If Congress determines it needs to reconfigure a review process for a project like this, maybe we would go into the statute and we alter the different agencies or we assign different responsibility or criteria.

That would be a relevant discussion to have, not bypassing something that Congress set up in statute. The President is doing what Congress told him to do in reviewing this process—not this Congress, but the underlying statute when it was passed.

Now, of course, there are a lot of issues around Keystone XL, and rather than interrupting the State Department's ongoing review process, Congress should allow all the relevant issues to be properly addressed around this issue.

I want to emphasize that the Republicans brought this tar sands bill forward just one day after China and the U.S. came to a landmark agreement to address climate change. Tar sands are a high-polluting fuel that, on a lifecycle basis, tar sands crude produces about 20 percent more carbon pollution than conventional crudes.

In addition, we have a study from Cornell University with regard to the effect of the XL pipeline on gasoline for American citizens, and top energy economists in this Cornell study said that if the XL pipeline is built, consumers in our country may end up paying 10 to 20 cents more per gallon for gas as a result of tar sands being diverted.

That is millions of dollars a year out of the pockets of Americans and perhaps into the pockets of wherever all this oil is going. But, again, of what benefit to America is this project?

There is also the simple matter of how a bill becomes a law, okay, so we have a House bill, a Senate bill, and let's take a wild presumption, maybe both Chambers will pass this bill. What happens next? It goes to the President. The President can sign a bill or veto a bill.

Essentially, the President can sign a bill approving the Keystone pipeline, which is something that he can do now without this bill. He can approve the pipeline, and if Congress goes through all this deliberative effort at taxpayer expense, talk, and votes and all this stuff, the President still has a decision.

Now, again, obviously, if there are two-thirds in both Chambers, Congress can seize power on a particular issue and exert its own will, but that hasn't been the case on these Keystone pipeline votes, and I don't expect it to be the case on this one.

So it is just an exercise in senseless hot air being thrown around the Chamber where we can pass bills and the same situation prevails if it passes or not; namely, the President can decide whether they want this to go forward or not. If Congress wants to alter that approval process, let's look at the statutory rules around how projects are reviewed for future projects and see if we can reach a bipartisan consensus about that.

I wish that this had been an emergency piece of legislation. I wish that we were tackling a potential public health crisis. I wish that we were tackling terrorism. I wish we were tackling balancing the budget, and I wish we were tackling securing our borders. But we are not.

We are tackling something that isn't going anywhere and, even if passed, will give the President the same choice that he has today, much to do about nothing.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, just so we really are a little bit clear, the President indicated last week what he might do on this exact issue of Keystone pipeline. He said that he would consider signing the bill if it creates jobs.

So, Mr. President, the study from your own State Department said that construction on Keystone would create over 42,000 jobs, so there is one answer to our President.

Another one, the President said he would consider signing the bill if it was good for the American people, good for their pocketbooks, if it were to reduce gas prices. Now, that is what the President said.

Once again, I have good news. Good news. Keystone pipeline will move up to 830,000 barrels of oil a day through an efficient process. Instead of it coming from halfway around the world, which adds cost to the transportation, it will come through a pipeline and be here real efficiently, so I think we are in good stead there to meet the test for the President.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to let you know that I have got five or six speakers that are here who are excited about this opportunity for jobs, a jobs bill that is on the floor today and the creation of legislation to have the XL pipeline.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Raleigh, North Carolina, Congressman HOLDING.

Mr. HOLDING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of American jobs and increased and efficient energy production. For too long, approval of the Keystone pipeline has been delayed, delaying thousands of new jobs—42,000 new jobs—and our struggling economy a much-needed boost.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans, both Democrat and Republican alike, support building the Keystone pipeline. Why? Because it is common sense. But for 6 years, it has been delayed. The Keystone pipeline will create jobs, grow our economy, and help our Nation provide a secure source of energy that does not have to come from halfway around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am focused on building a stronger economy for American families, and job creation is a top priority to accomplish that. Approving the Keystone pipeline advances all of these goals. I urge my colleagues in the strongest terms to support this rule and support the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. POLIS. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the passage of the rule and H.R. 5682, the underlying bill. You first have to consider the opinion of the world's undisputed foremost climatologist, former NASA scientist Dr. James Hansen, the guru on this subject, Betty Crocker, Good Housekeeping Seal, one of the first scientists to warn of the dangers of burning carbon fuel.

Dr. Hansen is a member of the prestigious National Academy of Sciences, and he has likened the building and the use of the Keystone XL pipeline to the lighting of ''the fuse to the biggest carbon bomb on the planet'' and nothing less.

''The fuse to the biggest carbon bomb on the planet,'' that is Dr. Hansen. Dr. Hansen has warned the completion of this pipeline will only reinforce our dependence on fossil fuels, not strengthen our Nation's energy independence, as has been argued by some of my friends on the other side.

When you brush aside the studies funded by TransCanada and other oil companies and you analyze the pure scientific studies that have no political motivation, every analysis clearly

demonstrates that the Keystone XL pipeline poses major threats at every turn, in extraction, in transportation, in refining, and in consumption.

Nationwide, about 3.2 million gallons of oil spill from pipelines every year. Spills such as those pollute drinking water, ruin American farmland, potentially destroy sacred tribal grounds, and create an uninhabitable environment for our own homeowners.

In fact, in Kalamazoo, Michigan, there was a spill in 2010 of tar sands oil that cost $1.2 billion and years and years and years to clean up. That is where the permanent jobs are going to be created, in cleaning up the spillage, and that is not the kind of jobs the American people want.

Building the pipeline carries the dirtiest oil from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico and is exactly the opposite of addressing climate change, which is what we should be doing today, and most of this oil will not go to America, but will go through America, endangering mid-America, and be exported overseas. There are no export restrictions on nondomestic crudes.

H.R. 5682 is a special interest earmark that will make the U.S. a permanent conduit to international markets for one of the dirtiest fuel sources on the planet.

My colleague and friend says that we are going to be helping our friend. Yes, Canada is our friend. We play hockey with them, basketball, whatever; but this oil is going to go to our other friend, China. This is about Canada shipping oil through America and endangering American lands to supply the Chinese with oil.

The Keystone XL proponents like to talk about these jobs it would create, but the vast majority are temporary. The permanent jobs measure but 35, and as I said, the permanent jobs will really be cleanup.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 45 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. As was mentioned by Mr. POLIS, these jobs are important if they are in transportation infrastructure. That creates real jobs in this country, getting goods to market, and my friends on the other side have resisted transportation infrastructure jobs.

Clean energy is permanent jobs. Wind and solar are permanent jobs. The only permanent jobs are the cleanups. When the U.S. and China have come together in historic agreement is not the time to light the fuse to the biggest carbon bomb on the planet.

For these and other countless reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.'' It is time to return our focus to an issue that centers on true energy independence through renewable sources and greener, domestic energy production.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I think we are seeing the same heresy take place here on the floor, and that is trying to scare people. It is Republicans who are trying to move a job bill, and jobs, the American people understand. Let's keep this thing right in the center of the table.

It is about jobs. It is about energy independence. It is about a working relationship with our friends. It is about lessening our dependence upon giving people in other countries in foreign lands our money that they don't always use in our best interest. It is about national security, and it is about a lot of things that make common sense. What makes common sense is not to scare people, but give them the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota, KEVIN CRAMER. He served on the commission up in North Dakota before he came to Congress, and he is a great young man.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. It seems it should be so unnecessary to have something that makes so much common sense become so historic, and yet, here, we find ourselves at a historic moment.

After years of debate and accommodation, the most environmentally studied and accommodated pipeline in the history of the world has been stranded on the President's desk, held hostage by Hollywood advisers and liberals, donors to politicians who either don't understand the issue or don't care.

□ 1645

But as signals of a possible vote in the United States Senate are being transmitted, the American people ought to find comfort in the fact that politics works, that when the American people speak, even the United States Senate listens.

So I am grateful that Congressman CASSIDY has brought this bill to the people's House, a bill that originated with my Senator, Senator HOEVEN in the Senate, so that we can tee it up for them this week so that next week they can do what they should have done a long time ago and pass this bill.

You know, I am a big part of the Keystone pipeline. When I was on the North Dakota Public Service Commission years ago, I carried the pipeline portfolio. I happened to oversee the siting of the original Keystone pipeline that goes through North Dakota and goes down to Cushing, Oklahoma. It crosses the border in North Dakota. It crosses eight counties in my State, 600 landowners' land. It crosses farms of farmers who know how to work the land and know the value of the topsoil and understand the value of the minerals underneath it. It crosses two scenic rivers and includes five pumping stations and runs 217 miles through my State.

I am proud to say that while not universally loved, not one inch of that pipeline through North Dakota required condemnation proceedings, not because I am a great regulator, but because North Dakotans understand value—the value of domestic energy, the value it has to job creation. And I want to talk about jobs in a little bit.

As vast reserves of oil are discovered and new technologies unlocked, energy security is within our reach this decade. The amount of oil that would flow to U.S. refineries in the Keystone XL represents 36 percent of what we import today from the Persian Gulf alone. The fact of the matter is that, today, over 71 percent of the Bakken shale crude that is produced in North Dakota is shipped by rail. Now, I have nothing against trains—I thank God that we have a robust rail system—but railing oil costs more. It is a little more dangerous. It is not as efficient as pipelines. It also requires trucks to get the oil to the rail facilities. Again, trucks are good—they are not bad at all—but they are not as safe or as efficient as pipelines, and they take a toll on our highway infrastructure.

According to the director of the North Dakota Department of Mineral Resources, Lynn Helms, approval of the Keystone XL will cause two things to happen, and listen carefully: 300 to 500 truckloads per day will be taken off of North Dakota highways, and there will be 10 fewer trains every week leaving the State. He also calculates that greenhouse gas emissions from rail are 1.8 times that of a pipeline and 2.9 times the emissions from pipeline transportation, and spills from truck transportation occurs at three to four times the rate of spills from pipelines. So yes, sometimes accidents happen, but they happen far more frequently with trucks.

Approval of the XL will result in 450,00 to 950,000 kilograms per day less greenhouse gas emissions in North Dakota alone, as well as significant decreases in dust and 60 to 80 fewer spills per year.

America's national security, Mr. Speaker, and America's economic security are tied directly to America's energy security. We can do a lot better, and we need to.

Now, the environmental safeguards in the Keystone pipeline—I said it is the most studied pipeline in the history of the world—they are rigorous and they are appropriate. They have been tested and they work. I can attest to that. I toured the Keystone during construction, and I met many of the men and women who worked on the line. Those, Mr. Speaker, are real jobs. Those pipe layers are real workers doing real jobs. The restaurant owners, the hotel owners, the retailers, the subcontractors, those are real jobs, and they should not be diminished by considering them something other than real jobs. We have the lowest workforce participation rate since 1978 in this country. Let's put people back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to stand here and support this rule and ask my colleagues to do the same. Support final passage. Put people back to work and make America more energy

secure and keep the prices low for the American consumer.

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

So again, I was excited that perhaps the Rules Committee was going to consider emergency legislation on public health or Ebola or the war with ISIS or our budget. How about a deficit of half a trillion dollars, I call that an emergency. Instead, here we are dealing with a bill, something that Congress already passed that even if they passed again would make the decisionmaker exactly the same decisionmaker we have today, namely, the President of the United States.

Rather than considering the Keystone pipeline bill—and if we weren't going to deal with one of the real emergencies—why not at least bring up bills that create new green energy jobs in our innovation and energy sector like the bipartisan Public Lands Renewable Energy Act that I offered along with Representatives GOSAR, THOMPSON, and HECK? The Public Lands Renewable Energy Act would expand renewable energy development and create jobs while protecting our Nation's public health and environmental resources. It would provide the framework for a competitive leasing system for wind and energy, solar energy, on public lands. The innovative leasing process would help move our Nation forward with clean energy development while providing funding for conservation, States, and localities. How about that? Let's use some of our great public lands that have good solar or wind characteristics for solar and wind. I think that would be a great bipartisan bill to bring up here today.

Another example of a bill that we could consider today that would create jobs and move to a renewable energy future is the Renewable Electricity Standard Act, H.R. 3654, which I co-introduced in order to boost renewable energy markets across the country. The bill would make sure that utilities generate 25 percent of their electricity from renewable energies like wind, solar, and biomass by 2025. It is a goal, and my great State of Colorado already has a 30 percent renewable energy standard. That legislation would build on the success of over 30 State-based renewable energy standards, including the standard in the great State of Colorado by creating a true national market for renewable energy. It would create jobs and save consumers money on utility bills, help keep gas cheap at the pump, and provide billions in local tax revenues for small towns while cutting carbon pollution. That, to me, sounds like a better idea than spending our time debating a bill that, even if passed, will leave the project that it is talking about in the same situation it is before the bill is discussed.

Instead, Republicans are moving forward on a bill that clings on to Big Oil interests and does nothing to make energy more affordable for American consumers, does nothing to move forward to a clean energy future, and does nothing at all because, even if it passes, it has to go to the President to sign, who is currently the person reviewing the applications as we speak.

The emergency Rules Committee meeting and closed rule today does not allow me to bring forward the Public Lands Renewable Energy Act as an amendment. It doesn't allow me to bring forward the Renewable Electricity Standard Act as an amendment. In fact, the closed rule today ensures that no Member, Republican or Democratic, of this great body can offer an amendment to improve this bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to set the tone for the next Congress by rejecting this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, and I will tell you, we are trying to keep the stage set that we in the Republican majority are leading for jobs for America. We are leading to help gas at the pump be less than what it has been. It doubled under President Obama's watch because they have not done the things that would allow more energy to be gotten. Sure, it is being gotten now on private lands, but on Federal lands, we need to do the same.

Once again, the same old worn-out rhetoric standing in the way of jobs in this country. That is why Republicans are now here on the floor again today. Our last bill is about jobs, too, before we leave.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Gainesville, Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee.

I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 5682, to authorize the construction of the Keystone pipeline. You know, it is not every day that I come back—and we have been gone for awhile from debating while we have been out actually campaigning and listening to the American people, and the American people spoke rather loudly last week, and it is good to come back and begin to put into practice what they have said. In fact, it is amazing to me how debates that went on so far here and coming to the floor—in fact, from people that normally we never disagree on—I am actually bringing to the floor a little bit of bipartisanship here.

In fact, I know that some will think there is no better argument for the pipeline—in fact, there is no better one that I have heard than one that I read in the paper today from a distinguished colleague in the other Chamber just across the way who does not share the Republican point of view. He said in regards to the Keystone pipeline:

> It would be a tremendous windfall for all of us. It is something we can count on. I can't for the life of me understand why we haven't, to date, been able to move this piece of legislation forward.

Well, good grief, neither do I. In fact, if I was to spend the rest of my 5 minutes just trying to understand why the Senate can't move bills, we would be here all night, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from the other side, the other body, the Senate, summed it up clearly. He said: I don't understand why we can't move stuff.

What I have also missed, Mr. Speaker, coming back to the floor of the House, is things that I have never heard before, I mean, not at least in north Georgia where I am from. When we talk about jobs—and I have heard it talked about here on the floor of the House this afternoon; in fact, it was said that this is a waste of taxpayer money. To bring bills like this up, that it is a waste of taxpayer money. What is a waste of taxpayer money is the House Republicans passing jobs bills for Americans regardless of their party, jobs for them, and having them sit in a Senate that never woke up. That is a waste of taxpayer money. Where do I go to get my money back from that side of the aisle?

You know what is another thing that is amazing to me today, I actually heard something, Mr. Speaker, and you may have to help me with this because I don't understand because it was just said here on the floor of the House that this bill was a special interest earmark. I have never heard jobs described as a special interest earmark. Are you telling me that the Congress, in looking to give people jobs, is a special interest earmark? I think that is exactly what we are supposed to be doing. Are you kidding? This is exactly what the election was about just a couple of days ago. It is exactly what the American people spoke of. It is exactly what they are tired of—of government standing in the way of jobs.

Emergency legislation, an ''emergency rule,'' another term I have just heard on the House floor just a few minutes ago, that we were coming to the floor with an emergency rule and that we were going to do something special. Undoubtedly, they have never met somebody who does not have a job. I have been without a job. And if you were to tell me that I could get a job when I was looking for a job, that is emergency legislation. It is whatever it is, and I am looking for a job, and there are millions of families looking for jobs. Special interests it is not; it is the work of this body. And to say it is a waste of time, have we lost that much of our vision of what the American people sent us here to do?

Are there things that we could bring up? I appreciate my friend from Colorado. Are there a multitude of bills we could bring up? Yes. But as my parents once told me, they said: DOUG, that is the supper you are getting tonight. You either eat it or go to bed hungry.

The bill we have before us is a jobs bill—42,000 jobs—puts millions of people in jobs and the economy back together again in a way that helps our economy and helps the world, but yet

all we are worried about is what could be. Well, what could be is not good enough for somebody who can't pay their house payment, who can't send their kids to school. It is bad.

If you are watching and if you want to think about this right now, there is a clear difference. And the clear difference is that the Republicans have listened to the folks at the ball fields, have listened to the folks at the churches and the synagogues, who have heard ''I need a job.''

I want to work together for good jobs, and we will get to better jobs; but what is before us right now, Mr. Speaker, is this bill. This is the bill that is before us, and there is bipartisan support for this. And we can claim what is not in it. We can claim what it is. But I would never ever want to come to this podium, Mr. Speaker, and ever say that a jobs bill is an earmark, that a jobs bill is something that we shouldn't be taking up or that it is a waste of time, because when we say that bills like this are a waste of time, then we might as well say to people on the unemployment line, ''You are a waste of time,'' and this Republican will never do that because the American people expect better from us. That is why this rule needs to pass; that is why this bill needs to pass; and that is why this Republican majority will do what it is sent here to do—govern.

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

Mr. Speaker, the other side here is arguing like somehow passing this bill would lead to this pipeline being built. That simply isn't the case. The current review process, the decision lies with the President and the Secretary of State. If this bill, in identical form, were to pass both Chambers, the President of the United States will have a choice—approve it or not approve it—the same choice he has now.

□ 1700

So in no way would this Republican bill that we are considering here today make a decision for the President. The President is elected by the people in the country. Congress itself gave the President the authority to review this bill. It only becomes law if he chooses to sign it.

I should point out that this bill exempts TransCanada from multiple environmental laws like the National Environmental Policy Act or the Endangered Species Act. If the President were to approve the Keystone project, it probably wouldn't even be by signing this bill. He would probably approve it without waiving those laws or perhaps different areas, or perhaps there are other issues that this body doesn't know about because Mr. WHITFIELD hasn't consulted the President on what the pending issues are in 6 months.

So again, as a Member of this body who is not on the committee of jurisdiction, I can't say that I have been briefed by the administration on what the pending issues are. Apparently, Mr. WHITFIELD hasn't either. So let's find out what they are and are there additional areas that have to be rerouted, are there precautions that have to be made because of the high temperature of the tar sands as they race across our country.

Approving this Keystone XL pipeline, which this bill, again, would not do—it would simply go to the President who could choose whether he wants to move forward or not, just as he can now—but it would simply benefit foreign oil interests. The real issue is where are the benefits for the American people—the health and safety of the American people, the integrity of agriculture-based economies in the areas that would be affected. Does Congress really want to give TransCanada special benefits and exemptions or should they be held to the same standard as other important energy projects?

We need to help America grow renewable energy to wean ourselves off of our reliance on fossil fuels. If Congress wants to weigh in on how large energy projects should be approved, by all means, let's do it. But, quite frankly, you don't do it by presenting a bill to the President which gives him the exact same options that he has today. It doesn't move the ball down the road one way or the other.

I share the desire that my colleagues have that hopefully the process is nearing its completion. Whether that is a week or a month or 6 months, I don't know. Apparently, the committee doesn't know either, because they haven't asked the Executive. But I do trust that they are taking the factors that Congress wrote into law into consideration and, hopefully, will come to the conclusion one way or the other regardless of whether this bill is passed or not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas (Mr. BARTON). As the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, he knows about as much as anybody in the United States Congress about not just the needs of jobs and energy in this country, but, as the distinguished former chairman of the committee, he led this fight for many, many years.

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

First of all, let's try to define what this bill actually does. We have had a lot of rhetoric on the House floor the last 30 minutes or so. It is a pretty simple bill. It removes the President from the decisionmaking authority. He can sign the bill and it would become law; he cannot sign it after so many days and it can become law; or he can veto it—but he doesn't have to make the decision whether to build the pipeline or not. That is the first thing. It takes the President out of the decisionmaking loop, except for the fact that he has the option as the President of the United States to sign the bill into law, veto it, or to let it become law without his signature.

Secondly, it says that if the bill does become law and the environmental groups still want to contest it, you get expedited judicial review so that we immediately get a decision. That is what the bill does. It is a simple bill.

A lot of the Keystone pipeline has already been built. From some of the rhetoric on the floor, you would think that it hadn't even been started yet. The reason the State Department and the President are even in the loop is because it is an international pipeline. Having said that, the international part of it has been built. The connection between Canada and the United States has been built and is operational. The part that is in question is within the interior of the United States of America.

If you were building a pipeline that wasn't connected to the Keystone pipeline as it exists, you wouldn't have to have the State Department review it and you wouldn't have to have the President make a decision. But because it is the continuation or in addition to an existing international pipeline, the State Department has to make a decision and, in this case, the President right now has to make a decision.

It is an 800,000-barrel-a-day pipeline if we make it operational. That brings oil from Canada into the United States where it can go to any number of domestic refineries, or it could actually, as has been said, it could be exported potentially. But in all probability, they will get a better market price in the United States down on the Gulf Coast and they would prefer to sell it here. But the market would make that decision, Mr. Speaker.

So, if at first you don't succeed, try, try, and try again. The House leadership, on a bipartisan basis, is going to send another bill on the Keystone pipeline to the other body. My understanding is that they are going to vote on it next week if it passes the House tomorrow, and then we will send it to the President. This would be a great Thanksgiving present for the American people, as has been pointed out: more job creation, more options for domestic refineries, potentially lower gasoline prices than they even are today for motorists and our consumers. It is a win-win-win.

There is no group in America that opposes it. Republicans support it; Democrats support it; labor unions support it. The only group is the radical environmentalists that probably make up 2 or 3 percent of the population. I just don't understand it.

I want to thank the committee of jurisdiction for bringing the bill to the floor, for the Rules Committee reporting out the rule. I urge a strong ''yes'' vote on the rule, and tomorrow I urge a strong ''yes'' vote on the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

What we have here is Congress trying to interfere with a highly technical review process that has already resulted in the rerouting of the proposed pipeline to ensure that the integrity of the Ogallala aquifer is preserved and that there are potentially other important issues to Americans that live in the affected areas where the pipeline would be built. Instead of hearing what those issues are or talking to the administration about what pending issues remain or are standing in the way of approval, Congress is seeking to shortcut that process, exempt the XL pipeline from the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act to immediately order it to be built regardless of the legitimate issues that should be waived.

When my colleague says, oh, somehow it is only 2 percent of the American people that oppose it, that is not the discussion we are having here today. It is not about who supports it or who opposes it. There needs to be the studies that are done to make sure that the routing of it maintains the health and safety of the American people, doesn't jeopardize the economy in the affected areas. Those are the issues that have already resulted in several changes of the plan and could result in additional changes to the plan of where and how the pipeline could be built. For Congress to somehow say we are just tired of dealing with the technical issues and we just want it done puts American lives at risk, puts America's health at risk.

We all wish that this process could have been completed 6 months ago, 3 months ago. We hope it is completed a month from now, 6 months from now. But giving the President the same choice he has today by passing this bill doesn't move the process forward. We should be taking advantage of our last few precious weeks before the end of the year to address some of the important pieces of legislation that the Senate has sent over, but somehow what we are debating, repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 53rd time or the Keystone pipeline again and again, somehow this body hasn't had time to even consider or debate or allow a vote on important pieces of legislation like the bipartisan immigration reform package that received more than two-thirds support in the United States Senate. There is a companion bill that is bipartisan that has been introduced in the House. There is a discharge petition at the desk for Members to sign to demand a simple up-or-down vote to fix our broken immigration system, secure our borders, reduce our budget deficit by over $200 billion.

There is a discussion of jobs with the Keystone project. Well, let me tell you, this bill on immigration reform that if this body allows a vote on would create over 250,000 jobs for American citizens.

Or how about the Employment Non-Discrimination Act? The Senate has acted on a bill that would prevent an employer from firing somebody just because they are gay or lesbian. It shouldn't be any of your boss' business who you date or who you love after work. The Senate passed that. More than three-quarters of the American people support it. We filed a discharge petition on that bill. We would love to be acting on that bill here today instead of yet again shortcutting the process with regard to an oil project.

This Congress has been a frustrating Congress. Unfortunately, here in our final weeks, I hope we are not setting the tone for an equally ineffective and inefficient 114th Congress. The American people deserve better. It is time to move forward with the renewable energy agenda, with balancing our budget, with fixing our broken immigration system, with making college more affordable, rather than talking in circles about projects that are already under review and won't be any more or less under review if the bill passes because it requires the signature of the same President who is currently charged with making this decision under current law in statutes passed by the United States Congress. Let's not waste our limited time on bills that won't go anywhere and won't do anything.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform, to the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for that purpose?

Mr. SESSIONS. I object.

Mr. POLIS. Well, unfortunately, yet again, we have been stymied in our efforts to address a critical issue facing the American people with a bill that would create over 250,000 jobs for American citizens, would secure our border, restore the rule of law, and unite American families. That is what the work of Congress should be; that is what the American people want Congress to do. If the 113th Congress can't do it, I sure hope that the President moves forward with the powers that have been granted to him by Congress and that the 114th Congress proves to be better than this Congress is in its waning days.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we heard our friends on the Democrat side talk about special interest money. They were talking about green energy: $18 billion a year is spent, money that would be spent like what was spent on Solyndra, sole-source contracts to companies that have gone belly up. Those are the ideas of the Democrat Party and the ideas of this President. The ideas of this President are they have taken over 6 years—2,246 days—the President of the United States, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State Kerry, an administration that stands in the way of the operation of getting people jobs, of doing the things that the American people want and need. That is why what happened this first Tuesday in November, the American people said: We have had enough.

□ 1715

I, as a Republican, don't take it that we are just outstanding and they elected us. What they said is: We are sick and tired of the direction we're headed. We want serious things to happen.

We have a brand new Governor in Maryland and a brand new Governor in Illinois. There is a lot of information that is out there, ready for us. We Republicans came right back to work. The Senate is doing the same. They are trying to pass this. We are trying to take the exact same bill that we were asked to do, with the expectation and understanding it can pass this body.

It is a well-understood bill. It hasn't taken us 6 years—2,246 days—to figure it out. If this administration can't figure the dang thing out, they need to admit they do not know how to read or lead. And I don't know which one it is, but either they can't read or they cannot lead. They need to know that the American people expect us to go get the work done. That is what you heard Mr. COLLINS say. The Republican Party is up to the task. The Republican Party, through the leadership of JOHN A. BOEHNER and the leadership of what will be MITCH MCCONNELL, the Senate majority leader, is going to do exactly that.

We are going to take all the issues, including the one the gentleman talks about all day and every day—and that is immigration—and we are going to have an immigration bill. And we are going to do the right thing.

But today we are talking about jobs: jobs and opportunities for people that need them. We need competition for the price of energy. We need to make sure we don't depend as much on the Middle East and that we work with our friends from Canada. And it does not take the Republican Party 6 years, or 2,246 days, to try and make a decision. The Republican Party is here today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 185, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

YEAS—233

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

NAYS—185

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

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta
Blumenauer
Campbell
Costa
Duckworth
Enyart
Hall
Hinojosa
Issa
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Moran
Negrete McLeod
Perry
Runyan
Smith (WA)

□ 1745

Ms. CASTOR of Florida changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 517, I was detained en route from National Airport. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

SUNSCREEN INNOVATION ACT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2141) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2141

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Sunscreen Innovation Act''.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF NONPRESCRIPTION SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Subchapter I—Nonprescription Sunscreen and Other Active Ingredients

"SEC. 586. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subchapter—

''(1) the term 'Advisory Committee' means the Nonprescription Drug Advisory Committee of the Food and Drug Administration or any successor to such Committee;

''(2) the term 'final sunscreen order' means an order published by the Secretary in the Federal Register containing information stating that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients—

''(A) is GRASE and is not misbranded if marketed in accordance with such order; or

''(B) is not GRASE and is misbranded;

''(3) the term 'GRASE' means generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs, as safe and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling of a drug as described in section 201(p);

''(4) the term 'GRASE determination' means, with respect to a nonprescription active ingredient or a combination of nonprescription active ingredients, a determination of whether such ingredient or combination of ingredients is GRASE;

''(5) the term 'nonprescription' means not subject to section 503(b)(1);

''(6) the term 'pending request' means each request with respect to a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient submitted under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act) for consideration for inclusion in the over-the-counter drug monograph system—

''(A) that was determined to be eligible for such review by publication of a notice of eligibility in the Federal Register prior to the date of enactment of such Act; and

''(B) for which safety and effectiveness data have been submitted to the Secretary prior to such date of enactment;

''(7) the term 'proposed sunscreen order' means an order containing a tentative determination published by the Secretary in the Federal Register containing information proposing that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients—

''(A) is GRASE and is not misbranded if marketed in accordance with such order;

''(B) is not GRASE and is misbranded; or

''(C) is not GRASE and is misbranded because the data are insufficient to classify such ingredient or combination of ingredients as GRASE and not misbranded and additional information is necessary to allow the Secretary to determine otherwise;

''(8) the term 'sponsor' means the person that submitted—

''(A) a request under section 586A;

''(B) a pending request; or

''(C) any other application subject to this subchapter;

''(9) the term 'sunscreen' means a drug containing one or more sunscreen active ingredients; and

''(10) the term 'sunscreen active ingredient' means an active ingredient that is intended for application to the skin of humans for purposes of absorbing, reflecting, or scattering ultraviolet radiation.

''SEC. 586A. SUBMISSION OF REQUESTS.

''Any person may submit a request to the Secretary for a determination of whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or a combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, for use under specified conditions, to be prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof (including dosage form, dosage strength, and route of administration) is GRASE and should be included in part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) concerning nonprescription sunscreen.

''SEC. 586B. ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS; DATA SUBMISSION; FILING.

''(a) ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 calendar days after the date of receipt of a request under section 586A, the Secretary shall—

''(A) determine, in accordance with paragraph (2), whether the request is eligible for further review under subsection (b) and section 586C;

''(B) notify the sponsor of the determination of the Secretary; and

''(C) make such determination publicly available in accordance with paragraph (3) and subsection (b)(1).

''(2) CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible for review under subsection (b) and section 586C, a request shall be for a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, for use under specified conditions, to be prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof, that—

''(i) is not included in part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) concerning nonprescription sunscreen; and

''(ii) has been used to a material extent and for a material time under such conditions, as described in section 201(p)(2).

''(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF TIME AND EXTENT.—A sponsor shall include in a request under section 586A the information required under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) to meet the standard described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

''(A) REDACTIONS FOR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—If a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is determined under paragraph (1)(A) to be eligible for further review, the Secretary shall make the request publicly available, with redactions for information that is treated as confidential under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, or section 301(j) of this Act.

''(B) IDENTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BY SPONSOR.—At the time that a request is made under section 586A, the sponsor of such request shall identify any information that such sponsor considers to be confidential information described in subparagraph (A).

''(C) CONFIDENTIALITY DURING ELIGIBILITY REVIEW.—The information contained in a request under section 586A shall remain confidential during the Secretary's consideration under this section of whether the request is eligible for further review consistent with section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

''(b) DATA SUBMISSION AND FILING OF REQUESTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a request under section 586A that is determined to be eligible under subsection (a) for further review under this section and section 586C, the Secretary shall, in notifying the public under subsection (a)(1)(C) of such eligibility determination, post the eligibility determination on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration, invite the sponsor of such request and any other interested party to submit comments, and provide a period of not less than 45 calendar days for comments in support of or otherwise relating to a GRASE determination, including published and unpublished data and other information related to the safety and efficacy of such request.

''(2) FILING DETERMINATION.—Not later than 60 calendar days after the submission of data and other information described in paragraph (1) by the sponsor, the Secretary shall determine whether the data and other information submitted by the sponsor under this section are sufficiently complete, including being formatted in a manner that enables the Secretary to determine the completeness of such data and information, to enable the Secretary to conduct a substantive review under section 586C with respect to such request. Not later than 60 calendar days after the submission of data and other information described in paragraph (1) by the sponsor, if the Secretary determines—

''(A) that such data and other information are sufficiently complete, the Secretary shall—

''(i) issue a written notification to the sponsor of the determination to file such request, and make such notification publicly available; and

''(ii) file such request made under section 586A; or

''(B) that such data and other information are not sufficiently complete, the Secretary shall issue a written notification to the sponsor of the determination to refuse to file the request, which shall include the reasons for the refusal, including why such data and other information are not sufficiently complete, and make such notification publicly available.

''(3) REFUSAL TO FILE A REQUEST.—

''(A) REQUEST FOR MEETINGS; SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION.—If the Secretary refuses to file a request made under section 586A, the sponsor may—

''(i) within 30 calendar days of receipt of written notification of such refusal, request, in writing, a meeting with the Secretary regarding the filing determination; and

''(ii) submit additional data or other information.

''(B) MEETINGS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a sponsor seeks a meeting under subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall convene the meeting within 30 calendar days of the request for such meeting.

''(ii) ACTIONS AFTER MEETING.—Following any meeting held under clause (i)—

''(I) the Secretary may file the request within 60 calendar days;

''(II) the sponsor may submit additional data or other information; or

''(III) if the sponsor elects, within 120 calendar days, to have the Secretary file the request (with or without amendments to correct any purported deficiencies to the request)—

''(aa) the Secretary shall file the request over protest, not later than 30 calendar days after the sponsor makes such election;

''(bb) at the time of filing, the Secretary shall provide written notification of such filing to the sponsor; and

''(cc) the Secretary shall make such notification publicly available.

''(iii) REQUESTS FILED OVER PROTEST.—The Secretary shall not require the sponsor to resubmit a copy of the request for purposes of filing a request filed over protest, as described in clause (ii)(III).

''(C) SUBMISSIONS OF ADDITIONAL DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION.—Within 60 calendar days of any submission of additional data or other information under subparagraph (A)(ii) or (B)(ii)(II), the Secretary shall reconsider the previous determination made under paragraph (2) with respect to the applicable request and make a new determination in accordance with paragraph (2).

''(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

''(A) REDACTIONS FOR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—After the period of confidentiality described in subsection (a)(3)(C), the Secretary shall make data and other information submitted in connection with a request under section 586A publicly available, with redactions for information that is treated as confidential under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, or section 301(j) of this Act.

''(B) IDENTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BY SPONSOR.—A person submitting information under this section shall identify at the time of such submission the portions of such information that the person considers to be confidential information described in subparagraph (A).

''SEC. 586C. GRASE DETERMINATION.

''(a) REVIEW OF NEW REQUEST.—

''(1) PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER.—In the case of a request under section 586A, not later than 300 calendar days after the date on which such request is filed under subsection (b)(2)(A) or (b)(3)(B)(ii)(III) of section 586B, the Secretary—

''(A) may convene a meeting of the Advisory Committee to review such request; and

''(B) shall complete the review of such request and issue a proposed sunscreen order with respect to such request.

''(2) PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—If the Secretary does not issue a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (1)(B) within such 300-day period, the sponsor of such request may notify the Office of the Commissioner of such request and request review by the Office of the Commissioner. If such sponsor so notifies the Office of the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall, not later than 60 calendar days after the date of notification under this paragraph, issue a proposed sunscreen order with respect to such request.

''(3) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—A proposed sunscreen order issued under paragraph (1)(B) or (2) with respect to a request shall provide for a period of 45 calendar days for public comment.

''(4) MEETING.—A sponsor may request, in writing, a meeting with respect to a proposed sunscreen order issued under this subsection and described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 586(7), not later than 30 calendar days after the Secretary issues such order. The Secretary shall convene a meeting with such sponsor not later than 45 calendar days after such request for a meeting.

''(5) FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.—With respect to a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (1)(B) or (2)—

''(A) the Secretary shall issue a final sunscreen order—

''(i) in the case of a proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 586(7), not later than 90 calendar days after the end of the public comment period under paragraph (3); or

''(ii) in the case of a proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (C) of section 586(7), not later than 210 calendar days after the date on which the sponsor submits

the additional information requested pursuant to such proposed sunscreen order; or

''(B) if the Secretary does not issue such final sunscreen order within such 90- or 210-calendar-day period, as applicable, the sponsor of such request may notify the Office of the Commissioner of such request and request review by the Office of the Commissioner.

''(6) FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—The Commissioner shall issue a final sunscreen order with respect to a proposed sunscreen order subject to paragraph (5)(B) not later than 60 calendar days after the date of notification under such paragraph.

''(b) REVIEW OF PENDING REQUESTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The review of a pending request shall be carried out by the Secretary in accordance with this subsection.

''(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF SECTIONS 586A AND 586B.—Sections 586A and 586B shall not apply with respect to any pending request.

''(3) FEEDBACK LETTERS AS PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 586(7), a letter issued pursuant to section 330.14(g) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations before the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, with respect to a pending request, shall be deemed to be a proposed sunscreen order and displayed on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration. Notification of the availability of such letter shall be published in the Federal Register not later than 45 calendar days after the date of enactment of such Act.

''(4) PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER.—In the case of a pending request for which the Secretary has not issued a letter pursuant to section 330.14(g) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations before the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall complete review of such request and, not later than 90 calendar days after the date of enactment of such Act, issue a proposed sunscreen order with respect to such request.

''(5) PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—If the Secretary does not issue a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (4), or the Secretary does not publish a notification of the availability of a letter under paragraph (3), as applicable, the sponsor of such request may notify the Office of the Commissioner of such request and request review by the Office of the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall, not later than 60 calendar days after the date of notification under this paragraph, issue a proposed order with respect to such request.

''(6) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—A proposed sunscreen order issued under paragraph (4) or (5), or a notification of the availability of a letter under paragraph (3), with respect to a pending request shall provide for a period of 45 calendar days for public comment.

''(7) MEETING.—A sponsor may request, in writing, a meeting with respect to a proposed sunscreen order issued under this subsection, including a letter deemed to be a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (3), not later than 30 calendar days after the Secretary issues such order or the date upon which such feedback letter is deemed to be a proposed sunscreen order, as applicable. The Secretary shall convene a meeting with such sponsor not later than 45 calendar days after the date of such request for a meeting.

''(8) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—In the case of a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (3), (4), or (5), an Advisory Committee meeting may be convened for the purpose of reviewing and providing recommendations regarding the pending request.

''(9) FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.—In the case of a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (3), (4), or (5)—

''(A) the Secretary shall issue a final sunscreen order with respect to the request—

''(i) in the case of a proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 586(7), not later than 90 calendar days after the end of the public comment period under paragraph (6); or

''(ii) in the case of a proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (C) of section 586(7)—

''(I) if the Advisory Committee is not convened under paragraph (8), not later than 210 calendar days after the date on which the sponsor submits the additional information requested pursuant to such proposed sunscreen order, which shall include a rationale for not convening such Advisory Committee; or

''(II) if the Advisory Committee is convened under paragraph (8), not later than 270 calendar days after the date on which the sponsor submits such additional information; or

''(B) if the Secretary does not issue such final sunscreen order within such 90-, 210-, or 270-calendar-day period, as applicable, the sponsor of such request may notify the Office of the Commissioner about such request and request review by the Office of the Commissioner.

''(10) FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—The Commissioner shall issue a final sunscreen order with respect to a proposed sunscreen order subject to paragraph (9)(B) not later than 60 calendar days after the date of notification under such paragraph.

''(c) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall not be required to—

''(1) convene the Advisory Committee—

''(A) more than once with respect to any request under section 586A or any pending request; or

''(B) more than twice in any calendar year with respect to the review under this section; or

''(2) submit more than a total of 3 requests under section 586A or pending requests to the Advisory Committee per meeting.

''(d) NO DELEGATION.—Any responsibility vested in the Commissioner by subsection (a)(2), (a)(6), (b)(5), or (b)(10) shall not be delegated.

''(e) EFFECT OF FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS DETERMINED TO BE GRASE.—Upon issuance of a final sunscreen order determining that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded, a sunscreen containing such ingredient or combination of ingredients shall be permitted to be introduced or delivered into interstate commerce for use under the conditions described in such final sunscreen order, in accordance with all requirements applicable to drugs not subject to section 503(b)(1), for so long as such final sunscreen order remains in effect.

''(B) SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS DETERMINED NOT TO BE GRASE.—Upon issuance of a final sunscreen order determining that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is not GRASE and is misbranded, a sunscreen containing such ingredient or combination of ingredients shall not be introduced or delivered into interstate commerce, for use under the conditions described in such final sunscreen order, unless an application is approved pursuant to section 505 with respect to a sunscreen containing such ingredient or combination of ingredients, or unless conditions are later established under which such ingredient or combination of ingredients is later determined to be GRASE and not misbranded under the over-the-counter drug monograph system.

''(2) AMENDMENTS TO FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDERS.—

''(A) AMENDMENTS AT INITIATIVE OF SECRETARY.—In the event that information relevant to a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients becomes available to the Secretary after issuance of a final sunscreen order, the Secretary may amend such final sunscreen order by issuing a new proposed sunscreen order under subsection (a)(1) and following the procedures set forth in this section.

''(B) PETITION TO AMEND FINAL ORDER.—Any interested person may petition the Secretary to amend a final sunscreen order under section 10.30, title 21 Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations). If the Secretary grants any petition under such section, the Secretary shall initiate the process for amending a final sunscreen order by issuing a new proposed sunscreen order under subsection (a)(1) and following the procedures set forth in this section.

''(C) APPLICABILITY OF FINAL ORDERS.—Once the Secretary issues a new proposed sunscreen order to amend a final sunscreen order under subparagraph (A) or (B), such final sunscreen order shall remain in effect and paragraph (3) shall not apply to such final sunscreen order until the Secretary has issued a new final sunscreen order or has determined not to amend the final sunscreen order.

''(3) INCLUSION OF INGREDIENTS THAT ARE SUBJECTS OF FINAL ORDERS IN THE SUNSCREEN MONOGRAPH.—

''(A) AMENDING REGULATIONS.—

''(i) REQUIREMENT.—At any time that the Secretary proposes to amend part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) concerning nonprescription sunscreen, including pursuant to section 586E, except as provided in clause (iv), the Secretary shall include in such part 352 (or any successor regulations) any nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that is the subject of an effective final sunscreen order of the type described in section 586(2)(A) and issued since the time that the Secretary last amended such regulations. Such regulation shall set forth conditions of use under which each such ingredient or combination of ingredients is GRASE and not misbranded. If these conditions differ from, or are in addition to, those previously set forth in the applicable final sunscreen order, the Secretary shall provide notice and opportunity for comment on such conditions in the rulemaking, and the applicable final sunscreen order shall continue in effect until the effective date of a final regulation, as set forth in clause (iii).

''(ii) INCLUSION OF ORDERS.—In proposing to amend the regulations as described in clause (i), the Secretary shall include in the proposed regulations a list of final sunscreen orders that shall cease to be effective on the effective date of a resulting final regulation. Such list shall include all final sunscreen orders of the type described in section 586(2)(A) that are in effect on the date that such regulations are proposed, with the exception that such list shall not include any final sunscreen orders that, on the date that the regulations are proposed, the Secretary is in the process of amending under paragraph (2).

''(iii) ORDERS NO LONGER EFFECTIVE.—Any final sunscreen order included by the Secretary in a list described in clause (ii) and in a list included in resulting final regulations shall cease to be effective on the date that such final regulations including such order in such list become effective.

''(iv) INGREDIENTS NOT GRASE.—If, notwithstanding a final sunscreen order stating that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded if marketed in accordance with such order, while amending the regulations as described in clause (i), the Secretary concludes that such ingredient or combination of ingredients is no longer GRASE for use in nonprescription sunscreen, the Secretary shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, either initiate the process for amending the final sunscreen order set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection or include in a proposed regulation an explanation and information supporting the determination of the Secretary that such ingredient or combination of ingredients is no longer GRASE for use in nonprescription sunscreen.

''(B) PROCEDURE FOR UPDATING REGULATIONS.—After the Secretary amends and finalizes the regulations under part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations under section 586E and such regulations become effective, the Secretary may use direct final rulemaking to include in such regulations any nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that are the subject of effective final sunscreen orders.

''SEC. 586D. GUIDANCE; OTHER PROVISIONS.

''(a) GUIDANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) DRAFT GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall issue draft guidance on the implementation of, and compliance with, the requirements with respect to sunscreen under this subchapter, including guidance on—

''(i) the format and content of information submitted by a sponsor in support of a request under section 586A or a pending request;

''(ii) the data required to meet the safety and efficacy standard for determining whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded;

''(iii) the process by which a request under section 586A or a pending request is withdrawn; and

''(iv) the process by which the Secretary will carry out section 586C(c), including with respect to how the Secretary will address the total number of requests received under section 586A and pending requests.

''(B) FINAL GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall finalize the guidance described in subparagraph (A) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act.

''(C) INAPPLICABILITY OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code shall not apply to collections of information made for purposes of guidance under this subsection.

''(2) SUBMISSIONS PENDING ISSUANCE OF FINAL GUIDANCE.—Irrespective of whether final guidance under paragraph (1) has been issued—

''(A) persons may, beginning on the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, make submissions under this subchapter; and

''(B) the Secretary shall review and act upon such submissions in accordance with this subchapter.

''(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) CURRENTLY MARKETED SUNSCREENS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to affect the marketing of sunscreens that are marketed in interstate commerce on or before the date of enactment of this subchapter, except as otherwise provided in this subchapter.

''(2) ENSURING SAFETY AND EFFECTIVENESS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to alter the authority of the Secretary with respect to prohibiting the marketing of a sunscreen that is not safe and effective or is misbranded, or with respect to imposing restrictions on the marketing of a sunscreen to ensure safety and effectiveness, except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, including section 586C(e).

''(3) OTHER DRUGS.—Except as otherwise provided in section 586F, nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to affect the authority of the Secretary under this Act or the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) with respect to a drug other than a nonprescription sunscreen.

''(4) EFFECT ON DRUGS OTHERWISE APPROVED.—Nothing in this subchapter shall affect the marketing of a drug approved under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

''(c) TIMELINES.—The timelines for the processes and procedures under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (6) of section 586C(a) shall not apply to any requests submitted to the Secretary under section 586A after the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act.

''SEC. 586E. SUNSCREEN MONOGRAPH.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall amend and finalize regulations under part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations concerning nonprescription sunscreen that are effective not later than 5 years after such date of enactment. The Secretary shall publish such regulations not less than 30 calendar days before the effective date of such regulations.

''(b) REPORTS.—If the regulations promulgated under subsection (a) do not include provisions related to the effectiveness of various sun protection factor levels, and do not address all dosage forms known to the Secretary to be used in sunscreens marketed in the United States without a new drug approval under section 505, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives on the rationale for such provisions not being included in such regulations, and a plan and timeline to compile any information necessary to address such provisions through final regulations.''.

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by this section shall be construed to—

(1) limit the right of a sponsor (as defined in section 586(8) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (a)) to request that the Secretary of Health and Human Services convene an advisory committee; or

(2) limit the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to meet with a sponsor (as defined in section 586(8) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 3. NON-SUNSCREEN TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.

Subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 586F. NON-SUNSCREEN TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.

''(a) PENDING TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) REQUEST FOR FRAMEWORK FOR REVIEW.—If, prior to the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, an application was submitted pursuant to section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations for a GRASE determination for a drug other than a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and such drug was found to be eligible to be considered for inclusion in the over-the-counter drug monograph system pursuant to section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, the sponsor of such application may request that the Secretary provide a framework under paragraph (2) for the review of such application.

''(B) REQUEST REQUIREMENTS.—A request for a framework for review of an application made under subparagraph (A) shall be made within 180 calendar days of the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act and shall include the preference of such sponsor as to whether such application is reviewed by the Secretary in accordance with—

''(i) the processes and procedures set forth for pending requests under section 586C(b), except that specific timelines shall be determined in accordance with other applicable requirements under this section;

''(ii) the processes and procedures set forth under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

''(iii) an initial filing determination under the processes and procedures described in section 586B(b) and the processes and procedures set forth for pending requests under section 586C(b), except that specific timelines shall be determined in accordance with other applicable requirements under this section; or

''(iv) an initial filing determination under the processes and procedures described in section 586B(b) and the processes and procedures set forth under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

''(C) NO REQUEST.—If a sponsor described in subparagraph (A) does not make such request within 180 calendar days of the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, such application shall be reviewed by the Secretary in accordance with the timelines of the applicable regulations when such regulations are finalized under subsection (b).

''(2) FRAMEWORK.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall provide, in writing, a framework to each sponsor that submitted a request under paragraph (1). Such framework shall set forth the various timelines, in calendar days, with respect to the processes and procedures for review under clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (1)(B) and—

''(A) such timelines shall account for the considerations under paragraph (5); and

''(B) the timelines for the various processes and procedures shall not be shorter than the timelines set forth for pending requests under sections 586B(b) and 586C(b), as applicable.

''(3) GOVERNING PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW.—

''(A) ELECTION.—Not later than 60 calendar days after the Secretary provides a framework to a sponsor under paragraph (2), such sponsor may provide an election to the Secretary regarding the processes and procedures for review under clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B). If such sponsor makes such election, the Secretary shall review the application that is the subject of such election pursuant to the processes and procedures elected by such sponsor and the applicable timelines in calendar days set forth under such framework, which the Secretary shall confirm in writing to the sponsor not later than the date upon which the Secretary provides a report under paragraph (4). If such sponsor does not make such election, such application shall be reviewed by

the Secretary in accordance with the timelines of the applicable regulations when such regulations are finalized under subsection (b).

''(B) DIFFERENT PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES.—At any time during review of an application, the Secretary may review such application under different processes and procedures under clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B) than the processes and procedures the sponsor elected in accordance with subparagraph (A), so long as the Secretary proposes, in writing, the change and the sponsor agrees, in writing, to such change.

''(C) INCLUSION OF INGREDIENTS IN MONOGRAPHS.—If the sponsor elects to use the processes and procedures for review in accordance with clause (i) or (iii) of paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary may incorporate any resulting final order into a regulation addressing the conditions under which other drugs in the same therapeutic category are GRASE and not misbranded, including through direct final rulemaking, and the final order so incorporated shall cease to be effective on the effective date of the final regulation that addresses such drug.

''(4) LETTER REGARDING PENDING APPLICATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, in writing, regarding all pending applications subject to paragraph (1). In such letter, the Secretary shall provide a report on the review of such applications, including the timelines, in calendar days, for the review and GRASE determination for each application. Such timelines shall account for the considerations under paragraph (5).

''(5) TIMELINES.—The timelines in calendar days established by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection—

''(A) may vary based on the content, complexity, and format of the application submitted to the Secretary; and

''(B) shall—

''(i) reflect the public health priorities of the Food and Drug Administration, including the potential public health benefits posed by the inclusion of additional drugs in the over-the-counter drug monograph system;

''(ii) take into consideration the resources available to the Secretary for carrying out such priorities and the processes and procedures described in paragraphs (1)(B) and (2); and

''(iii) be reasonable, taking into consideration the requirements described in clauses (i) and (ii).

''(b) NEW TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall issue proposed regulations establishing timelines for the review of applications for GRASE determinations for drugs other than nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients or combinations of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that are submitted to the Secretary after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), and that are found to be eligible to be considered for inclusion in the over-the-counter drug monograph system pursuant to section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), or that are subject to this subsection pursuant to paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a), as applicable, providing—

''(A) timely and efficient completion of evaluations of applications under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) for drugs other than sunscreens; and

''(B) timely and efficient completion of the review of the safety and effectiveness submissions pursuant to such applications, including establishing—

''(i) reasonable timelines, in calendar days, for the applicable proposed and final regulations for applications of various content, complexity, and format, and timelines for internal procedures related to such processes; and

''(ii) measurable metrics for tracking the extent to which the timelines set forth in the regulations are met.

''(2) TIMELINES.—The timelines in calendar days established in the regulations under paragraph (1)—

''(A) may vary based on the content, complexity, and format of the application submitted to the Secretary; and

''(B) shall—

''(i) reflect the public health priorities of the Food and Drug Administration, including the potential public health benefits posed by the inclusion of additional drugs in the over-the-counter drug monograph system;

''(ii) take into consideration the resources available to the Secretary for carrying out such priorities and the processes and procedures described in paragraph (1); and

''(iii) be reasonable, taking into consideration the requirements described in clauses (i) and (ii).

''(3) PROCEDURE.—In promulgating regulations under this subsection, the Secretary shall issue a notice of proposed rulemaking that includes a copy of the proposed regulation, provide a period of not less than 60 calendar days for comments on the proposed regulation, and publish the final regulation not less than 30 calendar days before the effective date of the regulation.

''(4) RESTRICTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations implementing this section only as described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

''(5) FINAL REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall finalize the regulations under this section not later than 27 months after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act.''.

SEC. 4. REPORTS.

(a) INITIAL GAO REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report reviewing the overall progress of the Secretary of Health and Human Services in carrying out subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as added by section 2 and amended by section 3 and subsection (c)), including findings on and recommendations with respect to—

(1) the progress made in completing the review of requests under subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including pending requests, and the feasibility of the timelines associated with such subchapter;

(2) the role of the Office of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs in issuing determinations with respect to requests reviewed under such subchapter, including the number of requests transferred to the Office of the Commissioner under section 586C of such Act;

(3) the extent to which advisory committees were convened by the Secretary regarding requests under subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including pending requests; and

(4) the types of metrics that have been, or should be, established for the review of time and extent applications.

(b) SUBSEQUENT GAO REPORT.—Not later than 5½ years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report reviewing the overall progress of the Secretary of Health and Human Services in carrying out subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as added by section 2 and amended by section 3 and subsection (c)) and the regulation of over-the-counter drug products, including findings on and recommendations with respect to—

(1) updates on the matters reported on by the Comptroller General under subsection (a);

(2) significant factors impacting the ability of the Food and Drug Administration to fulfill the mission of the agency with regard to the regulation of over-the-counter drug products, including finalizing outstanding monographs and responding to emerging and novel safety issues;

(3) the performance of the Secretary in carrying out section 586E of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

(4) the types of metrics that have been, or should be, established for the review and regulation of over-the-counter drug products; and

(5) timeliness, efficiency, and accountability in reviewing time and extent applications and safety and effectiveness reviews for over-the-counter drug products.

(c) FDA REPORT.—Subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 586G. REPORT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, and on the dates that are 2 and 4 years thereafter, the Secretary shall issue a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives describing actions taken under this subchapter.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The reports under this subsection shall include—

''(A) a review of the progress made in issuing GRASE determinations for pending requests, including the number of pending requests—

''(i) reviewed and the decision times for each request, measured from the date of the original request for an eligibility determination submitted by the sponsor;

''(ii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded;

''(iii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is not GRASE and is misbranded and the reasons for such determinations; and

''(iv) for which a determination has not been made, and an explanation for the delay, a description of the current status of each such request, and the length of time each such request has been pending, measured from the date of original request for an eligibility determination by the sponsor;

''(B) a review of the progress made in issuing GRASE determinations for requests not included in the reporting under subparagraph (A), including the number of such requests—

''(i) reviewed and the decision times for each request;

''(ii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient, combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, or other ingredient is GRASE and is not misbranded;

''(iii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient, combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, or other ingredient is not GRASE and is misbranded and the reasons for such determinations; and

''(iv) for which a determination has not been made, and an explanation for the delay, a description of the current status of each such request, and the length of time each such request has been pending, measured from the date of original request for an eligibility determination by the sponsor;

''(C) an annual accounting (including information from years prior to the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act where such information is available) of the total number of requests submitted, pending, or completed under this subchapter, including whether such requests were the subject of an advisory committee convened by the Secretary;

''(D) a description of the staffing and resources relating to the costs associated with the review and decisionmaking pertaining to requests under this subchapter;

''(E) a review of the progress made in meeting the deadlines with respect to processing requests under this subchapter; and

''(F) to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate, recommendations for process improvements in the handling of requests under this subchapter, including the advisory committee review process.

''(b) METHOD.—The Secretary shall publish the reports under subsection (a) in the manner the Secretary determines to be the most effective for efficiently disseminating the report, including publication of the report on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration.''.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2539) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2539

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. CDC PROGRAMS FOR PREVENTION AND SURVEILLANCE OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) PREVENTION OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.—Section 393B(b)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1c(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''2010, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2010'' and inserting ''2020, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2020''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 394A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–3) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through ''For the purpose'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 394A. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose'';

(2) by striking the second period; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.—To carry out sections 393B and 393C, there are authorized to be appropriated $6,564,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''.

SEC. 3. STATE GRANTS FOR PROJECTS REGARDING TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 1252 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–52) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking '', acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration,'';

(2) in paragraphs (1)(A)(i) and (3)(E) of subsection (f), by striking ''brain injury'' and inserting ''traumatic brain injury'';

(3) in subsection (h), by striking ''under this section, and section 1253 including'' and inserting ''under this section and section 1253, including''; and

(4) in subsection (j), by striking ''such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2012'' and inserting ''$5,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019''.

SEC. 4. STATE GRANTS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SERVICES.

Section 1253 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–53) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking '', acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration (referred to in this section as the 'Administrator'),'';

(2) in subsections (c), (d)(1), (e)(1), (e)(4), (g), (h), and (j)(1), by striking ''Administrator'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary'';

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting ''**REPORTING**'';

(B) by striking ''Each protection and advocacy system'' and inserting the following:

''(1) REPORTS BY SYSTEMS.—Each protection and advocacy system''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the services and activities carried out under this section during the period for which the report is being prepared.'';

(4) in subsection (i), by striking ''The Administrator of the Health Resources'' and all that follows through ''regarding'' and inserting ''The Secretary shall facilitate agreements to coordinate the collection of data by agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services regarding'';

(5) in subsection (k), by striking ''subtitle C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000'' and inserting ''subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.)'';

(6) in subsection (l), by striking ''$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each the fiscal years 2009 through 2012'' and inserting ''$3,100,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019'';

and

(7) in subsection (m)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6042 et seq.)'' and inserting ''subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6042 et seq.)'' and inserting ''subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.)''.

SEC. 5. TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY COORDINATION PLAN.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall develop a plan for improved coordination of Federal activities with respect to traumatic brain injury. Such plan shall—

(1) review existing interagency coordination efforts with respect to Federal activities related to traumatic brain injury, including services for individuals with traumatic brain injury;

(2) identify areas for improved coordination between relevant Federal agencies and programs, including agencies and programs with a focus on serving individuals with disabilities;

(3) identify each recommendation in the report required by section 393C(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1d(b)) that has been adopted and each such recommendation that has not been adopted, and describe any planned activities to address each such recommendation that has not been adopted; and

(4) incorporate, as appropriate, stakeholder feedback, including feedback from individuals with traumatic brain injury and their caregivers.

(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit the plan developed under subsection (a) to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 6. REVIEW OF BRAIN INJURY MANAGEMENT IN CHILDREN.

The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall conduct a review of the scientific evidence related to brain injury management in children, such as the restriction or prohibition of children from attending school or participating in athletic activities following a head injury, and identify ongoing and potential further opportunities for research. Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives the results of such review.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENHANCE LABELING, ACCESSING, AND BRANDING OF ELECTRONIC LICENSES ACT OF 2014

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2583) to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2583

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014'' or the ''E–LABEL Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Communications Commission (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'') first standardized physical labels for licensed products such as computers, phones, and other electronic devices in 1973, and the Commission has continually refined physical label requirements over time.

(2) As devices become smaller, compliance with physical label requirements can become more difficult and costly.

(3) Many manufacturers and consumers of licensed devices in the United States would prefer to have the option to provide or receive important Commission labeling information digitally on the screen of the device, at the discretion of the user.

(4) An electronic labeling option would give flexibility to manufacturers in meeting labeling requirements.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO ALLOW ELECTRONIC LABELING.

Title VII of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 720. OPTIONAL ELECTRONIC LABELING OF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'electronic labeling' means displaying required labeling and regulatory information electronically; and

''(2) the term 'radiofrequency device with display' means any equipment or device that—

''(A) is required under regulations of the Commission to be authorized by the Commission before the equipment or device may be marketed or sold within the United States; and

''(B) has the capability to digitally display required labeling and regulatory information.

''(b) REQUIREMENT TO PROMULGATE REGULATIONS FOR ELECTRONIC LABELING.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of the Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014, the Commission shall promulgate regulations or take other appropriate action, as necessary, to allow manufacturers of radiofrequency devices with display the option to use electronic labeling for the equipment in place of affixing physical labels to the equipment.''.

SEC. 4. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

The amendment made by section 3 shall not be construed to affect the authority of the Federal Communications Commission under section 302 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a) to provide for electronic labeling of devices.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROVAL OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5682.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 748, I call up the bill (H.R. 5682) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5682

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

SECTION 1. 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) FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any legal challenge to a Federal agency action 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, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(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 divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) 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.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5682, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pipelines are the energy lifelines that power nearly all of our daily activities. Pipelines are a very safe and cost-effective means to transport the products that fuel our economy. In fact, pipelines today supply more than two-thirds of the energy used in the United States. The Keystone XL project will be a critical addition to this extensive network, increasing our Nation's supply of oil and, thus, helping to reduce the cost of oil.

H.R. 5682 closely follows H.R. 3 that this House passed last year. Since the passage of H.R. 3, the State Department completed its Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on January 31 of 2014. However, there has still been no action by the administration on the pipeline. There have been excuses, the most recent of which is pending litigation in the State of Nebraska. However, H.R. 5682 takes that into account and allows for the rerouting in that State. There is simply no further reason to delay this important project, especially given the numerous benefits it will provide our Nation.

This pipeline will be a boon to economic development. Of particular interest to taxpayers, this pipeline doesn't require one Federal dollar to build. Further, the very nature of infrastructure creates jobs, and the Keystone XL is no exception. The U.S. State Department reconfirmed all of this last January. The State estimated that the Keystone XL will produce 42,000 jobs and $2 billion in employee earnings. This project will have a significant positive economic impact, including an estimated $3.1 billion in construction contracts, materials, and support services. Furthermore, the State confirmed that the estimated total property taxes for the project will be over $55 million spread across 27 counties. The State Department called this impact ''substantial for many counties.''

The Keystone XL pipeline is the most extensively studied and vetted pipeline

project in the history of this country. The project will include 95 special mitigation measures, including 59 recommended by PHMSA, to prevent spills and to make this the safest pipeline ever built. In fact, I would argue that we are facing a manufactured stalemate, one that could be described as ''paralysis by analysis.''

The majority of Americans knows this is the right thing to do, so the Congress, through this bill, will lead where the President has refused. This project will create jobs, improve the Nation's economy, strengthen our transportation system, and help improve the Nation's economic security.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman mentioned taxpayers. I think taxpayers might be concerned that this foreign entity which will ship our oil over 1,700 miles across America will be exempt from a fee that all of the American companies and others using our current pipelines have to pay because of a bizarre ruling from the IRS, which often makes bizarre rulings. Tar sands oil will not be required to contribute toward the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

I think U.S. taxpayers might be concerned that a foreign entity which is going to ship tar sands oil 1,700 miles through the United States to an export zone, in all probability to be processed and exported in a tax-exempt area, won't be paying much, if any, taxes in the U.S. except some property taxes, and it won't have to contribute toward this trust fund. In case there is a spill with this line, the U.S. taxpayers and other entities in the U.S.—mostly U.S. companies—will be liable to pay for their mess. So I have a concern about taxpayers.

Another part of this is three citizens of the State of Nebraska brought litigation because this bill would give a foreign entity the right to take their private property in the United States of America—in Nebraska—by eminent domain. I don't know. I am not aware of any other time we have given a foreign entity the right to take the private property of U.S. citizens. These same citizens won a case in district court, and this bill would essentially nullify the ruling that they won, which is still under appeal to the Supreme Court in that State.

So here we have a foreign entity that won't pay taxes that other oil companies and others who ship by pipelines will be required to pay, a foreign entity that will be given the right to take the private property of U.S. taxpayers and residents—and for what? Yes, there will be construction jobs, and jobs are good, but those are fairly ephemeral, and there is a lot of other construction going on, particularly in the fracking area and with some proposed liquid natural gas export facilities that will help provide employment in the construction trades. In this case, there will be 35 permanent jobs for this tax-exempt sludge that will be shipped to a zone in Texas where it is most likely to be exported.

□ 1800

Do we need to export more oil, gas, and diesel from the United States of America? Is that going to help lower the price at the pump for Americans? I don't think so.

And, in fact, we are today exporting 422,000 barrels of gasoline a day, 1.3 million barrels of diesel every day, and yet truckers are still being pretty well extorted at the pump. That is 54.6 million gallons of diesel, and yet our truckers are still being gouged at the pump because there is a diesel shortage.

Well, wait a minute. We are exporting that, and now we are going to take this tar sand goop, process it in the U.S., and export it. That is not going to help the truckers. It is not going to help the American consumers.

And then there are some minor environmental issues. You know, tar sands do create 81 percent more greenhouse gas than most other forms of fossil fuel extraction. They are going to destroy forever large portions of boreal forest. Now, sure, that is a Canadian issue. If I lived in Canada, I would be protesting this. I don't. But we don't need to facilitate it in the United States of America by building a pipeline there.

They will use precious water resources, create huge waste pits that will be polluted with the extract, except for the part which is shipped south to be processed and shipped overseas.

So I really don't see this as something where we should preempt the laws of the United States. There were 2.5 million comments. Apparently the Republicans don't care much about the public comments. There are 2.5 million comments that are still being meaningfully evaluated that are raising concerns about various aspects of this project.

But here I will say, bad legislation; good politics. We are trying to help someone get elected to the Senate who is currently a Member of the House. The Senate is moving potentially ahead with this bill. So the House, with very little notice, decided they would bring up this bill which we have passed in one version or another eight previous times. So this is nothing but bare, naked politics and the use of the House to promote someone's candidacy to the United States Senate, which I think is really a disgrace to this institution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as was duly noted, this bill is about jobs. This will create jobs, tens of thousands of American jobs, which are long overdue, to enhance our energy independence and strengthen our national security.

However, today I want to simply talk about the safety of this pipeline. As the chairman noted, TransCanada has agreed to a number of additional mitigation measures to make the Keystone XL pipeline the safest ever built. These 59 special conditions were recommended by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and go above and beyond current regulations.

Several conditions will help ensure the use of high-quality steel welds, both of which will reduce the chance of a pipeline release. The pipeline will also include automatic shutoff valves and increase the depth of coverage.

In many places, the pipeline will be buried a foot deeper than the regulations require. Furthermore, TransCanada will provide enhanced right-of-way inspections and greater transparency.

I believe in an all-of-the-above energy solution which includes this important pipeline that will not only create jobs but will help us to be energy independent. This project will create private sector jobs while being the safest pipeline ever built.

This project, again, has been bipartisan. It passed out of three committees with bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation at a very important time, when we need those American jobs.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, would you tell me the time remaining, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. We have heard about the nature of this very dirty material that is dug, rather than pumped, and the fact that it will go through America, not to America.

Now, we might ask, on a day when U.S. oil production was announced to reach a 30-year high of more than 9 million barrels, why we would be even considering this. Well, it is not because this fits into our energy picture.

We will risk oil spills that are a mess to clean up. And we hear, oh, but oil spills won't occur. Well, the TransCanada pipeline, also known as Keystone, had 12 separate oil spills in its first year of operation, tens of thousands of gallons. It is hard to clean up. And, as you have also heard from my friend, this doesn't count as petroleum, and, therefore, they don't pay into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. So taxpayers are on the hook for this difficult cleanup.

But the real problem is none of these points. It is that it is taking us down the road where we should not be going. This is the most carbon-intensive liquid fuel—if you want to call it liquid—that we could possibly use. It is changing our very climate in ways that are deadly and costly. We shouldn't be going in this direction. It is that simple.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is baffling to me that after 6 years, the Keystone pipeline debate is still going on.

We have an opportunity to provide jobs, reduce our dependency on overseas oil, and spur real economic development, yet many would rather play political gamesmanship.

I am especially frustrated because I see the benefits the southern leg has already had on my district, and I know this approval will enhance those effects. This pipeline would provide high-paying jobs that are well above minimum wage—exactly the types of jobs this body likes to talk about. Yet despite the economic benefits this pipeline would provide, there has been zero action by this President and his administration.

So today I stand in support of H.R. 5682 as a call to this President and the Senate that it is time to approve the Keystone pipeline. If they truly want to help the American people, they will join us in moving this legislation forward.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering today yet another bill to force approval of the Keystone XL pipeline outside of the regular order required for all other international energy infrastructure projects.

This is a very early Christmas present from the United States Congress to one specific Canadian company. The vote effectively exempts TransCanada from the rigorous analysis and the permitting standards that all American companies are held to. Worse yet, TransCanada will be exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund that all conventional crude companies are supposed to pay into. So merry Christmas, TransCanada.

And what gift can we expect in return? Well, carbon pollution and heavy crude shipped through our country to export terminals and higher gas prices. Let's remember: TransCanada is on record saying that the Keystone XL pipeline would increase the price of oil in the United States.

So instead of rigorous, deliberative process, the GOP majority is rushing to raise gas prices in this country. This Christmas present to TransCanada is actually like a lump of coal for U.S. consumers at the pump. It is certainly a lump of coal for communities who are sure to be impacted by this pipeline when something goes wrong. And it is absolutely a huge lump of coal for our global climate.

Congress should reject this massive corporate giveaway. We still have another 41 shopping days until Christmas. There is no need for us to play Santa for TransCanada today.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from western Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this is a jobs bill. It is a jobs bill not only in the House of Representatives, but it is a job bill in the Senate.

Now, in the House of Representatives, Dr. CASSIDY's bill is about creating tens of thousands of jobs for hardworking Americans. It is about an $8 billion private investment that will not cost the American taxpayer one cent. It is about energy independence, and it is about America taking the lead in energy.

For 6 years, this House has passed pieces of legislation that would have created the Keystone pipeline. Every one of those pieces of legislation died in the Senate. Now, miraculously—and I will call it a job bill—the Senate now is entertaining this because of one job.

The tens of thousands of jobs of all these Americans, who you turned a deaf ear and a blind eye to, are now being answered by the Senate because of one job, one Senator who has the possibility of losing her seat because of the Keystone pipeline not being able to go through the Senate.

Isn't it ironic that we sit here today and we try to spin this into something it is not? It is truly a jobs bill. It is an American bill. It is a bill that is going to create billions of dollars in revenue.

And I would just ask my friends on the other side: Please look no further than last Tuesday. Last Tuesday's vote was a referendum on incompetency, not on incumbents.

I would like you to please open your eyes and your ears to the American people and let them rise. Let us create jobs. Let us reach the energy independence that we need to succeed in the global economy.

This is tomfoolery, what is going on tonight. Is it really about one job in the Senate or is it about thousands of Americans who have been held hostage by an administration that refuses to move forward a jobs bill in a time when they said we have created thousands or saved jobs?

The one job they are trying to save right now is in the Senate, ladies and gentlemen. It has nothing to do with policy. It is all politics.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCALLISTER).

Mr. MCALLISTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 6 years since the application was filed for the Keystone pipeline.

This is my background. This is where I made my living to come up. Despite the opposition from environmental groups, the benefits of the pipeline will far outweigh any potential negative impacts. Approval of this should be a no-brainer.

Construction will lead to thousands of jobs, well paying jobs at a time when Americans are struggling to find work. Importing an efficient, reliable source of energy has the potential to decrease gas prices in the future, expand oil refineries along the gulf coast, and lessens our dependence on foreign energy sources.

In addition to the economic upsurge, this pipeline signifies a secure source of energy for our country, if needed. It is not merely an economic issue but a security issue as well. And each day that it is delayed is another day thousands of Americans are out of work.

I challenge you, Mr. Speaker: for those that say these are temporary jobs, talk to the men and women where I come from who have bought cars, bought houses, put children through college with these temporary jobs, as you call them. What, are they temporary legacies? Are they temporary retirements? Because that is what our community is built on.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCALLISTER. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman CASSIDY, for introducing this bill, which not only fulfills the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 but also protects the rights of private property owners should they be affected by the pipeline route.

With my past experience in pipeline construction, I can say that this project is no different from the thousands of other pipelines we lay each year—with one exception: it crosses national borders, giving President Obama the ability to delay it. The President is making political promises when it should be deemed practical.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let's just sum up.

We have the most carbon-intensive way of creating ultimately diesel and gasoline by extracting these tar sands. They contribute 81 percent more greenhouse gases. Of course many on the other side believe that greenhouse gases are potentially beneficial or aren't a problem.

We have a foreign entity here that will be exempt from paying taxes, like U.S. entities do, into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. And U.S. taxpayers will be stuck with the bill should a spill occur.

We have a foreign entity—granted, they are our friends and neighbors in Canada—but still, a foreign private corporation being given the right of eminent domain over citizens of the State of Nebraska.

□ 1815

We have, in fact, this company saying that it is likely, if this pipeline is completed, that gasoline prices will go up in Midwestern areas of the United States and their production will be exported from the United States; so it is not going to be a direct benefit to Americans or deal with energy independence, which we heard earlier.

Of course, we are cutting short the evaluation process that every other energy-producing entity in America has to go through in terms of environmental reviews, and of course, we are cutting off any meaningful consideration of the 2.5 million comments that have been received by the State Department.

But, hey, it could help a House Member beat a Senate Member and get elected to the Senate, so I guess it is a bad bill whose time has come.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate the numerous benefits this project will bring to our country, including jobs, energy security, safety, efficiency, and I would argue that more supplies of oil generally drive prices down, not up.

First, this pipeline safety, it is officially moved through this country safely. It is the safest way to move these products. There have been numerous additional mitigation measures. The State Department said it will reduce the risk of release.

Second, the State Department has explained this project will create over 40,000 jobs, over $3 billion in construction contracts.

Finally, as I said, from sourcing more crude oil from our friendly neighbor in the north, it will reduce our reliance and most likely reduce the cost of energy to the American people.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of our Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BILL CASSIDY, the author of this bill, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a real leader in trying to bring about energy independence in America.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 6 years since backers of the Keystone XL pipeline first submitted an application to the U.S. State Department, on September 19, 2008, to build this energy infrastructure project and bring jobs and greater energy security to America.

Now, building the Keystone XL pipeline would create more than 40,000 average annual jobs over a 1- to 2-year construction period, putting $2 billion into workers' and their families' pockets and giving a much-needed boost to the American construction sector.

In addition, tens of thousands of jobs would be supported throughout the supply chain, jobs for manufacturers that make the steel pipe, the thousands of fittings, valves, pumps, control, and safety devices required for a major pipeline.

In addition to my home State of Louisiana, manufacturers in Georgia, West Virginia, and throughout the country would benefit from the construction of this infrastructure project.

Now, economists have found that the pipeline would create 20,000 manufacturing jobs, an additional 118,000 spin-off jobs, including jobs within the U.S. refinery and petrochemical facilities. This would employ and improve the jobs for Americans who right now are struggling.

Refiners in Louisiana and along the gulf coast would benefit from a reliable supply of heavy crude transported through the Keystone XL pipeline. These petrochemical plants employing the families that right now are having the hardest time in this economy, this gives them those better jobs.

The final State Department review found the pipeline would create over 40,000 jobs without significant environmental impact.

Now, note, Canada's oil sands are going to be developed with or without this pipeline. The Canadian Government is already on record stating that oil sands derived from crude oil will be exported to overseas markets like China. It will be shipped on rail and in oil tankers, which may actually increase greenhouse gas emissions versus transportation to the U.S. by pipeline.

Now, the case for proving the Keystone XL pipeline is clear and obvious, so why hasn't the President approved it? And, up to this point, why hasn't Senator REID allowed a vote on approving Keystone? If there was ever legislation that should not be difficult to get through the Senate, it is the Keystone XL pipeline.

By the way, Pew Research reports that over 60 percent of Americans support it, as do major labor unions, every State along the pipeline's route, and a majority of the House of Representatives on eight separate occasions voting on similar bills in the affirmative.

So here we are on the ninth attempt. It has been 539 days, about a year and a half, since the House first sent a Keystone approval bill to the Senate in this Congress. That legislation could have been considered, amended, passed, or completely replaced; yet the bill has collected dust on Senator REID's desk. The bill considered today that I introduced is the language asked for by the Senate.

So we are going to make it as easy as possible for the Senate to finally get a bill to the President's desk that approves this long overdue Keystone XL pipeline.

Thanks to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Natural Resources Committee, the Rules Committee, and House leadership for working with me to clear a path for this expedited consideration.

Upon passage of this bill in the House, it will go to the Senate for approval, then to the President, where I hope he signs H.R. 5682 into law.

I want to thank Chairmen UPTON, WHITFIELD, SHUSTER, SESSIONS, and HASTINGS for their work on this important legislation.

I particularly want to thank the American people for sending a signal in this last election that they want us in Washington, D.C., to work together to accomplish commonsense legislation that will create jobs for families which are struggling now, but because of legislation like this, we will have more opportunity and a better future. This is a perfect example of what the American people have asked us to do.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in approving the Keystone XL pipeline to finally provide 40,000 promised jobs to the American people.

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

Today, we are voting once again to grant special treatment to TransCanada's Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. This is the third time this Congress and the eighth time since Republicans took control of the House.

Instead of helping families deal with pressing problems, we are helping Canadian tar sands producers and pipeline builders. We are spending our time trying to exempt a foreign company from the rules that every other company in America has to follow.

This bill is not an energy policy. It is about a single pipeline that will allow Canadian tar sands to flow across our country for export to other countries. That is oil going through the United States but not to the United States.

We don't need this oil. We have our own sources of oil, and we are using less oil because of our efficiency in new cars getting better mileage.

This bill will not lower gasoline prices by a single penny. It may even raise them in some places. It will, at most, create just a few dozen permanent jobs. There will be some temporary jobs for construction. Once they are gone, they are gone.

This bill is a regulatory earmark. It will waive applicable environmental review requirements and risk our farmlands and our water supplies. In fact, it even exempts the Keystone pipeline from paying into the oil spill fund that other oil companies have to contribute to.

That means if there is a problem with that pipeline, well, there is no payment by Keystone XL to that fund to make those who are hurt whole. That means that if there is a spill, there won't be the money to clean it up.

The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is a terrible deal for America. We get all the risks while the oil companies reap the rewards. But even if you support it, this bill is a harmful and unnecessary piece of legislation.

The State Department is carrying out their review of this highly controversial project. They have got millions of comments, and the Federal

agencies are reviewing these comments.

H.R. 5682 would approve the pipeline by fiat, lock out the public, eliminate the President's authority to balance competing interests, and stop Federal agencies from ensuring that if the project does go forward, we do it as safely as possible.

Forget about those comments. We will just pass a bill and make it happen rather than consider all the other issues that would be appropriate to look at in approving or disproving this pipeline.

I oppose this legislation for all these reasons. There is one more important reason why I oppose the bill. The tar sands pipeline will worsen climate change. Keystone XL would create a dependence on tar sands crude, reversing the carbon pollution reductions we have been working so hard to accomplish.

According to some experts, building the Keystone XL pipeline will triple production of the tar sands. That is totally inconsistent with any future scenario for avoiding catastrophic climate.

Just this week, the United States and China agreed to mutual pledges to fight climate change, and I commend President Obama and President Xi for that accomplishment.

This is a really important development. For the last two decades, antagonisms between the United States and China have stymied efforts to reach a global climate agreement. Those days, we hope, are finally over. The U.S. and China are now both pledging strong joint action. The world has been waiting decades for the U.S. and China to reach an understanding on climate.

Now that moment has finally arrived; yet instead of working on a real energy policy, one that would move us toward a new, low carbon energy future, instead of working on a clean energy future that would create lots of new jobs, real jobs, permanent jobs, and keep pace with China's clean energy investments, instead of trying to protect our irreplaceable environment and our drinking water supplies, Republicans have set their sights on passing a special law for a special interest.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip and member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a strong leader for energy independence for America.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WHITFIELD for yielding, and I especially want to thank my colleague from Louisiana, Congressman CASSIDY, for the leadership that he had in fighting hard to get this bill brought to the floor so we can finally get the Keystone pipeline built.

If you look at this issue, this is all about jobs, and it is all about American energy security, Mr. Speaker. What does the Keystone pipeline mean for America? According to the Obama administration, 40,000 jobs will be created here in America, good jobs that our economy needs.

In fact, this is not a partisan issue; this is a very bipartisan issue. Republicans and Democrats alike have come together and said, ''Build the Keystone pipeline.'' Even the labor unions have said, ''Build the Keystone pipeline.''

Unfortunately, just a small group of radical environmental extremists have held this project hostage, and President Obama has hidden behind studies and subterfuge to say, ''Don't do it.''

Now, Congress can come together in a bipartisan way and say, ''Let's get this thing done.'' Let's actually work with Canada, who is a friend, Mr. Speaker, and bring almost a million barrels a day of oil from Canada that we will no longer need to get from countries who don't like us. This isn't about a million new barrels coming into America; it is about deciding who we are going to do business with.

When we trade with Canada, we get about 80 cents on the dollar back. When we send billions of dollars to Middle Eastern countries, sometimes that money is used against us, against our troops, and we get less than 50 cents on the dollar back.

Everything about this says do it, says ''yes.'' Stop staying ''no'' to American jobs. Stop saying ''no'' to American energy security.

□ 1830

This is an issue that brings people together, and there was a message that the American people sent last week. They don't want a go-alone President. They want a Washington that can work for them. This is a classic example of how Republicans and Democrats can come together and say ''yes'' to a project that creates good jobs for our country and creates American energy security for our Nation.

The time for studies is over. This has been studied to death for 6 years. Everybody that looks at this says, ''You have got to do it.'' All we are saying is let the United States agree with Canada to cross the border. They still have to get the permits from each State that this pipeline would go through and all those great jobs that would come with that pipeline and the billions of dollars of private investment.

The time for studying is over, Mr. Speaker. It is time for action. It is time for those great American jobs. It is time to say ''yes'' to the Keystone pipeline. I urge approval from my colleagues for this bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the last gentleman that spoke said everybody is for this.

Well, everybody in Louisiana is clearly for it. The Senator from Louisiana has been a strong supporter of it, and the would-be replacement Senator is strongly for it. The Republican whip from Louisiana is strongly for it. The oil companies are strongly for it.

But to say that those who oppose it are radical environmental extremists seems to me quite a stretch. There are a lot of very responsible people against this legislation, even some who support the pipeline, because they would argue this is not the way to make a decision: put a bill on the floor, to ignore all the comments, all the evaluations, all the considerations.

The people in Nebraska are not going to be happy about that. Maybe in Louisiana, they will be, but other places would like to know that pipelines are safe and their aquifers for drinking water are not going to be jeopardized.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), a distinguished member of our committee who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to begin by thanking the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. WAXMAN, for his outstanding leadership on this and other matters that have come before the Energy and Commerce Committee. I want to say to him that his leadership has been inspiring on so many issues.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with the process that the majority's side has undertaken in order to hastily bring H.R. 5682 to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Keystone pipeline is not key to America's energy future. If we just disregard the merits or the lack thereof of the Keystone pipeline itself, the majority just recently in the past couple of weeks has made promises to the American people that it will return to regular order for bills to be brought to the floor of this Congress. Mr. Speaker, here we are once again: promises made, promises broken. This bill was brought to this floor after 1 hour—1 measly hour—of debate and without the ability for the minority side to bring forth any amendments. Not one amendment can we bring to this bill. Where is the promise of bipartisanship of the other side on this particular matter regarding this bill?

Promises made to the American people equals promises broken by the majority.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will automatically approve the Keystone XL pipeline even though this pipeline has no legal route through the State of Nebraska, where there is a case pending in a court before a local judge regarding some of the siting issues that surround this illegal pipeline. Why can't the people of Nebraska, the citizens of Nebraska, have the time and the consideration just to make sure that this pipeline is safe for them and their aquifers and also for their environment? There are other States that this pipeline is going to be traveling through.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, as President Obama pointed out, there is an independent process taking place, and this

bill shortcuts the approval process and would allow, Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow a foreign company to preemptively seize property from American people, from the landowners, particularly those in Nebraska.

Additionally, this bill seeks to usurp the President's ability and authority to ultimately approve or reject the project and instead uses this pipeline as a political football to score some elective advantages.

Mr. Speaker, eight times we have brought this bill or a version of this bill to the floor. Eight times. Don't we get it. As the popular TV series used to pronounce to us all, ''eight is enough.'' Eight is enough.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, this week the House will pass a bill to complete the Keystone pipeline system. The first pipeline in the system is known only as Keystone. That pipeline has been sending 600,000 barrels a day from Canada to Patoka, Illinois. It has been 4 years and counting, and the water in Nebraska is still clean.

The second pipeline in this system is called the Keystone XL. It sends the same oil into America as the Keystone does but on a slightly longer and different route.

Secretary Clinton twice has approved Keystone XL. Secretary Kerry has approved it once. And yet the Politician in Chief has threatened to veto the Keystone XL pipeline.

Canada will export their oil. Either it comes to America or it goes to China. President Obama has a simple choice: oil for America or oil for China. Oil for America or oil for China.

Please join Congress in choosing America.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WHITFIELD.

Mr. Speaker, for years I and Members of this body have come to the floor in support of the Keystone pipeline project, asking for the Senate and the White House to put politics aside in favor of this critical project.

With bipartisan support, the House has passed eight separate pieces of legislation to clear the way for the approval of the most studied pipeline in American history. Yet each time these measures were blocked in the Senate and condemned by a President crippled by indecision on a project that would put tens of thousands of Americans to work. So once again I rise in support of the Keystone XL pipeline, joining my colleagues in both parties in backing H.R. 5682, which would immediately certify the Secretary of State's final environmental impact statement from nearly a year ago and truly put our Nation on a course toward American energy independence.

Sadly, while the House has continued to take definitive bipartisan action to advance this critical goal, it appears the Senate has waited only until it is politically advantageous to do so, even as it enjoys majority support in that Chamber.

While I am pleased about the Senate's newfound interest in the wide-ranging benefits of this commonsense project which will grow our economy and strengthen our national security, it is a shame that it took election-year politics and not the best interests of American workers and the families that they represent for Senate leaders to act.

This pipeline is a vital piece of a plan that creates better jobs and more opportunity. I encourage the Senate and President to deliver on the promise of embracing an all-of-the-above energy strategy that works for the American people.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for so much, including his voice and his leadership on this issue.

There are three numbers that we all ought to know as we consider this bill approving the Keystone XL:

2 degrees Celsius—the amount the Earth can warm before climate change becomes truly catastrophic and irreversible;

565 gigatons—the amount of carbon dioxide that can be emitted before we reach irreversible global warming;

240 gigatons—the amount of carbon that would be emitted if the Alberta tar sands are fully developed, nearly half of all the carbon the world can burn.

Keystone XL is the fastest and perhaps the only way to fully develop the Alberta tar sands.

Keystone XL would move almost 1 million barrels per day of the dirtiest oil on Earth directly through the middle of our country. It would pass through some of our Nation's most important land and water sources, including the Ogallala Aquifer, which supplies 30 percent of the United States' irrigation and drinking water to millions of Americans.

And those who claim there is no serious risk of a spill have a very short memory. There were 12 spills in the first year of operation of the original Keystone pipeline, and there have been 30 spills in just over 4 years.

So what I am saying today is that this is dangerous, and it is also not the best way to create jobs. Three times as many jobs are created for every dollar invested in renewable energies over the pipeline. And so if we want jobs, if we want clean energy, we want a good environment, we should vote down this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers and I think I have the right to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

This legislation is very likely going to be approved, and that is sad for a number of reasons.

□ 1845

Let me just declare here what I declare in my district and anywhere else. I believe in earmarks because I think it is constitutional. I think it is almost politically obscene to give what the Constitution says is our responsibility to the White House no matter who is there. That is why I have some serious concerns about this special interest earmark that will make the U.S. a permanent conduit to international markets for one of the dirtiest fuel sources on the planet.

This is an earmark for TransCanada. Maybe the worst abuse in this legislation is that it exempts TransCanada from all Federal permitting requirements and other Federal environmental laws. Other U.S. companies will have to abide by laws that we will exempt for TransCanada. It exempts TransCanada from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which helps the government respond to oil spills.

Now, this particular company already has had major oil spills. We will have oil spills. So what we are saying when we approve this legislation are these things:

One, we are going to give an earmark to TransCanada. It is okay give it an earmark, special interest earmark, but we just can't do it here in the United States;

Number two, we are saying that TransCanada will have the ability to bypass environmental laws that Americans cannot bypass;

And number three, we are saying that this company does not have to pay one penny into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which means that the people who are watching this debate tonight will pay when an oil spill occurs, and I think that is obscene.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how many minutes I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining.

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

I would like to, first of all, thank Mr. WAXMAN of California for the many

contributions that he has made while a Member of the House of Representatives. I have had the opportunity to serve with him on the Energy and Commerce Committee for many years. He has very strong beliefs; he is committed; and I just want to wish him the very best in his future endeavors. I know that he won't be retiring. He'll be very active in some worthwhile cause, and I just want to tell him how much we admire and respect the work that he did. Although I personally didn't agree philosophically with some of it, as I am sure you do not agree with many of mine, I do wish you the very best, Mr. WAXMAN, as you move forward.

In conclusion, on this important debate, I would like to say this is not a new piece of legislation. It has passed the House of Representatives on eight separate occasions, and we really did not plan to bring it up in this lame-duck session except that Senator REID, the leader of the Senate, the Democratic leader of the Senate, changed his mind and decided to bring it up on the Senate side. So when we found out about that, Mr. CASSIDY introduced this legislation, which mirrors the bill on the Senate side, and we are thrilled that we have an opportunity to pass this legislation, and I expect that we will pass it.

I might add that it has been studied for over 6 years. There have been four complete environmental studies completed. The Secretary of State's office on more than one occasion—two occasions, three occasions—has said it would have a negligible environmental impact. In fact, in one place they said they would be better off to build this pipeline than not to build it because the environmental degree of moving it by pipeline would be better than the alternative in which it is being moved today. So I think it is a win-win-win situation for America.

Many people have said, well, they are simply bringing this oil through the United States and then it is going to be exported. We have had many hearings. Some of it will be exported, but some of it will be refined right here in the U.S. It will be 850,000 barrels of oil a day, which is about half of what we are importing from the Middle East. It will make us less dependent. Some labor unions support this legislation. The Governor of Nebraska supports this legislation. So I think it is a win-win-win for everyone.

There are additional safety requirements on this pipeline that are not required on other pipelines. I think there are going to be adequate safeguards. We have had so many hearings on this. I would urge the body, the House of Representatives, to pass this legislation and give us the opportunity to send it down to the White House for the President's consideration.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to today's legislation to grant automatic approval of the Keystone XL pipeline, bypassing the legal review process.

Today's bill grants immediate authority to Canadian company TransCanada to "construct, connect, operate, and maintain" the pipeline as described in their 2012 application to the State Department. However, as the bill itself acknowledges, there are still outstanding issues with that application. Notably, there is no legal route through Nebraska due to an ongoing court case over private property rights and eminent domain. This bill does nothing to resolve that case. It gives blanket approval without knowing what the pipeline route will look like in Nebraska.

I am also deeply concerned that tar sands oil, which would be transported in the pipeline, is exempt from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund that is used to respond to leaks and accidents. If there is an accident along this pipeline, taxpayers will be on the hook for cleanup. We need to close that loophole and ensure that the American public is not bearing the risks for TransCanada's pipeline.

The State Department continues to review the 2.5 million comments it has received on this project and is awaiting a final route from Nebraska to make its determination on whether this project is in the best interest of the American people. We should allow that process to continue.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5682, a bill to approve the northern portion of Keystone XL pipeline.

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

But I also rise in support of the bill because the Keystone XL pipeline has become an obstacle created by indecision and inaction.

Keystone XL is not the first cross-border pipeline project built in North America.

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

Today, the United States, Canada and Mexico are revolutionizing the world and the world of energy.

These three North American partners are reshaping the geo-political balance of the entire world.

Between the three countries, we can satisfy our own energy needs for the first time in memory.

But to accomplish this feat, we must be able to move products to market.

My colleagues who oppose Keystone XL have forgotten that just because there isn't a pipeline doesn't mean the products aren't moving.

In fact, they are moving just as rapidly as ever.

Unfortunately, the products are moving to market at the expense of other commodities and even at the expense of people's schedules.

Opponents cannot deny that pipelines are the safest, most effective way to move products to market.

Opponents cannot say the State Department has failed to consider the environmental consequences of the pipeline.

Opponents cannot say this project hasn't been reviewed by the proper authorities.

If they do, they are incorrect.

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

If we built railroads, the way we built KXL, we wouldn't have a rail system.

If we built roads, the way we built KXL, we wouldn't have a highway system.

As we face the 114th Congress, we have real problems we need to address.

Keystone XL pipeline is good for the United States, it's good for North America and we should support this bill.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 748, 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

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

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5682 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:

SEC. 2. 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. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the final—and only—amendment to this bill. Passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it is adopted, my amendment will simply be incorporated into the bill and the bill will be immediately voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that we are still primarily dependent on oil and other fossil fuels for our energy needs. This dependence does have the effect of polluting our planet, harming public health, and threatening our national security. Recent advances in clean, renewable energy technologies have demonstrated that it doesn't have to be this way. But rather than pursuing this sustainable energy future we know we need, H.R. 5682 and the Keystone pipeline double down on fossil fuels and

push us further down this destructive path.

No matter if you support or oppose Keystone XL, we can all agree that drilling and transporting oil has serious risks. It only takes one small crack, one small mistake, to cause a major oil spill and catastrophic, irreparable harm to the surrounding communities.

In 1969, my home district experienced one of the worst oil spills in U.S. history. I saw firsthand the devastating damage to our local economy, to human health, property, and natural resources. We have seen this happen far too many times since then in communities around the country. The Deepwater Horizon disaster cost 11 lives, billions of dollars in economic damages, and untold devastation to the delicate ecosystem of the gulf.

That very same year, we saw a terrible spill in Kalamazoo, Michigan. This spill was particularly noteworthy because it involved tar sands oil, which is the same type of oil that would flow through the Keystone pipeline. Tar sands is much harder to clean up than standard crude, which is one of the reasons that spill took nearly $1 billion and several years to fully clean up.

Mr. Speaker, history has shown us that there is simply no such thing as a spill-proof well or pipeline. Accidents do happen. In fact, accidents have already happened 14 times on the existing Keystone pipeline. Despite numerous assurances that Keystone XL will be safer and that spill risks will be minimal, safer simply does not equate to safe.

That is why we have the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which is funded by an 8-cents-per-barrel excise fee on crude oil and petroleum products. This fund ensures that the oil companies that create these messes also pay to clean them up. But TransCanada is currently exempt from contributing to the trust fund for Keystone because tar sands oil is not considered crude oil for purposes of the program.

If Keystone XL is approved, the pipeline's tar sands oil will literally get a free ride through the United States. If there is a spill, taxpayers and local communities—not those responsible—could be stuck with the cleanup bill. This makes no sense. TransCanada and all tar sands oil companies should have to pay into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund just like every other oil company.

That is why I am offering this very straightforward amendment. My amendment would simply require TransCanada to certify that it will pay the same per-barrel fee for its tar sands oil as it does for its regular crude. It would ensure that TransCanada—and not our taxpayers—would pay to clean up its own mess in the event of a spill.

Mr. Speaker, if we as a Nation—and these are our natural resources as taxpayers—if we as a Nation are going to bear 100 percent of the spill risk, the least we can do is to ensure that those responsible pay to clean it up. This is a commonsense idea that should have bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment to protect American taxpayers and ensure that oil companies pay what is only their fair share, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman's motion.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentlewoman that President Obama, through a regulation, decided that diluted bitumen is not crude oil for the purposes of the trust fund tax, so the problem was created by President Obama and the IRS.

We are in the process of trying to address that issue. It is under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. In their tax reform package, that is an issue that they are looking at. But if we try to change that now in this bill, we would be treating TransCanada differently than all other pipelines are being treated bringing bitumen into the United States.

I would also point out this pipeline's greater safety characteristics. It has more safety characteristics than any other pipeline built. We would think you would want to incentivize its use and not punish it with further taxation.

So, in my opinion, while I have great respect for the gentlewoman from California, this is simply a ruse to kill the bill.

I would respectfully ask our Members to oppose this motion to recommit and pass H.R. 5682. The Senate has said—Senator REID has said—that they will take it up in the Senate. That is precisely what we would like to see.

I urge defeat of the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5682 is postponed.

D.C. ASKS CONGRESS TO RESPECT THEIR LOCAL MARIJUANA INITIATIVE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, thank you to the two Democratic Representatives, BLUMENAUER and POLIS, and Republican Representative ROHRABACHER who stood with the District of Columbia for letting our marijuana reform bill stand today.

Although Blacks and Whites smoke pot at the same rate, the majority of those convicted of possession of small amounts in the District of Columbia and nationwide are Black. Your State may not be counted among the 58 percent of Americans who want cannabis legalized. D.C. doesn't ask you to support marijuana. D.C. asks only that the Congress respect our local marijuana initiative, which is every bit as much a local control matter as the decision made by four other States on this very same issue.

□ 1900

THE PASSING OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN LANE EVANS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise on Veterans Day Week to pay tribute to our dear friend and longtime former colleague, Congressman Lane Evans.

An honorable man and Marine Corps Vietnam veteran, Lane was elected in November 1982, and sworn in January 1983 as a member of a large freshman class that comprised the 98th Congress. He hailed from a working-class district and was a son of the working class. So few Members are grounded in that heritage. He was intelligent, committed, a true gentleman, and a patriot.

The economy and social benefit programs consumed the attention of that Congress. Very high unemployment levels hung over our Nation, mired in the aftermath of a very deep recession following the first Arab oil embargo and economic policies of the Reagan administration that did not relieve the dire circumstances of unemployed workers. Extending unemployment benefits occupied that Congress as a lifeline to millions of workers that saw their livelihoods evaporate almost instantaneously. In the spring of 1983, Congress passed the historic refinancing of the Social Security program to assure the system would be sound for generations to come. Lane had fought to be a Member to fight for that, and he was a ''yes'' vote on that historic measure.

During the first decade of Lane's service, we served together on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. After an extended fight, legislation was passed to allow Agent Orange-affected Vietnam veterans to receive benefits as a moral obligation to these veterans who had served. Today, Lane's legacy lives on as we continue to build on the foundation he laid.

During his distinguished career, Mr. Evans led the effort to fight for veterans returning home with PTSD and TBI. His efforts in Congress laid the groundwork for a new chapter in the way American cares for those suffering from mental illness and the stress-related conditions of battle.

Mr. Evans was taken from us far too soon. He was only 63 when he passed away last week after a very long, courageous, and difficult battle with Parkinson's. He will be dearly missed.

Always true to the Marine Corps motto, Lane was ''always faithful.'' May God bless him. May he be elevated to a very high position in heaven. I feel so privileged to have had the opportunity to serve with him as a Member of the 98th Congress and those that followed.

HONORING THE LIVES OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVES PHIL CRANE AND LANE EVANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCALLISTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Ohio mentioning Lane Evans. The point of this time is to recognize two of our colleagues who have have passed. We want to remember them. I appreciate Marcy for those kind words about Lane Evans.

I am going to manage this hour. So with respect to my colleagues who are down here, I would like to yield to Congressman HULTGREN.

Mr. HULTGREN. I want to thank my good friend, Congressman SHIMKUS, for this time and for this important time to honor these wonderful colleagues.

Before I get started, I will enter into the RECORD an article titled: ''Philip M. Crane: Teacher, Lecturer, Author, Congressman and Friend,'' written by Ed Feulner, former president of the Heritage Foundation.

PHILIP M. CRANE: TEACHER, LECTURER, AUTHOR, CONGRESSMAN AND FRIEND

(By Ed Feulner, Former President of the Heritage Foundation)

Former Rep. Phil Crane, R–Ill., died Nov. 7 after a struggle with lung cancer.

His passing reminded all of us who knew Phil what a unique contribution to the modern conservative movement he had made.

On some days he was giving his famous lecture, ''The Blessings of Liberty,'' to audiences around the nation. For many months he was stumping for Barry Goldwater, Ronald Reagan, fellow congressional candidates and many other conservatives running for office at every level in our nation.

After his election to the U.S. House of Representatives, he played a key role advising and leading conservatives both inside and outside of the Capitol on legislative tactics and institution building always based on principles of our Founding Fathers.

I met Phil when he was a lecturer for the Intercollegiate Studies Institute in the early 1960s. He was teaching history at Bradley University, in Peoria, Ill., before founding a private school in the Chicago suburbs.

Phil's reputation was that of an emerging leader: a great speaker, a motivator of the grassroots and an original thinker.

Most significantly to me, Phil was a man who understood the power of ideas. After all, he had attended Hillsdale College (and served on its board of trustees for many decades), and then earned his Ph.D. in history from Indiana University, where ''his academic record had never been exceded.'' Phil was the author of an important early book on the philosophical issues that defined the difference between conservatives and the reigning progressive orthodoxy, ''The Democrats Dilemma'' (Regnery, 1964).

His vision for the future, based on the underlying principles of America's Founders' commitment to liberty, was an inspiration to all of us who knew him and who worked for him and with him.

Phil was elected to succeed Don Rumsfeld in the Congress in a special election in 1969, against a field of seven other candidates. Many of us were rooting for him as the principled conservative in this large and complex field, but we weren't certain that he could really do it. Phil was a principled conservative—a tea partier long before there was a tea party. But throughout the primary process, his message of principled conservatism rang true to his constituents-to-be. He won that special election, then won 17 more times.

He stuck to his guns, whether he was in the minority or in the majority, throughout his 35-year tenure in Washington.

When Phil was sworn in as the newest member of the U.S. House of Representatives, he was a representative of a minority (committed conservatives) in the minority party (the Republicans). When he left the Congress in 2004, he had helped make conservatism the mainstream of the Republican Party and of the entire U.S. political arena.

In his early Washington years, when I had the great privilege of serving as Phil's legislative director (1970–71) and then as his chief of staff (1971–74), he was the leading light of elected conservatives in Washington.

It was Phil Crane who passionately argued that private American citizens should be permitted to own gold. It was Phil who argued as a matter of principle that federal spending for subsidies for urban mass transit systems—even in his home city of Chicago—was not an appropriate use of federal taxpayer funds. Big arguments over foreign policy and domestic issues involved Phil as a leading conservative figure in Washington and around the nation.

Battles like these—some won, others lost—may be forgotten, as the media focus on Phil's battle to preserve the Panama Canal as an integral part of the United States. Of course, on the Panama Canal he fought side-by-side with the former governor of California, Ronald Reagan.

For those of us who worked for Phil, we remember the late-night meetings of conservative congressmen, staffers and activists, who looked to Phil Crane for leadership on policy issues.

It was during these legislative battles that Phil formed the idea of a coordinated effort among House conservatives. These conceptual discussions resulted in Crane's vision for the Republican Study Committee to counter the long-established Democrat Study Group of liberal House members. Today, the RSC is the largest faction within the membership of the House Republicans, and it exists because Phil Crane envisioned its potential.

But my fondest memories of Phil will be of long discussions about conservative ideas and how they best can be advanced in the political milieu of Washington.

We talked about how conservatives can communicate more effectively with grassroots leaders around the nation. And we discussed how to build a conservative infrastructure to counter the establishment interests of Washington.

We decided that America needed a number of new institutions, including a new form of a policy research and communicating organization. From these discussions, Phil became an early advocate of that new conservative think tank, The Heritage Foundation. And for that, all conservatives should be grateful.

And speaking very personally, a picture of Phil holding our month-old son, flanked by Linda and me, has a special place of honor in our living room. That son is now 43 years old, by the way.

Rest in the peace of the Lord, which you have so eminently earned, my friend.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and respect to former Congressman Phil Crane, who we lost this week.

As a fellow committed conservative Representative of the west and northwest suburbs of Chicago, I have always had a special connection to Congressman Crane. For 35 years, he represented sizable portions of what is now the 14th Congressional District, the district I represent in Congress. When Illinois was redistricted following the 1990 Census, Phil Crane was willing to give the McHenry County portion of his old district to the newer 16th District in order to present the Republican nominee, Don Manzullo, with a better chance of recapturing the district for the GOP. And he did this, arguably, to the detriment of his own reelection prospects down the road.

Twenty years later, most of McHenry County is in the 14th Congressional District, and I am proud to represent his former constituents, who were stalwart supporters of his.

When he left office in 2004, he was at the time the longest-serving House Republican. In his book: ''The Sum of Good Government,'' Crane wrote:

> Once people are willing to admit the possibility of alternatives, the battle is more than half won and the time for refinements of a ''conservative reform platform will be at hand.''

Phil pursued that platform as a leader of the conservative movement both in and outside of Congress. He served as chairman of the American Conservative Union, a prominent think tank and advocacy organization. In 1973, he founded the preeminent conservative organization in the House, the Republican Study Committee, of which I am a proud member. Today, the RSC is the largest Member organization of House Republicans and drives much of the conservative agenda.

Congressman Crane spent most of his career pursuing that agenda on the Ways and Means Committee. There, he championed many of the ideals I and many of our shared constituents subscribe to. These include lowering taxes on everyone, simplifying the Tax Code so that it is fair and transparent, defending free market economics, and promoting free trade with other nations.

His work propelled him to become the ranking member and eventually chairman of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee. While there, he led the effort to pass numerous free trade agreements, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, which opened up economic opportunities with our northern and southern neighbors.

He also was very active in efforts to reduce or limit government spending and authored and supported hundreds of bills and amendments to bring overspending under control.

In addition, Phil had a passion for and deep knowledge of American history. Citing historical events in the Constitution to make one's case during floor debate and public speeches is not a recent phenomenon. Congressman Crane did this regularly when fighting for his principles and policies.

Every day, he looked for opportunities to demonstrate his love for robust discussions on conservative ideals. But he didn't let his firm positions on issues drive a wedge between him and other Members of Congress. He built relationships with those with whom he disagreed, and was well-liked on both sides of the aisle, handwriting letters to colleagues, especially thoughtful notes to those who were going through tough times or had lost a relative or loved one.

Most importantly, he wrote letters to, and spent time with, his constituents whom he represented. To him, they were his most important relationship. They were his boss, as they are to all who are privileged to enter Congress on their behalf.

Every day, I strive to represent my district with the same commitment and dedication as Congressman Phil Crane did, and to stand up for the principles that make this country great.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague. It is great that you took the time out to come. A lot of our colleagues want to come down but are caught up with time issues.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. As I said, Mr. Speaker, we want to recognize two colleagues whom I served with. Congressman HULTGREN mentioned Phil Crane and Congresswoman KAPTUR mentioned Lane Evans. Both were colleagues of mine that I was fortunate to serve with, so I am going to talk about both of those at this time.

Lane was born in Rock Island, Illinois. On August 4, 1951, he joined the Marines at the age of 17. He had orders for Vietnam, but he served in Okinawa, Japan, as a security guard because his older brother was already deployed in the war.

In 1982, Lane was first elected from his western Illinois district and served for an additional 12 terms. He worked for more than a decade after his Parkinson's diagnosis, but announced in 2006 that he wouldn't seek reelection because of his deteriorating health.

As a Congressman, he fought for the rights of veterans and became the senior Democrat on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. He pushed legislation to help those exposed to agent orange and to give former servicemembers' rights to judicial review in pursuing their benefits. He also campaigned for veterans grappling with post-traumatic stress disorders and other health problems.

As I know Lane, he was very adamant and focused on serving the veterans. He also was one of the first to start talking about the concerns of veterans in finding jobs after their service. President Obama credited Lane Evans with aiding his own political rise, saying once that he wouldn't have made it to the U.S. Senate without early support from his fellow Illinoisan.

Lane is survived by his three brothers.

Lane and I bordered each other in our congressional districts. We split the community of Adams County and a little bit of a town called Quincy. When you share congressional border lines with a colleague, you do numerous events together. And when they are of different parties, they are even more important because there are so many things that unite us. A lot of times there is a view that there is always division here, but back home when we are working on issues like infrastructure, roads, bridges, and veterans' benefits, it really is a chance for the public to see Members working together.

So I relished my time meeting and serving with Congressman Evans as we shared a congressional boundary line. He gave his all to his country. He gave his all to this country through his service as a Member of Congress, and he fought a very tough fight against Parkinson's. He would still be here today had he not had this debilitating disease that forced him to leave public service.

I will remember Lane well. I wish God's blessing to his family.

We also want to take this time to remember Congressman Phil Crane.

Congressman Crane was born in Chicago, Illinois, on November 3, 1930. He received his undergraduate degree from Hillsdale College in 1952, and went on to earn a Ph.D. in history from Indiana University in 1963. He also served in the United States Army from 1954 to 1956.

In 1969, Phil Crane won a special election race triggered by the appointment of then-Illinois Congressman Donald Rumsfeld to the Nixon administration. He served in that seat from 1969 until his defeat in 2004.

In the 1970s, Congressman Crane was instrumental in founding, as was mentioned by my colleague, Congressman HULTGREN, the Republican Study Committee, the Heritage Foundation, and the American Conservative Union, stalwarts of the view of conservatism who lead the way in the debate of conservatism in this country.

So I reached out to friends of mine this afternoon, Don and Wanda Weder, who reside in Highland, Illinois, because they were very close to Congressman Crane, and I would like to read from some remembrances that were put down on my behalf to submit for the Record:

> We met Phil in 1964 when my father arranged for Barry Goldwater, Jr., and Phil to speak at the Highland High School auditorium concerning the Presidential campaign of Barry Goldwater. Phil and Barry, Jr., delivered excellent speeches. My father, Wanda, and I were amazed at Phil's intellect and the fact that he spoke eloquently, including detailed budget numbers and cogent economic theory, all without notes.

Let me interject here, for those of us who served with Phil, that was true then and it was true when he served here in Washington.

□ 1915

> At that time, Phil was a professor of history at Bradley University. In 1966, I transferred from the University of Illinois to Bradley, at my father's suggestion, to enable attending Phil's classes and those of Professor Nicholas Nyaradi, the former Minister of Hungary prior to and during World War II. The first of Phil's classes I attended was a lecture series with about 300 students.
>
> Phil typically arrives in the auditorium about 5 minutes after his aides had imposed order on the students. He entered impressively, at a brisk pace, and with the Chicago Tribune and other papers under his arm.
>
> Placing the papers on the podium, he greeted the class and began a wonderful lecture, citing facts, dates, describing personalities, and humorous anecdotes, all with no reference to notes. His most memorable lectures were those on the Spanish American War and Colonel Theodore Roosevelt.
>
> His lecture on TR was so memorable that I could recite most of it today: TR commandeering two leaky boats to transport the Rough Riders to Cuba; TR being down to his last pair of glasses at the time of the charge up San Juan Hill; the deficiencies of the Rough Riders' lever-action Craig rifles being outranged by the Spanish 1898 Mausers; and the real hero at the Battle of San Juan Hill, a young second lieutenant recently graduated from West Point and leading a platoon equipped with Gatling guns.
>
> In 1969, Donald Rumsfeld was appointed by President Nixon to head the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Phil decided to run for the congressional seat vacated, the 13th Illinois District.
>
> I graduated from Bradley that spring and spent a good deal of my time attempting to be of some service to Phil in his campaign. He referred to his philosophy as conservatism, an approach I thought daring at the time. He attended many ''teas'' throughout the district and was always received, especially by the lady voters who were the primary attendees.
>
> In subsequent campaigns, I had the privilege of flying Phil around Illinois. Phil frequently introduced me generously as his best student and a Bradley summa cum laude.
>
> I recall him sitting next to me in a single-engine Cessna on a trip from Springfield to Vandalia when I asked him what he intended to say to the group of voters in Vandalia. Phil commented, ''I have no idea. I will have to think fast.''
>
> On another occasion, I asked him if his exceptional speaking skills came to him naturally. He said, ''No. I developed them by forcing myself to speak publicly and turn the cobwebs in my brain into high voltage electrical cables.''
>
> Phil was not only exceptional mentally. Hunting rabbits and quail with my father and me, he demonstrated considerable skill

with a shotgun. His endurance was phenomenal.

In 1980, Phil ran in the primaries against Ronald Reagan, John Connolly, and others. Phil campaigned on an intellectual plane. He was obviously the most capable and sincere candidate.

Had Phil been elected, he would have made his best efforts to move the country to smaller government, greater personal liberties, and a more nearly free market economy. Phil enjoyed the New Hampshire debates and commented that Reagan was well-received, primarily as a result of the old B movie lines he used.

During President Reagan's second term, I commented to Phil that the President had not actually made any real progress in reducing the size of government and establishing a free market economy. He invited my father and 11 other people to meet about twice monthly in Washington to advise him.

My father was hospitalized prior to an early meeting of this group, and Phil asked me to attend. Thereafter, the group asked me to be the 13th member of group. Phil's campaign accountant left the campaign. We could not find the financial records. His political adviser had not had a bad day. He also left the campaign.

His lead staff person left the campaign and joined the Reagan campaign, later to receive an appointment under the Reagan administration. Phil wound down the campaign and stumped for Reagan.

A few months later, he commented to me, ''I have not had a bad day since the campaign ended.'' In 1987, Phil told me that President Reagan always treated him courteously but seldom sought his input. He believed that the First Lady was adverse to him because he sought the nomination in 1980.

Phil and Barry Goldwater, Jr., delivered eulogies at the funeral of my father and mother in 1987 and 2005. Both recalled many years of happy times and were most touching.

You know better than I Phil's legislative contributions. Two major successes in which he played a significant part were the bill that legalized ownership of gold by private citizens and the Freedom of Information legislation.

Phil was an inspiration to his students, his constituents, and the many advocates of personal liberty who heard him speak or read his literary works. His passing represents an irreplaceable loss of knowledge, capability, and spirit to our society and all who pursue the ideal of liberty.

So I couldn't put into words any better than what my good friends Don and Wanda Weder did in a short time in doing remembrance of someone they knew very well.

I know I have other colleagues coming down to make sure they make their voices heard. I was fortunate to serve with Phil. I was fortunate to go sit in his office in the Cannon Building, around with colleagues talking about public policy issues of the day. It will be times that I fondly remember.

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

HONORING THE LIVES OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVES PHIL CRANE AND LANE EVANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the Majority Leader.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is great to follow my colleague, but we have some other colleagues here tonight that I want to make sure that they get an opportunity to talk about their experience with the two Members that we are here to honor tonight, Congressman Phil Crane and Congressman Lane Evans.

For that reason, I yield to my colleague from the great State of Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Illinois yielding to me.

If Phil Crane were sitting here on the front row tonight, he wouldn't have any idea who I am, but when you do great things, you don't ever know who those efforts, who that toiling, that sweating, that genuine effort that goes into what you do, you never know who that is going to affect.

You have heard it here tonight. It was 1973. Folks were talking about how it is that we could bring conservatism to the United States Congress. It is Paul Weyrich, it is Phil Crane, and the RSC, the Republican Study Committee, is born.

At that time, they thought the Republican leadership was a little too liberal in the House. They thought we needed another voice to kind of balance that leadership out. Imagine that, the audacity that a young Congressman—he had been on the Hill about 4 years at that time, won in a special election in 1969—the audacity that Phil Crane had, as a young Congressman, was to say, ''Maybe we need some balance in the discussion. Maybe we need a place to debate.''

Now, that is 1973. Fast forward, it is 2014, and if you go and visit with colleagues today who are members of that Republican Study Committee that has survived and grown under Phil Crane's leadership and others, they will tell you that when it comes to healthy debate, that may be the single best location in the entire United States House of Representatives. I want you to think about that.

Again, if Phil Crane were sitting here on the front row, he would not remember the times that we have met because I was a minor blip on his radar, but what he dreamed has become the single largest and most productive forum for the discussion of ideas that exists in the people's House in the United States of America.

I always wonder about the dreams that we don't hear about, those dreams that had they materialized would have affected dozens of lives, hundreds of lives, thousands of lives, but because the dreamer did not press on and the dream was never materialized, we will never know.

Phil Crane was not just a dreamer. Phil Crane was a doer, and because of the work, the sweat, the toil that he invested, not dozens, not hundreds, but thousands of Members of Congress who have followed have had an opportunity to be among their colleagues and grapple with the pathway forward.

So much of what we do here on the House floor seems so scripted today. What Phil Crane wanted was an opportunity for us to discuss, an opportunity for us to challenge one another, an opportunity for us to make each other better.

For all the things that Phil accomplished, for all the impact he had on his family and his friends, this may seem minor, but if you are a young Member in the U.S. House of Representatives, the legacy that Phil Crane left behind isn't something; in many cases, it is everything.

I cannot imagine what this institution would be today without the groundwork that he laid those many years ago and continued groundwork he continued to lay until the day he left this institution. It is a proud legacy from the great State of Illinois, and I am grateful to my friend for allowing me to come down and talk about that tonight.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. The gentleman from Georgia mentioned the great legacy that Phil Crane left, and it was a great legacy that not only former Congressman Phil Crane left for those of us who follow him in Illinois, it is a great legacy for former Congressman Lane Evans that he left too.

My colleague from Georgia also mentioned what would a young Member of Congress say if Phil Crane were here today and the inspiration that he gave to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague and my good friend from the great State of Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK), one of the youngest Members of Congress to offer his remarks.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Illinois for yielding the time.

I also want to thank my colleague from Illinois, the distinguished dean of the Illinois Republican delegation for organizing the tribute to the late Phil Crane.

The history of American conservatism, I believe, cannot be written without mentioning Phil Crane. Phil was born into a large family, to stalwart Republican parents. Crane's bedtime stories may well have been the Federalist Papers or the collected works of Edmund Burke.

After completing his Ph.D. in history at Indiana University, Phil moved to my hometown of Peoria, Illinois, and he began teaching history, philosophy, and economics at my alma mater, Bradley University. For years, Crane filled his classes with students captivated by his engaging lectures, and he inspired them by his commitment to America's founding principles.

All the while, he worked to build conservative youth movements from the ground up, creating leading groups like

the Young America's Foundation and the American Conservative Union. Together with the pantheon of American conservatism, William F. Buckley, Ed Feulner, Stan Evans, Phyllis Schlafly, Barry Goldwater, and even Ronald Reagan, Crane helped lead the Republican Party out of the wilderness.

I don't think it is an overstatement to suggest that a governing Republican majority would never have been possible without the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable Phil Crane.

He was willing to enter the arena, to confront the ideologies of socialism, communism, and Big Government liberalism head on. He armed conservatives with the intellectual firepower they needed to assault the bulwark of Big Government, and he lived long enough to see the New Right emerge strong and resilient.

In Congress, he was a fierce advocate for free trade and pro-growth economic reforms, and he was a champion of commonsense pension reforms that were needed to help the middle class.

A few years ago, Phil was honored at a dinner here in Washington for his contributions to the conservative movement. That night, surrounded by the men and women he had worked alongside for more than three decades, he reflected on his earliest memories growing up as a conservative in Illinois.

He told the crowd that night how every time when he was a young boy going to visit his grandfather, that his father would make him shake his grandfather's hand, and he would say, ''Son, remember shaking that hand. That hand has shaken the hand of Abraham Lincoln.''

Phil Crane grew up with a deep sense that he had a responsibility and a calling to keep the party of Lincoln tied forever to the principles of free enterprise, individual liberty, and peace through strength.

Through his entire public service, Phil Crane fought hard for the things he believed in, and along the way, he managed to mentor and train an army of young conservatives to join him.

There is something poignant about the fact that Phil Crane lived long enough to see the largest Republican majority in the House of Representatives in his lifetime. He even got to see his home State of Illinois elect a Republican Governor, the first time since 1892 that a sitting President's home State Governor switched parties.

In his eight decades, Phil labored to build the conservative movement. In his final days, he surely sensed that his labors were not in vain.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I would remiss if I wasn't able to offer my prepared remarks on Congressman Crane and also Congressman Evans before we recognize some of our other friends who are here tonight.

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, I want to say it is a privilege for me to be able to stand on the floor of this House to recognize the life and accomplishments of two great leaders from the State of Illinois.

Congressman Phil Crane was first elected in the 13th District of Illinois to represent the northwest Chicago suburbs in 1969, and he held that office for nearly 40 years. At the end of his career, he was the longest-serving Republican Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Congressman Crane was, in a word, a legend. He was one of those larger-than-life politicians that we often talk about or read about in history books but who rarely exists today.

We also take the time today to mourn the loss of former Congressman Lane Evans. Last week, former Congressman Lane Evans passed away after a long battle with Parkinson's disease. Mr. Evans, a former marine, was elected in 1982, at the age of 31, and served the people of the 17th District for parts of three decades. In fact, over the course of his tenure, Mr. Evans served the many parts of Illinois that I am now lucky and proud enough to represent. During his 24 years in the House, he was a staunch advocate for our Nation's veterans and for America's working men and women, and his service to his constituents was second to none. He will be remembered as a fighter both for the people he represented and against the disease that eventually took his life.

It is fitting today that Republicans and Democrats together have come to the floor to honor the lives of two great public servants from Illinois and to thank them for their service to our country. We send our thoughts and prayers to the families of Congressman Evans and Congressman Crane during this very difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned Republicans and Democrats coming to the floor of the House to honor these two great men, and it gives me great privilege to yield to my good friend and colleague from the great State of Illinois, Mr. DAN LIPINSKI.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Thank you, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor two of our former colleagues, Phil Crane and Lane Evans.

First, I didn't have the opportunity to serve with Mr. Crane, but Phil Crane was certainly a giant, as some of our previous speakers have said—a giant of the conservative movement. He certainly served here in this institution but also just in the wider circles, especially in the eighties. He ran for President in 1980 but lost to Ronald Reagan. Yet many of those things that Ronald Reagan brought forward and saw through were things that Phil Crane stood for. While I may not agree with everything that Phil Crane did, there is really no denying the fact that he stood up for what he believed in. He fought very hard for what he believed in, and he was a great American patriot. I really, truly believe that.

I also want to honor our former colleague and a friend and a mentor of mine, Lane Evans.

From his time in the Marine Corps to nearly a quarter century in this House, Lane always put his country first. He bravely served in the Marine Corps during the Vietnam war. His experience in the military and his firsthand knowledge of veterans' issues led him to become a leading advocate for veterans during his time in Congress. Certainly, many would say he was the leading advocate on issues critical to veterans, such as posttraumatic stress disorder, the effects of Agent Orange, and homelessness. He was consistently a leader in crafting real policy solutions. In addition to the great work on veterans' issues, Lane always dutifully served his constituents in the State of Illinois. He was a strong advocate for working people, and he was one of the first to see the need for renewable energies.

Personally, my own experience in Congress began about 30 years ago when I interned for Lane Evans. During my time in his office, he certainly showed me how to be a truly compassionate and effective leader in the House. Lane really cared about people, and that showed through in everything that he did. He was very passionate in all that he did. During his final years, he again showed his courage and strength in his fight with Parkinson's disease. If this terrible disease had not afflicted Lane, I am sure he would still be here today, fighting for his constituents, for hardworking families, and for all of our veterans, especially those who are coming home today.

I send out my prayers to Lane and his family. We truly miss him. I had the opportunity to serve 4 years with Lane before he had to retire because of Parkinson's, but I really miss having Lane around. I think the example that he gave is truly something that we can look up to and emulate in what he did for the State of Illinois, along with what Phil Crane did for the State.

We had two men who were very passionate. They had very different ideas, but they were very passionate about what they believed in. They fought hard for those things, and that certainly deserves our great respect. Our prayers go out to their families on this loss.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), who had the opportunity to get to know Lane Evans not only as an intern but also as a colleague.

I never had that opportunity to serve with either Mr. Crane or Mr. Evans, but I had the opportunity to be able to work for the dean of our Republican Illinois delegation, Mr. SHIMKUS, who was here earlier tonight, and I got to meet both of these men during my time in working for Mr. SHIMKUS in the late nineties and throughout the last decade. I can tell you that both gentlemen

were pillars of public service for very different reasons. They both served their State well. They served their districts well, and they served their constituents well.

As a matter of fact, I had the opportunity—and it might have been during one of the times that Mr. SHIMKUS mentioned. It was a flight that Mr. Crane was taking through Springfield that ended up in Vandalia, where Mr. Crane appeared at an event on behalf of Mr. SHIMKUS, and I got a chance to hear him speak personally. His passion for free markets, his passion for economic development and economic growth, and his passion for free trade was evident during his discussion. That was one of the few times I got the chance to actually experience what many, when I was growing up, experienced when watching Phil Crane, in person, run for the Presidency in 1980.

Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that, in 1980, we had many Illinoisans vying to send to the Presidency; not only President Reagan, who was born in Illinois—in Dixon, Illinois—but we also had Mr. Crane, Congressman Phil Crane, and also John Anderson, Congressman John Anderson. It looks like Illinois was the center point of the Presidential election in 1980, and Illinois still, obviously, plays a great role in the White House today. This is an opportunity that we have to stand here to talk about bipartisanship in Washington, D.C., something that, when many people turn their TVs on, they don't see. They don't see the bipartisanship that we are seeing here tonight.

That chance to see Congressman Crane in action helped inspire me to want to become a Member of this institution. He served the 13th District that I am now blessed enough to represent—that district starting with Marguerite Church and Donald Rumsfeld and then Phil Crane. Then we had Robert McClory and John Erlenborn, Harris Fawell, and Judy Biggert, who served the 13th District of Illinois before I did. Now I get the opportunity to follow in the footsteps of people like Phil Crane and those aforementioned Members of this great institution, and it humbles me every day to know that I get the chance to follow in their footsteps.

With Congressman Lane Evans, I got a chance to know him and his successor, Congressman Phil Hare, who was once a fellow staffer for Lane Evans. We sat next to each other in Hillsboro, Illinois, talking about how Republicans and Democrats can work together to make sure that water infrastructure needs and sewer infrastructure needs are addressed in Montgomery County, Illinois. I now get a chance to serve Montgomery County, Illinois. I think back to that time when Lane Evans never thought he would leave the Rock Island area and the Adams County area and represent places like Montgomery County, Illinois, but he did, and he did it well. We got a chance to work together as fellow staffers—Phil Hare and I and Jerry Lack, who was another one of his economic development coordinators in the district that I worked so closely with. Opportunities like that to see leadership in action and bipartisanship in action is another reason I wanted to be a Member of this great institution.

Lane Evans never thought that he would come down and represent areas like Pana, Illinois, and my home county, Christian County, Illinois. With Lane Evans, I remember the first time he was in Pana and actually called it ''Pannah.'' Do you know what? Lane Evans was the type of guy who could laugh at himself. If you make a mistake in this business, sometimes that mistake is turned into a 30-second ad, but Lane Evans was able to take that mistake and turn it into humor and to represent Pana, Illinois, extremely well.

Mr. Speaker, I learned a lot about constituent service from my former boss, JOHN SHIMKUS, but I also learned a lot about constituent service from Lane Evans. Lane Evans taught many of us that it is the most important part of our job to make sure you answer every phone call, that you answer every time a constituent writes you a letter—or, in today's day and age, an email—and that you make sure you respond to their requests because members of our communities—the citizens of the 13th District of Illinois—don't call us at the beginning of their problems. They call us to help break through the bureaucracy of Washington, D.C., when they are at the end of their ropes, when they have already called the Federal agencies, when they have already not gotten the answers that they needed or deserved. What JOHN SHIMKUS and Lane Evans taught me while seeing them in action was that responding to our constituents' needs is what matters most, and it is a part of our job that I appreciate the most.

Now, I mentioned Lane Evans came down to central Illinois in a new district that included a county that I now am blessed enough to represent. It is Macoupin County, Illinois. I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity in this time that we are honoring the service of Congressman Phil Crane and honoring the service of Congressman Lane Evans to honor another gentleman, another public servant from Macoupin County, Illinois, who also passed away unexpectedly at the age of 50 this week. His name is Brad Demuzio. Brad was the son of longtime State Senator—an institution in central Illinois—Vince Demuzio.

I got to know Brad when I got the chance to meet his dad, Vince, and Vince was a powerhouse in Illinois politics. We didn't share the same partisan affiliation, but what we shared was friendship and opportunities to serve central Illinois together. Vince passed away from colon cancer a few years back, and he was succeeded in the Illinois State Senate by his wife, Deanna, who happens to currently be the mayor of Carlinville, Illinois, and somebody I am blessed enough to be able to work with today. Before her, Brad Demuzio served Macoupin County and Carlinville as mayor for multiple terms. Brad was also the director of the Illinois Secretary of State Police. Brad served in that position until he passed away unexpectedly last week. Brad was a public servant, true and true, for his community and for our communities.

There was a time in the Illinois State Capitol when we had somebody who was mentally ill walk in with a loaded gun and fire a shot that killed a friend of mine, Bill Wozniak, who was guarding the door. Brad Demuzio helped lead the charge to make sure that we created an Illinois State Capitol Police force that secured the Illinois State Capitol to ensure that Bill Wozniak was the last person to be killed in the line of duty, guarding the Illinois State Capitol. Brad Demuzio worked with our secretary of state, Jesse White, to make sure that this police force was put into action.

That is true leadership. That is public service. That is why I stand here, on the floor of the House today, to also honor my friend who died way too young, at age 50—former mayor, former director of the Illinois Secretary of State Police, and my friend, Brad Demuzio.

□ 1945

So it gives me great pleasure tonight to honor these three great men because they are inspirations to me, and they are going to be inspirations to future generations of central Illinois' public servants.

Thank you, Phil Crane, for your service to this country and to our great State. Thank you, Lane Evans, for your service to this great institution. And thank you, Brad Demuzio, for your service to the great State of Illinois and Macoupin County.

And with that, I see no other Members down here to recognize the service of these great men, so, Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 14, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7675. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting Fiscal Year 2015 Budget amendments to fund Overseas Contingency Operations; (H. Doc. No.

113–173); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7676. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's ''Major'' final rule — Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards [Regulation WW; Docket No.: R-1466] (RIN: 7100 AE-03) received October 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7677. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards [Docket ID: OCC-2013-0016] (RIN: 1577-AD74) received October 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7678. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Release No.: 34-73407; File No. S7-14-11] (RIN: 3235-AK96) received October 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7679. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Centerville, Texas) Station KKEE, Centerville, Texas [MB Docket No.: 14-56] [RM-11718] [File No.: BMPH-20140324ADD] received October 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7680. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-099, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7681. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-111, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7682. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-084, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7683. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-085, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7684. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-074, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7685. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-098, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7686. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-060, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-077, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7688. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-097, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7689. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-118, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7690. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-453, ''Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7691. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-458, ''Protecting Pregnant Workers Fairness Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7692. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-452, ''Georgia Avenue Great Streets Neighborhood Retail Priority Area Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7693. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-451, ''Rent Control Hardship Petition Limitation Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7694. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Copayments for Medications in 2015 (RIN: 2900-AP15) received October 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7695. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; End-Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System, Quality Incentive Program, and Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies [CMS-1614-F] (RIN: 0938-AS13) received October 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

7696. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs; CY 2015 Home Health Prospective Payment System Rate Update; Home Health Quality Reporting Requirements; and Survey and Enforcement Requirements for Home Health Agencies [CMS-1611-F] (RIN: 0938-AS14) received October 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

7697. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs: Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment Systems and Quality Reporting Programs; Physician-Owned Hospitals: Data Sources for Expansion Exception; Physician Certification of Inpatient Hospital Services; Medicare Advantage Organizations and Part D Sponsors: CMS-Identified Overpayments Associated with Submitted Payment Data [CMS-1613-FC] (RIN: 0938-AS15) received October 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

7698. A letter from the Deputy Director — ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Revisions to Payment Policies under the Physician Fee Schedule, Clinical Laboratory Fee Schedule, Access to Identifiable Data for the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation Models and Other Revisions to Part B for CY 2015 [CMS-1612-FC] (RIN: 0938-AS12) received October 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 5696. A bill to reinstate reporting requirements related to United States-Hong Kong relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 5697. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the windfall elimination provision and protect the retirement of public servants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5698. A bill to create an independent advisory panel to comprehensively assess the leadership structure, protocols, training, tools, and capabilities of the United States Secret Service and make recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 5699. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 5700. A bill to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the ''Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 5701. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of federally recognized tribes in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5702. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Ebenezer D. Bassett, the first African-American diplomat; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 5703. A bill to protect and preserve international cultural property at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services,

and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 5704. A bill to amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a Master Teacher Corp program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 5705. A bill to modify certain provisions relating to the Propane Education and Research Council; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LANCE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5706. A bill to deny Social Security benefits and other benefits to individuals whose citizenship has been revoked or renounced on the basis of their participation in Nazi persecution; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 5707. A bill to direct the President to take action to protect against the transmission of Ebola virus from individuals traveling to the United States from abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 5697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, ''The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * *''

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 5699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 5700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 5704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, cl. 3

The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes,

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5706.

Congress has the power to enact the legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 5707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the Power to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 171: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 303: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 318: Mr. PITTS and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 477: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 640: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 725: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 786: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 975: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1015: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1070: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. RIBBLE, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1074: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1078: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1146: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1150: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1179: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1250: Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 1257: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1274: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1286: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1324: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1339: Mr. NEAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ROONEY..
H.R. 1507: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1563: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1737: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1761: Mr. HIMES, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1981: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2003: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2028: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2073: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2313: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2355: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2452: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2529: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2536: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HOLT, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2591: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2607: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 2772: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2851: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2921: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2955: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3116: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3172: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3279: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3322: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 3367: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 3426: Mr. TONKO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3465: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3471: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 3662: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3708: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3712: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3836: Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KIND, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FARR, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. COOK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3850: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 3852: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 3877: Mr. TERRY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4145: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4172: Mr. KIND, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 4221: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4240: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4347: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4351: Mr. SESSIONS and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4418: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4504: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 4551: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4567: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4634: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 4664: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 4693: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana,

Mr. WALZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4748: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 4790: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 4793: Mr. BARBER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MULVANEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VALADAO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 4815: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 4837: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MARINO, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 4879: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4885: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 4886: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. Lamborn.

H.R. 4887: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4905: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4977: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 4991: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4998: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 5014: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 5052: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 5063: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 5126: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5133: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 5182: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 5212: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 5213: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 5217: Ms. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS.

H.R. 5242: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5262: Mr. HANNA and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 5271: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5277: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5285: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 5287: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 5288: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 5336: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 5354: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5369: Mr. COOK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 5380: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 5403: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 5441: Mr. COHEN and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 5450: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 5459: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 5475: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 5478: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FARR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 5480: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 5484: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 5494: Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5544: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5551: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 5559: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5580: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5611: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 5617: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5644: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5646: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 5650: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 5656: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5665: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 5680: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 5682: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 72: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 109: Mr. KENNEDY and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Res. 147: Mr. BYRNE.

H. Res. 319: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 456: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 584: Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Res. 667: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 711: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MARINO, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 728: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KING of Iowa.