



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 2017

No. 122

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 19, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRUCE WESTERMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, 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. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

FIGHTING FOR IMMIGRATION POLICIES

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, it looks almost certain that the Trump administration is going to take about 1.2 million immigrants who currently have documents issued by the U.S. Government and turn them into undocumented immigrants. They have work permits and pay their full share of taxes. They are covered by U.S. labor laws and are not undercutting

the wages, well-being, and livelihood of native-born American workers.

For all intents and purposes, they are documented workers in the U.S., and many have been here for more than two decades. Nevertheless, the more than 400,000 with temporary protected status, or TPS, and 800,000 with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, could be made undocumented in the coming weeks and in the month of September.

Then, once they are categorized as undocumented, President Trump will unleash ICE and Homeland Security to go after them so they can be deported.

There are 800,000 young people who went through a thorough background check and have been complying with the rules of the DACA program for almost 5 years. They were brought here as children and grew up in the United States, went to our schools, played sports with our kids, and they speak English probably as well as you and I.

They came forward, as they were told to, and we actually reduced the population of undocumented immigrants, got people on the books, and were able to redeploy our resources elsewhere.

Now it appears that the leaders in the Republican Party who do not like the idea of so many immigrants having legal status are giving the President an ultimatum: deport the DREAMers, or we will sue.

The Governor of Texas, who is leading the charge, has a very sympathetic judge, and it is up to Jeff Sessions to put up a fight, when he himself has been trying to kill legal status for immigrants for years.

So, practically speaking, between ending DACA and ending TPS, we are going to dump about 1.2 million people into the pool of 10 million to 11 million people who are living and working here under the radar, outside of legal protections, and without any way to become legal.

So this Saturday, in Chicago, at 2 p.m., at Lincoln United Methodist

Church on Damen, we are going to get together and organize ourselves to fight back. Yes, there will be legislation from Democrats and even Republicans to fight back. There will be court cases to fight back, even if the Attorney General does nothing, which we fully expect him to do. But fighting for DACA and fighting to keep millions of people in this country who have put down roots and built lives here is going to be a people's fight, and the effort to find ways to protect families and to cope with more than a million people being pushed into the black market requires us to organize in every community across the Nation.

It is up to us to teach each other how we will resist this latest insult in our congregations, churches, universities, cities, and neighborhoods throughout the Nation. Immigrants or people who have DACA or TPS cannot do this on their own, but they need to be part of a coalition that fights back.

Teachers who work with kids every day and bear witness to the fears students face every day about their parents and families can't do this alone. They need to be part of a coalition that comes together to resist.

Employers will face a choice: whether they are just going to roll over while employees are ruled ineligible and work documents are terminated, or to stand with us and stand with their workers and fight for them.

So, if you marched with your pink hat at the Women's March, I am asking you now, on behalf of immigrants and the very future of immigration, to stand with us. If you marched for science or the environment, if you have joined us in protesting bathroom laws and discrimination in all its forms, your brothers and sisters need you now.

At airports across the country, you stood up for refugees and said no to Trump's Muslim ban. We need you. Black Lives Matter, we need you, and, frankly, we need each other.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5981

People are going to peacefully stand up and fight for justice, common sense, and what is right. We need everyone to be there with us, helping us, walking with us. In Chicago, it starts this Saturday at 2 at Lincoln United Methodist Church in Pilsen.

The road ahead is not going to be very easy, but we have fought hard to win victories for our country, and for the DREAMers, who are the leading edge of our movement to make immigration legal again in this country.

Now is the time. We need your help to protect families and communities and to do what is right. We cannot do it alone.

RECOGNIZING MADE IN PENNSYLVANIA COMPANIES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about American craftsmanship as the White House celebrates “Made in America Week.”

American entrepreneurs, workers, farmers, and innovators have built this country and drive our country. They are the heart of this Nation, and they ensure that the “Made in the USA” label means quality and value, which is something we treasure.

Pennsylvania has a rich history of being a manufacturing leader, especially our storied Pennsylvania steel. The Commonwealth has been an important cog in the wheel of this country’s industrial revolution, thanks to industries like iron, coal, and lumber, in addition to steel.

Our Pennsylvania farmers have fed, and continue to feed, generations of Americans, providing safe, nutritious food for all of our neighbors. This rich history continues today.

The Fifth Congressional District is home to numerous producers that have made vital contributions to our prosperity. They have employed American workers, produced American products, and grown American crops. From heritage companies to newer, rising stars, we have a wide cross-section of products produced in the Pennsylvania’s Fifth Congressional District.

Brookville Equipment Corporation in Jefferson County is the leading American manufacturer of diesel locomotive engines, street trolleys, and mining machinery. Brookville’s mass transit resume includes fully refurbishing streetcars for New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

Since 1889, W.R. Case & Sons Cutlery Company has been fashioning handcrafted pocketknives and sporting knives in McKean County. Zippo Manufacturing Company, makers of the world famous Zippo windproof lighter, owns Case knives today. Zippo is another family-owned business based in Bradford since 1936.

Clarion Industries has two divisions in Clarion County: Clarion Boards,

which produces high-quality fiberboard used to manufacture products such as laminate flooring, furniture, fixtures, cabinetry, and moldings; and Clarion Laminates, the only “Made in the USA” flooring manufacturer of its kind.

Emporium Powdered Metal, Inc., in Cameron County, is a powdered metal manufacturer staffed with more than 120 years of combined experience.

Welch’s, in Erie County, is particularly known for its grape juices, jams, and jellies made from dark Concord grapes and its white Niagara grape juice.

Clearfield Machine Company has been producing custom machining since 1868 in Clearfield County.

Since 1830, the Woolrich name has stood for the best in sportswear for men and women, and it continues to make outerwear that combines comfort and function in Woolrich, Pennsylvania.

GE Transportation is an American manufacturing giant. The organization manufactures equipment for the railroad, marine, mining, drilling, and energy generation industries in Erie County.

Major leaguers have been swinging our fine Pennsylvania hardwoods, thanks to Jefferson County company BWP Bats. BWP’s slogan is “Built With Pride.”

Huntingdon County’s Bonney Forge has a state-of-the-art forge facility capable of manufacturing our entire line of forged steel fittings and forged steel valve products since 1875.

DiamondBack Truck Covers is a company two Penn State students started in their garage in 2003. They make heavy-duty, utility-oriented, diamond plate aluminum truck bed covers for pickup trucks in Philipsburg, Pennsylvania, in Centre County.

Domtar Paper Company in Elk County is the largest integrated producer of uncoated freesheet paper in North America, and the second largest in the world, based on production and capacity.

Pul-A-Pump of PA, Inc., in Potter County, manufactures portable pump pulling machines for those in need of water well technology, with a unique dual traction belt design that is second to none.

Whirley Industries Incorporated in Warren County designs, develops, and produces products for the food and beverage industry.

Centre County also boasts many new rising stars in high-tech industries, including KCF Technologies, a dynamic technology company that develops and commercializes products for industry and the military.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a sample of the manufacturers who employ our friends, families, and neighbors in the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. These companies, and many others, produce quality, American-made products, and we could not be more proud to celebrate them during

“Made in America Week.” Congratulations, and keep up the great work.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues came to the floor this morning and said: It kind of smells like bacon in here. I said: That is because the Republicans are cooking their budget just off the floor. That is what they are doing. They are cooking up a budget with cooked books.

Here we are with a national debt of nearly \$20 trillion and the highest priority on the Republican side of the aisle—reflected both in their so-called healthcare bill, which was actually tax cuts only for people who earned over \$250,000 a year—is tax cuts for people who earn over \$250,000 a year, particularly targeted toward those in the top one-tenth of 1 percent—those who earn millions of dollars a year.

They say that is the cure for all of America’s ills: just cut their taxes, and the benefits will trickle down onto all the rest of us. I think a lot of people don’t much like to be trickled on in that manner.

What are the priorities, other than tax cuts, in their budget? A massive increase in spending at the Pentagon.

Remember, the Pentagon is the only agency of the Federal Government that is unauditible. That is right. Every year, every agency of the government is subject to an audit, but not the Pentagon. They say: Hey, we can’t be audited. The books are a mess. We can’t be audited.

Last fall, there was a report that \$125 billion went missing from the Pentagon budget. The Pentagon attempted to repress that report. God forbid we should bring any fiscal accountability to the Pentagon. They are just going to shower more money on them, in the hope that some of it gets spent on the real needs of the military. But there is no sense of responsibility there.

How are they going to get to their illusory balanced budget if they are having massive tax cuts for the wealthiest among us and massive increases in spending at the Pentagon, with no fiscal accountability?

Well, simple. We are just going to cut the programs that average and struggling Americans depend upon, like student financial aid. They don’t know anybody at the country club whose kids need help going to college. So those programs get cut. Hungry kids? They have never met one. Never met a hungry kid. So let’s cut the school lunch program again, and let’s cut food stamps for families.

But they are breaking some new ground here and breaking some of the President’s promises. The President promised he would not cut Medicare. Well, their proposed budget cuts Medicare. Yes, it cuts Medicare. It would cut \$500 billion out of Medicare. It assumes that, instead of getting a guaranteed benefit, an earned benefit that

every American over 65 can have, you will get vouchers, and you can go into the private insurance market and do better. It sounds a little bit like the failing ObamaCare plan that they talk about all the time. Now they want to put seniors in that same boat, instead of guaranteed Medicare.

Then, of course, \$1.5 trillion cuts in Medicaid. That is welfare. Well, actually, the largest recipients of Medicaid are seniors in long-term care. A lot of people are going to be surprised when grandma or granddad is out in the street or comes home and needs a lot of help and assistance and there is none to be had.

□ 1015

So that is the largest group.

Now, what is the second largest group of freeloaders on Medicaid?

Oh, it is kids. God forbid that kids should get medical help when they are growing up. Let's have them long-term, lifetime disabled. Deny them medical care when they are young and we will just worry about all that later. This is quite a set of priorities they are putting before us and fiscally irresponsible.

So as I have in past years, I am introducing a fiscally responsible balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, not like the Republican one that said you have to have two-thirds to increase taxes and one vote to cut taxes, no. This one would say you have to balance the budget, but you do it by prudent reductions in spending, and also you have to deal with the revenue side. And, oh, by the way, mine protects Medicare and Social Security totally from these sorts of cuts. It makes them into the entitlement programs they are supposed to be that the Republicans want to do away with in their budget.

So I think there is a better way to go forward, but just like in their fake healthcare bill, which was really disguised tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, they are now giving us a supposedly prudent fiscal budget blueprint, which, again, is huge tax cuts for the wealthy, massive increases for the Pentagon and cuts for everybody else.

DEATH OF THE CONSERVATIVE AGENDA

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our Republican Senate majority is killing our conservative agenda, our Republican agenda, and President Trump's agenda. The murder weapon is the Senate filibuster rule, an archaic accident of history created during the days of horse-and-buggy and slavery.

The filibuster rule destroys the basic democratic principle of majority rule and obstructs passage of legislation unless a 60 percent supermajority of Senators agree. While today's 52-Senator Republican majority can abolish the filibuster rule anytime it wants, so

long as the filibuster rule is in place, Republicans can pass nothing without the consent of CHUCK SCHUMER and the Democrats.

Think about it. Our Republican Senate majority has abdicated control and empowered CHUCK SCHUMER and the Democrat minority to obstruct the will of the Republican House, obstruct the will of the Republican Senate majority, obstruct the will of President Trump, and obstruct the will of the tens of millions of American voters who send us to Washington.

That is political suicide and an abject betrayal of the millions of American voters who sent us here.

There will be no border wall because our Republican Senators empower Democrats to kill it. There will be no ObamaCare repeal because our Republican Senators empower Democrats to stop us. America's out-of-control deficits and debts will cause a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy that destroys an America it took generations of our ancestors to build because our Republican Senators empower Democrats to spend money we don't have, have to borrow to get, and cannot afford to pay back.

During 2015 and 2016, the House worked hard to address America's challenges. Over 500 of our bills never got so much as a single Senate floor vote. All that work wasted.

The Senate filibuster rule is not in the Constitution. It is not a Federal law or statute. It exists solely at the discretion of the Senate majority.

President Trump understands the filibuster rule and that it threatens the President's entire legislative agenda. On May 2, President Trump urged our Republican Senators to end the filibuster rule, stating: "Change the rules now to 51 percent."

On May 30, President Trump reiterated: "The U.S. Senate should switch to 51 votes immediately and get healthcare and tax cuts approved fast and easy. Dems would do it, no doubt."

President Trump's pleas have fallen on deaf ears. Exhibit A in this murder trial is an April 7 letter to CHUCK SCHUMER, of all people, and MITCH MCCONNELL that lists the accomplices, those deaf ears, who are killing the conservative agenda, the Republican agenda, and President Trump's agenda.

The letter states: "We . . . urge you to . . . preserve existing rules, practices, and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation before the United States Senate. . . . We are united in our determination to preserve the ability of Members to engage in extended debate when bills are on the Senate floor."

Each Senator on exhibit A empowers CHUCK SCHUMER and the Democrats to kill President Trump's agenda. Remarkably, even an Alabama Senator supports killing President Trump's agenda.

Mr. Speaker, Republican Senators claim we need the filibuster to play de-

fense when Democrats control the Senate. I submit that claim is myopic and shortsighted. In the past 90 years, Republicans have not had a single filibuster-proof Senate, while Democrats enjoyed filibuster-proof Senates in the 1930s, the 1960s, and in 2009. In those years, Democrats passed ObamaCare and forced great society welfare programs on us that busted our budgets, destroyed the work ethic, broke up American families, and threatened America with a national insolvency.

Over the long haul and because of the filibuster, Democrats force their leftist, socialist policies down America's throats, while Republicans never have the power to reverse the damage done.

That is the Senate filibuster legacy.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out. America's future is at stake. Now is not the time to play procedural games. I agree with President Trump.

Senate: End the filibuster.

VOTE ON LIFESAVING LEGISLATION

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise, yet again, to beg this House for action. Let us have a vote on lifesaving legislation.

Just this weekend, 57 Americans were shot in just one U.S. city. Tragically, 11 of them passed away, including a 10-year-old boy and a revered community activist who worked to create jobs for at-risk kids.

The violence did not take a rest after the weekend. On Monday, 13 more people were shot and 3 were killed.

Mr. Speaker, what are we doing here?

People, Americans, American kids are dying every day in every community, in every State, in every district, yet this House, the people's House, continues to do nothing.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Why is that?

Well, I think greed and dollars.

My 101st victim I want to share with you is Gustavo Garcia, who was 10 years old. Mr. Speaker, Gustavo would have turned 11 next month. He would have started fourth grade at Arnold Mireles Academy next month. Instead, he was murdered in the back seat of an SUV by an assault weapon, a weapon of war that this House has allowed to be legal and spill blood on our city streets.

These weapons have one purpose: killing people. They are not for sportsmanship. They are not for personal defense. They are for theaters of war. They are designed to devastate, maim, kill, and destroy. That is why assault weapons were banned from our streets until this House, poisoned by NRA dollars, allowed the bill to expire.

Mr. Speaker, Gustavo Garcia was 10 years old. He had an entire lifetime ahead of him. Mr. Speaker, the operative word in that sentence is "had." Now he has become "Dollar NRA No. 101."

\$102, William “Willie” Cooper, who was 58 years old. Willie was working to change Chicago and give our children a future. He founded the Lilydale Outreach Workers for a Better Community and helped mediate more than 50 conflicts that could have turned deadly.

Willie was everything you could want in a neighbor, a community leader, and a friend. He was kind, concerned about others in his community, someone who truly loved all of his fellow men. Now he is “\$102.” He was assassinated also with an assault weapon in front of the nonprofit he founded to help young people find jobs.

Time and time again I hear from the other side of the aisle that work is transformative, it gives people purpose and direction in life. I could not agree more.

Mr. Speaker, nothing stops a bullet like an opportunity. What Chicago needs is jobs for our young people, not guns flooding from States like Wisconsin and even the Vice President’s home State of Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, it is about jobs. So I join Senators DICK DURBIN and TAMMY DUCKWORTH to introduce three pieces of legislation directly targeted to support at-risk youth and the amazing businesses that take a chance on them to change their lives. To date, these bills have simply been referred to committee.

Mr. Speaker, when is the agenda of this House going to turn to the actual issues devastating American families?

This Congress has voted to allow companies to poison our air and water. We passed a bill that stripped 23 million Americans of their health insurance. We even passed a bill that lets dangerously mental ill people buy a firearm. Shameful.

We have not had one single debate, not passed one bill, nothing, zero, zilch, to save American lives. I guess some things just aren’t worth the price.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF COLONEL THOMAS KUNKEL

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colonel Thomas Kunkel, who retired on July 10, 2017, as the commander of the 23rd Wing at Moody Air Force Base, near Valdosta, Georgia.

Colonel Kunkel has served in the United States Air Force for over 20 years, and he has logged nearly 3,000 hours of flight. As commander of the 23rd Wing, he led over 5,000 airmen spread over four bases throughout the country.

An example of his extraordinary leadership and bravery occurred when one of his fellow airmen was shot down behind enemy lines during the Kosovo conflict in 1999. Colonel Kunkel bravely led a successful mission to rescue the missing pilot that was shot down by a missile.

Colonel Kunkel was also a part of the Air and Joint Staffs in Washington, D.C., that serve as advisers to the President of the United States.

He was stationed all over America, in addition to his time abroad in Iceland and Qatar, defending the freedoms we all greatly enjoy.

I am proud to rise today to honor Colonel Kunkel for his leadership, his commitment to our country, and his commitment to our airmen. Colonel Kunkel will now begin service in the Secretary of the Air Force Legislative Liaison Office here in Washington, D.C. I wish him all the best.

HONORING ERNIE LEE, STATE OF GEORGIA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Ernie Lee, who was named the 2016 Teacher of the Year for the State of Georgia.

Mr. Lee is a dedicated U.S. Government, civics, and history teacher to his students at Windsor Forest High School on Savannah’s south side.

After being named as Georgia’s Teacher of the Year, Mr. Lee was a finalist for National Teacher of the Year.

Before becoming a teacher in 2008, Mr. Lee practiced law for over 20 years. You can clearly tell through his demeanor and passion that he discovered his true calling when he began teaching.

Mr. Lee is currently working as a fellow at the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, D.C., studying the State of Georgia’s historical relationship with Indian Nations, specifically the Supreme Court case, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*.

His research during the fellowship is centered around writing and publishing lesson plans on the topic. I can’t thank Mr. Lee enough for his dedication to Georgia’s students and his ability to inspire them to learn about history and government.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF JAMES P. BURNS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. James P. Burns of Warner Robins, Georgia, who passed away on April 31, 2017, shortly after celebrating his 100th birthday.

Mr. Burns used his 100 years to make his country and his community a better place to live. Mr. Burns served in the Army Air Corps and the United States Air Force from 1940 to 1960, fighting for his country during World War II and the Korean war.

After being honorably discharged from the Air Force, Mr. Burns worked another 16 years for the Department of Defense before retiring at Robins Air Force Base in Georgia.

Upon his retirement from the DOD, Mr. Burns and his wife, Lucille, dedicated their lives to helping fellow members of the south Georgia community. In his 20 years, Mr. Burns volunteered over 14,500 hours at the Houston Medical Hospital. When he wasn’t volunteering for the hospital, Mr. Burns could be found helping seniors do their

taxes or transporting food for the local food bank.

I am proud to recognize Mr. Burns’ life today and his dedication to the community. He will certainly be missed.

TASK FORCE ON DENYING TERRORISTS ENTRY INTO THE U.S.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the liberation of Mosul from the Islamic State the other week was a major victory for the Iraqi people and for the United States, which supported the operation.

But to achieve victory in our broader mission of destroying radical Islamic terrorism and keeping the American people safe, we must confront some tough questions about the road ahead.

As chairman of the Task Force on Denying Terrorists Entry into the United States, I am concerned about the degree to which jihadists and foreign fighters threaten our homeland and our ability to meet these threats.

□ 1030

We know that Iraqi fighters are concealing their identities and fleeing with groups of refugees, many to Europe. These returning fighters have learned to make dangerous weapons, have gotten battlefield experience, and are successfully training young people susceptible to radicalization. We know our visa waiver program, which allows many European citizens to travel to the U.S. without a visa, provides a window of opportunity for these determined terrorists to exploit.

Confronting these threats lies in our ability to quickly and effectively vet and screen travelers, share sufficient intelligence with our allies, and act on credible threats when identified. And the threats are real.

Between 100 and 250 ideologically driven foreigners are thought to have been smuggled into Europe between 2014 and 2016. These foreign fighters pose a greater threat to the West than ever before; and for the sake of our national security, it is a threat we cannot overlook, and it is a threat we must work together to confront. Nothing can be put ahead of the safety and security of the homeland.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN PUSHING BACK AGAINST RUSSIA

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not as a Republican or a Democrat, but as an American. If we can really find a way to cut through the media circus surrounding the debate about Russia in the past few weeks, I think it would reinforce for all of us that whatever our political differences, our country must always come first.

Those who would destroy our way of life do not wear the jersey of one political party or another. The only laundry

they wear is the flag of their nation, whose interests they will advance regardless of domestic American politics.

And make no mistake, Mr. Speaker: Russia, under Vladimir Putin, is not our friend. He is on no one's team but his own.

There are concrete steps that we in Congress can take to push back against Russian aggression both here at home and overseas. To start with, we must pass sanctions on Russia and Iran. The Senate passed a sanctions bill 98-2 just 1 month ago. We need to do the same. No more excuses. We need to vote immediately.

Most of all, Congress must reclaim its long-neglected role in foreign policy. Russia is not and will never be a partner in Syria. It has supported and enabled the Assad regime's genocidal war while focusing much of its military campaign against U.S.-supported rebels.

At the same time, the growth of Iranian power has deepened the sectarian atmosphere off which ISIS thrives. ISIS and Iran are two sides of the same coin of religious fundamentalism.

To advance our long-term interests in Syria and in the Middle East, we must cease outsourcing our foreign policy to our adversaries, and we can no longer cede a sphere of influence to the Russians and the Iranians.

We here in Congress have a constitutionally mandated role to play. True, we have been derelict in this duty for decades, but we now have an opportunity to reclaim our authority.

As part of a congressionally led campaign to push back against our adversaries, we should revisit the underlying authorities that are allowing us to conduct lethal activities around the world. We need to pass a new Authorization for Use of Military Force to put our efforts against ISIS, against al-Qaida, against all of their affiliates and anyone else who would seek to challenge our interests on the strongest legal footing possible. We can't just sit on the sidelines. The part of passive spectator is unworthy of this great body.

We must lead when it comes to both enhancing our defenses against attacks and pushing back against Russian or Iranian aggression abroad. To do otherwise would be to abdicate our responsibility to our constituents, to our Nation, and to the oath we all took to protect this country.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-EN JACKSONVILLE SOLDIER, MARINE SERGEANT JOSEPH MURRAY

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Marine Sergeant Joseph Murray, who paid the ultimate sacrifice on July 12, 2017, when a KC-130 military transport plane crashed in the Mississippi Delta.

Sergeant Murray had lived in Jacksonville, Florida, since he was 10 years old and was a military dependent whose father was in the Navy for over 20 years. He was a Sandalwood High School graduate in the class of 2009, and joined the Marines that same year. He was stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

Sergeant Murray was promoted three times in the first 3 years he was in the Marine Corps, and he was very proud of his two deployments to Afghanistan. He told his father he wanted to be a grunt instead of an intelligence officer because "that is the hardest thing to do." He died as a member of a special operations team, where his closest friends were the fellow marines who served next to him.

Sergeant Murray was a proud husband and father, with four children: a 5-year-old son, a 3-year-old daughter, and 1-year-old twin boys.

He met his wife, Gayle, the same year he joined the military, and he was a family man who loved to serve others. Gayle said that he would do anything for his family and loved to play his guitar for them. She said: "What he wanted most in the world, besides his family's happiness, was to destroy evil on Earth."

His father, Terry, stated the only thing stronger than his commitment to his family was his commitment to his church. In fact, he was known to hum praise and worship songs when he was on patrol, and his fellow servicemembers looked to him as a faith leader. A fellow marine mentioned: "When Joseph stopped that humming and singing praises, they took the safeties off their weapons because they thought something was up. All was well when Joseph was with them."

His father said: "The city of Jacksonville should be very proud to have had his son come from here."

I can attest today for the citizens of northeast Florida that we are very proud, very proud and honored to have had Sergeant Murray defending our freedoms. Sergeant Murray's dedication to his faith, family, and nation will always be remembered.

May God bless and keep you and your family.

Semper fi, Sergeant Murray.

A TOO-MUCH-IS-NOT-ENOUGH MENTALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the problem with TrumpCare.

The problem with TrumpCare is a too-much-is-not-enough mentality: a too-much-is-not-enough mentality that would cause some to be willing to sacrifice the needy to satiate the insatiable desires of the greedy; a too-much-is-not-enough mentality that would allow some to rob the needy of healthcare to reward the rich with

wealthcare—a too-much-is-not-enough mentality.

This too-much-is-not-enough mentality exists at a time, Mr. Speaker, when the very wealthy are doing very well in this country:

The big banks are banking big bucks. The healthcare industry is quite healthy. In fact, last year the industry's net income was up \$13.1 billion. That is 46 percent.

CEOs are doing quite well. The top 10 percent CEOs are raking in millions, annually. Let's look at the number one person on the top 10. This person had an income of \$98 million, up 499 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I don't begrudge people from making money. I don't begrudge people from making a lot of money. I do think that they should all pay a fair share of taxes on that money, however. Some of them pay carried interest, which is not the ordinary income tax that other people are paying.

Mr. Speaker, the too-much-is-not-enough mentality not only impacts the way people view healthcare, but it also impacts people who are making minimum wage. Juxtapose the person who made \$98 million last year with the person who is making \$7.25 an hour.

By the way, all minimum wage workers are making \$7.25 an hour except those who are in the service industry, and they make even less. \$7.25 an hour, the minimum wage has not been raised in a decade, more than 10 years. CEOs get raises of millions, annually.

Mr. Speaker, the too-much-is-not-enough mentality is keeping wages down, causing those at the top to make more and creating a chasm between the top and the bottom, and the middle as well; and in so doing, we have created a class ceiling—a class ceiling.

Those who are in the working class are not making enough to make ends meet. At \$7.25 an hour, you cannot afford to take care of a family. At \$7.25 an hour, you can barely manage to take care of your needs, and you cannot afford healthcare.

Those who would take a trillion dollars out of healthcare, those who would reward the rich with billions of dollars as a result, those who would do it so that they can go on to a tax plan where they will cut even more, those who would do this, Mr. Speaker, have a too-much-is-not-enough mentality. It seems that they believe that the poor can do more with less, and that the rich need more to do more.

I refuse to support TrumpCare. I will not support anything developed along the lines of too much is not enough.

HONORING THE 106TH RESCUE WING OF THE NEW YORK AIR NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 103rd Rescue Squadron, a unit of the 106th Rescue

Wing of the New York Air National Guard.

Commanded by Colonel Michael Bank, the 106th Rescue Wing is based out of Gabreski Airport in Westhampton Beach, located in my home district, and has a long and distinguished history of service.

In October 1991, during the storm that was depicted in the major motion picture "The Perfect Storm," an HH-60 and tanker from the 106th Rescue Wing flew to an endangered sailboat about 250 miles south of its base.

After survival gear was dropped onto the vessel, they began their return to base. However, braving incredibly severe weather conditions, the HH-60 was forced to ditch 60 miles south of base in the Atlantic Ocean. All but one member of the crew was rescued by the United States Coast Guard cutter Tamaroa.

In addition, in 1998, the 106th Rescue Wing carried out the longest overwater rescue mission in an HH-60. Members of their wing were also on scene at Ground Zero during the 9/11 terror attacks.

Then, most recently, this past April, the heroic members of this squadron saved several lives when an explosion occurred on a Slovenian cargo ship. These brave airmen took immediate action when called upon to offer desperately needed medical assistance.

On April 24, the cargo ship Tamar was rocked by an explosion in the forward bulkhead, which resulted in the immediate death of one individual and severe burns for three other crew members, one who, sadly, perished prior to the team's arrival. 1,300 miles off the coast of Cape Cod at the time of the explosion and holding a crew of over 20 men, the situation looked dire for the injured members of this crew.

Boston Rescue Coordination Center was initially contacted for help, who reached out to two Canadian vessels in the area. However, these ships were 12 to 24 hours away, at the very least, and did not possess the necessary medical capability. It was then that the 106th Rescue Wing was called into immediate action to save those lives aboard the vessel.

Less than 2 hours after the request was made by the Coast Guard, this seven-member crew, led by Major Sean Boughal, boarded a C-130 Hercules aircraft from the 102nd Rescue Squadron, also a part of the 106th Rescue Wing, to begin the search and rescue. Following a 5-hour flight and superb airmanship by the C-130 crew, the seven-man PJ team executed a complex night parachute insertion of equipment and personnel into the water and then made their way to the stricken vessel.

After making it onboard, the 103rd Rescue Squadron PJ team provided advanced medical care for the next 2 days until a Portuguese rescue helicopter could hoist the team off and airlift the injured seamen to a higher level of medical care. If not for the brave actions of this rescue wing, there could

very well have been a greater loss of life upon that vessel.

Mr. Speaker, these pararescuemen risked life and limb to save these crew members and have more than earned our respect and admiration. Today I would like to honor Major Edward Boughal, Technical Sergeant Jordan St. Clair, Major Marty Viera, Senior Master Sergeant Erik Blom, Master Sergeant Jed Smith, Staff Sergeant Bryan Dalere, and Senior Airman Michael Hartman for their lifesaving efforts on April 24.

□ 1045

Not only today, but every day, men and women, like those in the 106th Rescue Wing, put themselves on the line to protect us, our families, and our communities. It is so important that we continue to give our support to our Nation's defenders and provide every needed resource for these heroes. All Americans should be very proud of the 106th Rescue Wing and their continued legacy of remarkably answering the call to duty.

RECOGNIZING KIDSPACE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize KidsPeace, which is a private charity dedicated to assisting children and adolescents experiencing emotional, behavioral, and social challenges in Pennsylvania. Founded in 1882, KidsPeace provides a comprehensive range of residential treatment programs, accredited educational services, and a variety of foster care and community-based treatment programs to help people in need overcome challenges and transform their lives.

Last week, I had the privilege of meeting Dominick DiSalvo and Patrick Slattery, advocates of KidsPeace Foster Care in Doylestown in my district, where they work with families affected by the opioid epidemic.

Through the power of family living, kids who have emotional and behavioral challenges learn to participate in healthier relationships with adults, experience healthy family functioning, witness positive parenting styles, participate in community life, and learn social skills through positive role modeling.

I am proud of the efforts of KidsPeace to help Bucks County's youth receive the information and treatment they need to become healthy adults. KidsPeace reminds us that we can all make a difference in the life of a child.

HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I received this

message from a very respected businessman in Knoxville, Randy Greaves.

He wrote:

I just received a letter from Humana stating that they are leaving the State of Tennessee next year.

This leaves no one to write individual health policies in the State. Aetna only writes group policies, and they may withdraw, as well. Please let anyone with a vote know that families are being failed miserably, as you already know.

The insurance that Humana wrote for my family, in 2017, required that we pay the first \$37,000 between premiums and the deductible before insurance would contribute only 50 percent.

It was basically worthless, and now they won't even make that lousy policy available because people on subsidies, mostly with no personal accountability for their own health, cost a fortune to the rest of us.

ObamaCare may have helped 20 million people, but it has hurt 200 million people in the process.

About a month ago, The Irish Times, the largest newspaper in Ireland, reported that they had over 660,000 people on waiting lists for healthcare. That is in a country of less than 5 million people. If you multiply that times 60 or 65, you have got the United States.

Medicare, when it started, when it was first passed, there was a CBO prediction that it would cost \$9 billion after 25 years. Instead, it cost 12 times that after the first 25 years, and now it costs six times more than that, or about 70 times more than the original estimates.

California, as liberal and leftwing as that State is, a few days ago, I read that they tried to pass a healthcare, or medical care for everyone, bill. They had to withdraw the bill because they found out that it would cost \$400 billion for the first year. If you multiply that times 10 or 11, you are talking about the whole United States. We are having trouble affording the Medicare that we have now for 14 percent of the population, so Medicare for everyone is not going to work in this country.

We took what was a very minor problem, for very few people in the mid-sixties, and turned it into a major problem for everyone so that now only Warren Buffett and Bill Gates, and people like that, multibillionaires, can afford healthcare. And the reason is, is that anything the Federal Government subsidizes, the costs just explode because you remove the incentives and pressures to hold costs down.

The American people don't want a Russian or Cuban type of medical system in this country. They don't want a totally federally run system, like they have in so many countries, with medical care that is not even a fraction of what we have.

We are still under ObamaCare today, and it is not working. These insurance companies are pulling out all over the whole country, and The Washington Times reported yesterday, or the day before, that, according to the Department of Health and Human Services, premiums went up 63 percent in Tennessee in 2017 alone.

Mr. Speaker, this system is not working. We need to move more in the direction of a free market medical system if we are ever going to hope to bring down healthcare costs for the American people with the kind of healthcare that everyone is demanding and wanting and that we want to give to them.

RECOGNIZING STEVE BANTA

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to recognize a great American patriot, Captain Steve Banta, call-sign "Slash," who will be retiring this week from his post as commanding officer of Naval Air Station Corpus Christi.

A 1991 graduate of the United States Naval Academy, where he earned a bachelor's degree in engineering, Captain Banta completed primary naval aviation training with the VT-27 Boomers at NAS Corpus Christi, and was designated a naval aviator on March 18, 1994.

His sea duty included deployments on various cruisers, destroyers, frigates to the Mediterranean, Arabian Gulf, Caribbean, Southeast Pacific, and other areas. During his deployment as maintenance officer with HSL-44 Detachment Four, they were the first in the fleet to test the Hellfire missile.

On September 11, 2001, he was deployed on the USS Carl Vinson with Carrier Group Three. During the first 4 months of Operation Enduring Freedom, he coordinated the daily schedule of more than 40 helicopters in 16 different aviation units. In 2009 and 2010, he served as commanding officer of the world famous HSL-48 Vipers. During his tenure, they earned multiple awards for tactical and retention excellence.

Captain Banta's shore duties includes tours as a Seahawk helicopter flight instructor, as an analyst in the Pentagon for the Navy's role in Operation Enduring Freedom, and as the lead country program director for Afghanistan with the Defense Security Cooperation Agency.

He earned a master's degree in national security strategy at the National War College in 2011.

Captain Banta assumed command of Naval Air Station Corpus Christi on June 26, 2014. During his tour, improvements in infrastructure, program management, and quality of life resulted in numerous awards, including Department of Defense Fire Department of the Year, Fire Department National Accreditation, SECNAV Gold Award for Energy and Water Management, and CNO Shore Safety Award. The Wingspan Newspaper was ranked number one in the Navy, and the base was on the A-list for outstanding customer satisfaction in family housing, and more.

Captain Banta has been an invaluable asset to the Navy, south Texas, and the

United States. I wish him and his wife, Sarah, a Corpus Christi native, best of luck as he moves into civilian life and begins his new job as executive director of the USS Lexington Museum on the Bay. Thank you, Captain Banta, for your service.

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 53 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

Chaplain Marshall Dunbar, Christian Community Action, Lewisville, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, thank You for the opportunity You have given me to stand before the men and women of this House, who have the awesome responsibility of governing this great Nation. Help them to come together in unity, for Your Word reminds us that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

So believing You know what we have need of before we even ask, together we offer this prayer as taught by Your Son, Jesus Christ:

Our Father, which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on Earth, as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

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.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DEUTCH 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 CHAPLAIN MARSHALL DUNBAR

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak in honor of our guest chaplain, Marshall Dunbar, of Cross Roads, Texas.

Chaplain Dunbar is the vice president of Spiritual Life and interim vice president of Programs for Christian Community Action, one of the largest private nonprofits in north Texas. He has an extensive record of service to our country and the north Texas community, including years in active military service, law enforcement, and homeland security.

Chaplain Dunbar was commissioned into the United States Army Reserve Chaplain Corps as a chaplain candidate in 2011, beginning his chaplaincy career at the VA Hospital in Dallas. In 2014, he ended his military career as a first lieutenant.

Chaplain Dunbar holds a B.S. in ministry and leadership from Dallas Christian College and a master of divinity in chaplaincy from Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary. He is currently working toward his doctor of ministry degree in Christian leadership and spiritual formation at Dallas Theological Seminary.

I am grateful to Chaplain Dunbar for his service to north Texans and the American people. It is a true pleasure to have him here in the House, along with his wife, Melinda, and daughter, Elle-Simone. We are grateful for his service and we welcome him to the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING HARVE MOGUL

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in great admiration of Harve Mogul, who, for more than a quarter century, has served as the CEO of United Way of Miami-Dade.

Through its many successful programs in education, financial stability, and health, this wonderful organization strives to create a stronger Miami.

Harve has been dedicated to public service from a young age, serving as a teacher in the Peace Corps and working at several United Way chapters across our great Nation. In 1991, he took on the great task of leading the Miami chapter, where he arduously worked to broaden the organization's advocacy and philanthropic efforts.

Throughout his tenure, Harve has spearheaded many campaigns, including a national event to advance the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, of which I am proudly a council member.

Harve is now ready for a new chapter in his life. He will be stepping down from his CEO position, but he will continue to advance the goals of this noble organization.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our community and the many individuals who have been positively impacted by Harve's contributions, I want to say thank you to my friend, "mi amigo." He is an inspiration to us all. Good luck and Godspeed to Harve Mogul.

AMERICAN SOLUTION TO HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has failed to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, or the ACA.

As the President said: Healthcare is hard.

As Democrats, we didn't receive Republican votes to pass the ACA, but it is the law of the land.

Our job as Members of Congress is to fix laws that are not effective. Let's work as Members of Congress not to do a Republican fix or a Democratic fix. Let's work together as Americans to find the American solution to our healthcare problems. That is what our Founding Fathers and our constituents expect from us.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Captive Nations Week.

In 1959, Congress authorized and requested the President proclaim the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. During this week, we stand united with those who still live under the rule of communist regimes as they

continue fighting against this oppression and lack of human rights. You have my word that I will continue to fight along with you.

As a way to educate current and future generations about the ideology, history, and societal impact of communism, the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation was authorized in 1993 by a unanimous act of Congress.

In honor of this foundation, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 57, which expresses the sense of Congress that establishing a museum in memory of the victims of communism is an important step in educating Americans about the human rights violations committed by these totalitarian regimes and telling the whole story of 20th century history.

This museum would honor the memory of the heroes who resisted communist tyranny and commemorate America's more than half a century of efforts resisting Soviet imperialism.

I ask my colleagues to join me during Captive Nations Week in recognizing and supporting victims of communism by cosponsoring H. Con. Res. 57 and bringing the truth to light.

BUDGET FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, many of us are engaged in the budget process today.

A budget for Americans should be the playbook for improving the quality of lives for all Americans. Yet this draconian budget, which is worse than the Trump budget, cuts \$250 billion-plus out of quality of life issues for Americans. It cuts education, healthcare, Medicaid, Medicare, and the environment, undermining the fight against climate change.

Where is the relief for the American people?

We have the fact that wages are slow in growing. Mr. Speaker, corporate America is doing well, and all that is needed, as some corporations have already done, is to raise the salaries of Americans.

We also need to make sure the government does what the American people need, to shore up the Affordable Care Act, but not cut billions from it. Shore up national defense, but not cut from diplomacy and engagement in peacekeeping activities, as well as USAID. Shore up America's national security. Give a quality of life to our young people so that jobs are created.

How do you do that?

You do that, Mr. Speaker, by ensuring that the climate and quality of life issues are there for corporations to grow. Growth is important for the American people, not draconian cuts to leave Americans without healthcare, without good climate, and without education. We want a budget for the American people.

SAVING PRECIOUS WELFARE DOLLARS

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

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, sadly, rural Maine is ground zero for the opioid epidemic in America.

Every day, on average, Mr. Speaker, one fellow Mainer dies from an overdose. Sixty percent of our families are impacted one way or another from this scourge.

For years, Mr. Speaker, law enforcement officials in Maine have found electronic benefit transfer cards, or EBT cards, at drug busts. Every month, these EBT cards are replenished with food stamps and other welfare benefits intended to help disadvantaged families. But too often these valuable cards are used to buy drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this has got to stop. I have found a commonsense way to do that. My Food Stamp Integrity Act permanently disqualifies anyone convicted of drug trafficking from receiving food stamps. This will help make sure limited welfare benefits are saved to compassionately help moms and dads put food on the table for hungry kids.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3151 will require able-bodied adults without dependents, between the ages of 18 and 50, work at least 20 hours per week, job train, or perform community service in order for taxpayers to help them out with food assistance.

Mr. Speaker, similar reforms in Maine have helped lift thousands out of poverty and into independence and better lives through employment. We have plenty of jobs available.

My bill will help save precious welfare dollars for the disabled, elderly, sick, and the poor. It will also help stop deadly drug trafficking and treat taxpayers better.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3151 is a Maine commonsense solution to a national problem. I ask everyone in this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats, to vote for it.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER ON HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have threatened to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act for 7 years, but earlier this week, they failed again to deliver on this threat. So next week, the Senate will vote on a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act without a replacement.

If this bill were to pass, 32 million people will lose their health insurance, insurance premiums will go up, and insurance markets will unravel. That is exactly why this bill will not pass. But MITCH MCCONNELL and the Republican leadership are going to have a vote anyway.

What is the point?

The American people are sick and tired of Washington failing to get things done. It is time—in fact, well past time—for Republicans to stop going it alone. All of us came here to serve our constituents, but that is not going to happen unless Republicans are willing to work in good faith with Democrats to make the necessary improvements to the Affordable Care Act.

If we work together, none of us will get everything we want, which is true, but our constituents will finally get the progress they have been waiting for, and that is much more important.

ROLLING BACK FEDERAL REGULATIONS

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a rebounding community in the Eighth District of Indiana.

Sullivan County, Indiana, is located in central western Indiana, along the Wabash River. It is home to roughly 21,000 proud, hardworking Hoosiers. The local economy relies on manufacturing and the coal and transportation industries.

In the first 6 months of this new administration, we have worked with the Trump administration to roll back the aggressive, job-killing Federal regulations of the last 8 years that have devastated this area of the country. The agenda we have set forth of less regulation and lower taxes is breathing life into our local economies and communities like Sullivan, Indiana.

As of May 2017, the unemployment rate in Sullivan County is at a 27-year low, sitting at 3.3 percent. Just a year ago, the unemployment was 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue to work on behalf of the American people, I am hopeful this trend continues.

□ 1215

RUSSIAN CYBER ATTACKS

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, inaction from this House leaves us open to Russian cyber attacks against our democracy, and the numbers tell the story.

Sixteen months since Russians attacked, this House stands mute. Eleven months since all four major U.S. intelligence agencies confirmed Putin's direct involvement, and we have done nothing.

Eight Russians and Trump advisers met to discuss illegal Russian Government assistance to the Trump campaign, 3 hours of face-to-face meetings between President Trump and Putin, one of those hours with absolutely no accountability to the American people,

and 98 out of 100 Senators voted in favor of new Russian sanctions 34 days ago.

And finally zero. Zero action from this House to fight back. Zero show of bipartisanship that mirrors our Senate counterparts. Zero votes on the House floor to send the sanctions bill to the President.

Mr. Speaker, if you allow us to vote on this bill, it will pass with overwhelming bipartisan support. And if you do not allow us to get Russia sanctions to the President's desk and put the pressure on him to sign it, you and the rest of this majority in the House will carry the weight of our failure to stand up to Russia back to your districts in August, and no one will understand how it is that you show weakness when it is strength that is required in the face of Russian aggression. That is what America expects and deserves.

RECOGNITION OF ELI BOROCHOV

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize a little known role model, Eli Borochoy, a 22-year-old young man from Cedarhurst, New York.

While on a trip to Israel with his family in 2015, Eli was praying during a Shabbat service at the Cave of the Patriarchs in Hebron. While praying, Eli was targeted by a pair of Arab snipers and was shot twice in the leg. Thankfully, after emergency surgery and a lengthy rehabilitation, Eli has recovered.

After the terrorists were apprehended and put on trial, Eli was called upon to speak in court, which meant he had to face his shooters in person. While addressing the court, Eli displayed conviction and character well beyond his years.

As Eli mentioned in his statement, the only reason he was targeted was the fact that he was practicing his Jewish faith. I commend Eli for standing tall in the face of violence and showing great courage. He is a role model.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the most basic rights that serves as the cornerstone of our democracy, and that is freedom of speech, freedom of expression for all Americans guaranteed in the First Amendment in our Bill of Rights. It is the freedom of press; it is the freedom of assembly; it is the freedom to petition.

This morning, I joined with several fellow Members of Congress and other Americans to exercise this First Amendment freedom in a demonstra-

tion outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence, the same place where members of Turkish President Erdogan's security forces attacked 11 peaceful Americans who were exercising their freedom of speech on May 16.

This morning, we stood together to demand the protection of the freedom of expression. We stood together to say that we will never stop fighting for those basic freedoms that are enshrined in our Bill of Rights and protected by our Constitution.

Americans have fought for over 241 years and shed blood to protect our basic freedoms that we hold most dearly. As Supreme Court Justice Cardozo stated in 1937, freedom of expression is "the indispensable condition of nearly every other form of freedom" that we cherish in our country.

CELEBRATING ST. CLOUD FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the St. Cloud Federal Credit Union for being named one of the top 150 workplaces in Minnesota by the Minneapolis Star Tribune.

The companies selected were based off of a survey done by Workplace Dynamics, which measured the employees' opinions on engagement, organizational health, and overall satisfaction at their company. This is a wonderful achievement for the St. Cloud Federal Credit Union as Workplace Dynamics surveyed nearly 70,000 employees throughout Minnesota to come up with these results.

For every company, no matter how big or small, the employees are the key to securing success. The hard work they put in every day is critical, so it is imperative that management ensures they feel both valued and respected.

I want to congratulate everyone at the St. Cloud Federal Credit Union on their incredible teamwork, and I especially want to congratulate management for creating a great workplace for their employees. Your company and employees will continue to thrive due to your leadership. Keep up the good work.

STANDING UP FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let the American people know that my message is standing up for hardworking American people; standing up for hardworking American people to have the healthcare that they deserve and that they have with the Affordable Care Act; standing up for the American people so they can have equal voting rights and not have a sham voting rights commission that

President Trump has developed; standing up for American people so they can have an investment in jobs and in their communities; standing up for the American people against Trump's budget; standing up for the American people so we can keep Medicaid; standing up for the American people so we can make sure that they have healthcare, that they have jobs, that we don't cut Medicaid and the safety net programs that allow us to have hardworking Americans supporting their families.

AWARENESS FOR TYPE 1 DIABETES

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness for the issue of type 1 diabetes across America.

As co-chair of the Congressional Diabetes Caucus on the Republican side with my good friend, DIANA DEGETTE, on the Democratic side, this is an issue I care deeply about. We must work together to find ways to address this disease to improve the lives of families that are dealing with this each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, my family is one of these families. My son, Will, at 17 years of age, has been fighting this disease 24/7, 365 days a year since the age of 4.

This young girl, Kennedy, I had the honor to meet with and is representing my district here in the congressional workshop being put on by Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation. She showed me the scars on her fingers where she has to poke her fingers six to seven times a day, Mr. Speaker, to control her blood sugar and monitor it on a regular basis.

She is a true inspiration to all diabetics across the Nation and should be an inspiration to each and every one of us to tackle this disease in a way that will improve lives for generations to come.

APPRENTICESHIP GRANTS BUDGET CUT

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, last February, President Trump had CEOs from America's largest manufacturers to come and talk about progrowth tax policies. Instead of talking about taxes, what they really talked about is the real need out there, which is to close the skills gap in this country and get the job training out there so that people can get hired.

USA Today reported the next day with the headline: "U.S. factory CEOs to Trump: Jobs exist; skills don't." In the 2017 budget, the bipartisan budget, Congress listened, and we appropriated robust funding for apprenticeship pro-

grams, for youth job training programs, and for adult, older incumbent job training programs.

Incredibly, a few minutes ago, the partisan Republican budget cut apprenticeship grants to zero, from 95 million from last year to zero. Mr. Speaker, better skills means better wages and better jobs. We should be investing strongly in job training programs so that people will have a future for themselves and their families.

We should listen to the job creators in this country. We should listen to the people back home, and we should reject this Republican budget which incredibly turns the clock back so that we can fill the job openings that the Labor Department says now total almost 6 million jobs in this country. Close the skills gaps. Invest in job training.

HONORING C.J. AND DAVE DUNKLEE

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize C.J. and Dave Dunklee, founders of The Healing Box Project. Mr. and Mrs. Dunklee are serving our Nation's veterans through providing guitar lessons at the Truman VA Hospital in Columbia, Missouri.

The Healing Box Project came to life at the Truman VA Hospital a couple of years ago. C.J. and Dave provide guitars, picks, and lessons to disabled veterans in order to help them ease the wounds that so many of them are facing.

These weekly lessons provide an outlet for veterans to use the joy of music to heal their souls. Weekly, they provide these lessons for up to 50 veterans. C.J. and Dave provide the fundraising through their 501(c)(3) nonprofit to pay for the supplies and lessons needed to help this project succeed.

I am thankful for their efforts to provide services to our Nation's heroes who have so graciously given service to our great country.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to take this opportunity to recognize C.J. and Dave for their efforts on behalf of our Nation's veterans. I am blessed to represent them in Congress and wish them continued success with this very special project.

HONORING MARYAM MIRZAKHANI

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of Maryam Mirzakhani. Maryam was born and raised in Iran where she was the first female on Iran's International Mathematical Olympiad team, winning gold medals in 1994 and 1995, and was the first Iranian woman elected to the National Academy of Sciences.

She moved to the United States to attend graduate school at Harvard Uni-

versity and became a 2004 research fellow of the Clay Mathematics Institute and a professor at Princeton University. In 2008, she became a professor at Stanford University. In 2014, Maryam was the first woman ever to be bestowed with the most prestigious mathematical award, the Fields Medal, for her outstanding contributions to the dynamics and geometry of Riemann surfaces and their moduli spaces.

The Fields Medals are awarded every 4 years to people aged 40 or younger. Maryam was an amazing mathematician, socially engaging, and involved in the local community. Maryam Mirzakhani died last week at the age of 40, a tragedy not only for her family and friends but for the additional beautiful mathematics she would have given the human race had she been blessed with a long career.

HONORING MONSIGNOR JOHN MCSWEENEY

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Monsignor John McSweeney, priest of Charlotte's St. Matthew Catholic Church, the largest Catholic parish in America, who retires this week after more than 40 years of ministry.

He was actually the first priest ordained in what was then the new Charlotte Diocese back in 1974. Monsignor McSweeney is committed to the principle of servant leadership and of helping each member of his parish find their special God-given role in life and in the church.

Despite his very public role, he often reminds folks that Jesus is the star of St. Matthew, not the priest. Monsignor McSweeney has another motto: "You never say no to Jesus."

And so, still listening to Jesus at age 75, Monsignor McSweeney is retiring from America's largest Catholic parish to move on to Haiti or Jamaica to live among the poor and minister to their needs.

May God bless Monsignor McSweeney in this next phase of ministry.

□ 1230

AFGHAN ALL-GIRLS ROBOTICS TEAM

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the all-girls robotics team from Afghanistan for taking home the silver medal at this weekend's FIRST Global Challenge.

I speak on behalf of my colleagues who travel on our annual bipartisan trip to Afghanistan when I say that these girls are the embodiment of our

hopes and dreams for the future of their country. We have learned on our trips that nothing is more important for global security than the development of human capital, and what better example could there be than these remarkable girls.

I want to echo the sentiments of Afghanistan's First Lady and say to the girls, "Saar Bolan demoom kar deen," literally, "You make us hold our heads up high." We are proud of you.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that, when these girls were born, women were not allowed to get an education in Afghanistan. Now, because of the bravery of these girls and the tireless efforts of their teachers, the rest of the world can now see how remarkable Afghan women truly are.

Congratulations on your remarkable achievement.

CHIEF JAMES CARMODY, WYOMING, MICHIGAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, MICHIGAN POLICE CHIEF OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a humble public servant and someone, frankly, I am proud to call a friend, Chief James Carmody of the Wyoming, Michigan, Police Department, who was recently named Michigan Police Chief of the Year.

Jim Carmody began his career in 1975 as a police officer in Port Huron, Michigan, where he rose to the rank of deputy chief. In 2006, Jim made the decision to join the Wyoming Police Department as chief and call west Michigan home.

Chief Carmody has led the charge to strengthen the relationship between police officers and the community that they serve, while providing the residents of Wyoming, Michigan, with top-notch law enforcement.

Chief Carmody's relentless commitment to public safety doesn't end there. He also chairs the Michigan Police Chiefs' Traffic Safety Committee and was recently appointed to serve on the Governor's Traffic Safety Commission.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Second District of Michigan, I congratulate Chief Carmody on being named the top Michigan Police Chief for 2016. We thank him for his 42—and keep counting—years of service to Michigan and to our Nation.

CONGRATULATING VIRGIN ISLANDS WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM, AND THANKING RAKEEM CHRISTMAS AND THE CHRISTIANSTED HILLSIDERS

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate the Virgin Islands women's basketball team on winning the gold medal at the 2017 Centrobasket Championship and finishing the tournament with a 4-1 record. They beat out teams from Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean.

I particularly want to congratulate Natalie Day, who was named MVP, with a tournament double-double average, 18.6 points and 11 rebounds per game.

Good luck to the Virgin Islands women's team at the FIBA Women's AmeriCup 2017 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. We are rooting for you.

I also want to congratulate another Virgin Islander, Rakeem Christmas, who, for the last 2 years, has played center for the NBA's Indiana Pacers.

I want to thank Rakeem for returning home to St. Croix repeatedly and hosting a series of youth events, and for opening a basketball court funded by his foundation for the Frederiksted Boys and Girls Club. He and other athletes will coach basketball camps on St. Thomas and St. Croix this week, with the highlight of an all-star competition on St. Croix's Educational Complex.

Finally, to the Hillsiders, who host their annual picnic this weekend, thank you so much for continuing the tradition of the Hillsiders of Christiansted. I will be there to celebrate with you as we remember culture and family, united in pride and hope.

RISING MEDICAL PREMIUMS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago The Washington Times published a chart from the Department of Health and Human Services showing that medical premiums went up 116 percent last year in Arizona, 69 percent in Oklahoma, 63 percent in my home State of Tennessee, 59 percent in Minnesota, 58 percent in Alaska, and on and on and on.

President Obama promised, if we would pass his healthcare bill, that people could keep their plans, yet millions were forced onto ObamaCare because either their premiums went up too high or they lost their insurance altogether. He promised that the average family would save \$2,500 a year. It has been almost impossible to find any family that has saved that \$2,500.

ObamaCare has been great: great in making healthcare unaffordable for almost every family in America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2910, PROMOTING INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2883, PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 218, KING COVE ROAD LAND EXCHANGE ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 454 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 454

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-28. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2883) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for

the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 218) to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-27. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the re-

port equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 20, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 2825) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Friday, July 21, 2017, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 454, which provides a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act; H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act; and H.R. 218, the King Cove Road Land Exchange Act.

Mr. Speaker, our domestic energy industry has suffered greatly over the last 8 years under outdated regulations and burdensome bureaucratic red tape that have prohibited growth and innovation. Today's rule allows for consideration of two very important bills that will provide clear and transparent policies for our pipeline permitting processes, making them more efficient and effective so that we can fully realize the North American energy boom; create American jobs; grow our economy; and strengthen our relations with our largest energy trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

The first bill, H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for

Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, is sponsored by my colleague, Mr. FLORES of Texas.

□ 1245

This bill reinforces the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's role as the lead agency for siting interstate natural gas pipelines by directing it to identify and invite all agencies considering an aspect of an application to establish a schedule for concurrent reviews, and to impose deadlines for final decisions.

Recent advancements in energy exploration have allowed companies to tap into previously inaccessible natural gas reserves, leading to a dramatic increase in domestic production. The increased supply has lowered energy costs and increased demand for natural gas.

As a result, current U.S. pipelines are now operating near capacity, making new pipelines necessary to deliver gas to consumers across the Nation, especially to those in the Northeast and Midwest, where demand for energy is high, but where they lack the infrastructure to deliver domestic natural gas. Additionally, due to its abundance and affordability, many manufacturers are beginning to rely on natural gas as a primary fuel.

Unfortunately, the permitting process for new pipelines is arduous and unnecessarily burdensome. Currently, when siting a pipeline project, multiple permits are required, including permits under the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Clean Air Act, for example. According to the Government Accountability Office, the average processing time from pre-filing to certification for interstate natural gas pipelines has been 558 days. We cannot afford to wait that long, Mr. Speaker.

It is critical that we expand and modernize our Nation's pipeline infrastructure to ensure the access to affordable energy and affordable prices for consumers across the country. In order to do this, we simply must promote timely and efficient reviews as well as coordination among Federal, State, and local regulators. This bill accomplishes these goals, and I support its passage.

The rule we are discussing today also provides for consideration of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN). This bill creates a uniform and transparent process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international transfers of oil, natural gas, and electricity imports and exports.

The bill directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to review cross-border oil and natural gas pipelines and the Department of Energy to review cross-border electric transmission facilities, requiring the relevant official to issue a certificate of crossing, unless it is found not to be in the public interest.

Recent advances in technology, Mr. Speaker, have dramatically increased our ability to harness our vast natural resources, but the current ad hoc permitting process has inhibited energy producers from exporting American-made energy to our international trading partners and has significantly delayed recent proposals, such as the Keystone XL pipeline.

The value of energy traded between the United States and its North American neighbors exceeded \$140 billion in 2015, with \$100 billion in U.S. energy imports, and over \$40 billion in exports. We simply cannot afford to gamble our energy security and competitiveness on an inefficient permitting process.

Today's rule, Mr. Speaker, also allows for consideration of H.R. 218, the King Cove Road Land Exchange Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). This bill authorizes an equal value land exchange to facilitate the construction of an 11-mile road linking the remote city of King Cove and the city of Cold Bay, which has a modern airport. The State of Alaska will transfer approximately 43,000 acres to the Department of the Interior to add to the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge in return for 206 acres of Federal lands to build the road.

This road is critical, Mr. Speaker, because harsh winter conditions make transporting individuals in the remote King Cove community of nearly 1,000 people dangerous and sometimes fatal: gale-force winds ground planes and prevent sea travel; evacuations can take days; and the hovercraft terminal and medical facility that Congress temporarily provided funds for, in lieu of land for the road, ceased operation in 2010.

The King Cove community has been denied proper hospital care and access to essential emergency services since they began fighting for this road 40 years ago, and that, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable.

Ensuring these folks have ground transportation options for accessing the regional hub at Cold Bay, especially during harsh winters, is vital to the safety of this community in emergency situations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I encourage support for the rule for these important bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today would put some of our most sensitive lands at risk and limit the voices of experts, all to further construction of dangerous projects that could harm local communities.

First, H.R. 2883 undermines the National Environmental Policy Act and tips the scales in favor of massive, controversial oil and gas pipeline and electric transmission projects. Transboundary projects like this often travel for hundreds of miles, last for decades,

and pass through sensitive and Native lands and important aquifers. And, as we all know, pipelines leak.

That is why there is currently a rigorous Federal review process that takes into account the impact of these projects on the environment and the communities along their route.

Today, in order to construct an oil pipeline, a natural gas pipeline, or an electrical transmission line that crosses the U.S. border with Canada or Mexico, a Presidential permit must first be obtained, as well as additional approvals from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—FERC—the Department of Energy, or the Department of Defense, depending on the type of pipeline.

This review process helps us to understand the environmental impact of these projects and it allows communities and landowners along the route to weigh in with their concerns. All of this helps to keep communities safe from hazardous substances that, if spilled or ignited, could have catastrophic consequences. Yet the majority is proposing this measure to severely limit that rigorous review.

The bill effectively exempts these massive projects from environmental and safety review under the National Environmental Policy Act. It narrows the approval process and environmental review to just the "cross-border segment" of projects that physically cross the border with Canada or Mexico rather than, presently, the entire trans-boundary project. So inside the United States, anything goes.

Instead of requiring an agency to affirmatively find a project is in the public interest, the bill also places a burden of proof on the opponents of the project to show that it is not in the public interest. If that wasn't bad enough, the legislation would also give new life to the controversial projects that have already been denied, for very good reason, by allowing permits to be resubmitted under this sham process.

Second, H.R. 2910 would supercharge the natural gas pipeline approval process, putting private property rights in jeopardy and hindering important environmental reviews.

The bill gives the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission almost complete authority and severely limits the input of expert entities tasked with protecting the environment, our natural resources, and public health.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind those watching today just how streamlined the natural gas pipeline approval process already is. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is basically a rubber-stamp entity. It almost never denies a pipeline project. On average, 88 percent of projects are approved within 1 year, and then we think about the consequences later.

In fact, FERC officials have testified that what is mostly slowing down the applications is that the applicants themselves fail to submit the necessary information to perform congressionally

mandated project reviews. So this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

Third, H.R. 218 revives an ill-advised proposal to build a road to the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge and its world-class wetlands.

This proposal has been, as pointed out for a number of decades, rejected by multiple State and Federal agencies on numerous occasions over the past 30 years. It has been exhaustively studied time and time again, and, every single time, the results have been clear. The road is not the most viable option for the residents of King Cove and would do irreparable damage to the refuge.

Yet the majority is ignoring three decades of expert analysis and public input in an effort to green light this damaging road through a congressionally designated wilderness area. More efficient and viable options exist, including the addition of a heliport and construction of a new airport, which we should be focusing on because a road is the wrong approach.

Mr. Speaker, we all know this, but I think we do need to be reminded from time to time that we are the stewards of our environment and this planet and the land only while we are alive. None of us ever really own it. We do, however, have an obligation to protect it, care for it, and make sure that it exists for future generations. These bills fail that test.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), my friend and colleague, and the sponsor of H.R. 218.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I listened to people on the other side. This is a good rule. I want to compliment the Rules Committee.

It is crucially important to recognize that this is an issue that means lives: 19 people have died out of that community of King Cove—mothers, children, husbands, brothers, uncles, and aunts—because they didn't have a road.

We passed legislation similar to this in 2009 that granted a land exchange—and was a massive land exchange—of 43,000 acres for 260 acres from the State of Alaska to construct this road. I think that is a fair exchange for an 11-mile road—single lane, gravel covered—just so they have access to save lives.

Those who speak against it have never experienced the wind that howls through that area when you try to land a plane or take off, you have a sick person with you, and you crash. Or go across the bay when waves are 30 feet high, and the evacuation of those ill people to an area that is only 11 miles away on an unfinished road and they die. Human beings, Alaskan constituents, that have medical aid only 600 miles away and stopped by 11 miles that is not allowed because supposedly there is a better way. And there is no

better way than a road in the weather condition I am speaking of.

When you think about it, I often listen to the other side of the aisle in voting against something like this, yet they will defend the right to save certain animals, but they don't want to save human life. That is wrong.

This is a good project. It should be built. I am hoping this body recognizes that lives are important and recognize the fact that this road doesn't disturb any of the wildlife. It is ironic that they will say it is going to disturb the geese that live off of eelgrass. The closest road that comes to this one bay is 11 miles away—11 miles. And the same area as this wildlife range has miles of road in it already, miles of road already in place. One of those roads already in place goes right by the lagoon where the tourists go watch the geese.

Now, why can't a tourist go by an area and watch the geese and it doesn't disturb them, but if someone is sick, dying, in a bus, ambulance, car, or truck, that is going to disturb the geese?

This is a nonsense argument by environmental communities around this Nation that want to put a stop to anything that benefits mankind and save the wildlife, say from New York or San Francisco, and don't know what they are talking about.

□ 1300

My job is to protect my people. This is not going to cost the taxpayers a nickel. This is going to be a project that is well done, and it will not disturb the wildlife they are so-called trying to protect.

So I ask my colleagues on this floor to think about humanity. Think about that person, be it your mother, your daughter, your son, your aunt, your uncle, your brother, and you would want to see them die because they are trying to protect a goose?

Shame on you. Shame on those who vote against this bill, saying: This is more important—I live in New York or California. This goose is more important than human life.

I think it is time we use a little sense in this body, a little understanding. Let's build this road. Let's pass this bill.

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative PASCRELL of New Jersey's Bring Jobs Home Act, H.R. 685. This bill will close the tax loophole that rewards companies from moving jobs overseas, while providing a tax credit to companies that move jobs back to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and spokesman for the other side.

Before I give my remarks, I don't think this is an either/or proposition, Mr. Speaker. Some of the things that my friend from Alaska just talked about make sense. There is nothing more essential than life. But this is a bill that has been put in with other bills as well. So I rise in opposition to the rule, Mr. Speaker.

This week, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade held our first hearing of the year, which was on NAFTA. You would think, from the President's rhetoric on trade, that many on the other side in Congress would be focused on creating good-paying, middle-class jobs and boosting our manufacturing base. You would think that. But, instead, we are here debating a bill, a number of bills, that are an assault on private property rights and the environment in the name of corporate profit and expediency.

Lo, what happened in 1923 that led to a change in our Tax Code when we tried to privatize public property and public resources. It was the biggest scandal of the 20th century.

Where are the jobs that were supposed to be coming back from overseas under this administration? Where are the higher middle class wages? Where are the policies coming from this Congress that support workers and their families?

The majority of Americans, Mr. Speaker, agree that keeping United States jobs from moving overseas should be a top priority. Yet, despite the empty promises made by this President, the flow of jobs overseas has not stopped by any barometer.

This administration has awarded government contracts to companies that continue to offshore our jobs. Think about that. Our tax money is still going to corporate America that sends jobs overseas to help those companies send jobs overseas. Now, if that makes any sense, I will listen to the rationale.

We don't stop companies from offshoring American jobs by holding rallies. We do it by making good policy, an exercise this administration and this majority-led Congress have refused to engage in. If they want to change that, they can start right now.

Under current law, when companies move overseas, we give them a tax break for the cost—a tax break. That is the law.

We need to stop offshoring now. The Congress can defeat the previous question and bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act. This bill eliminates this tax deduction and gives a tax credit of up to 20 percent of the cost to United States

businesses that bring jobs back to the United States of America. The companies would have to add jobs to claim the credit.

I have also introduced legislation, the Jobs and Trade Competitiveness Act, that builds on the Bring Jobs Home Act and further strengthens enforcement against countries that cheat our trade laws.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. I encourage my colleagues to look at it.

So let's stop subsidizing companies that ship jobs overseas and start bringing jobs back to our shores. It doesn't get much simpler than that, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a new idea. President Obama and Democrats in Congress have raised this bill for years. The Republican House has blocked our bill at every turn. Senator STABENOW of Michigan leads this bill in the Senate, where it cleared a procedural vote in 2014, 93-7.

President Trump has declared this week Made In America Week. I challenge you today to stop the small talk and put your money where your mouth is. Take up and pass this bill to stand up for American manufacturing and the workers here at home who need it.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act and start bringing jobs back to the United States.

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

I share my colleague's dedication to job creation, and what we know is that the kind of job creation we need in this Nation can only come with access to reliable, affordable sources of energy. Our fossil fuels in this country are a national treasure, and these bills that are being considered under this rule today are bills that would help to streamline the regulatory process.

We have been, Mr. Speaker, really facing a war on fossil fuels during the course of the last 8 years. We have seen these industries targeted, completely unfairly targeted, based on some notion that, by shutting down our fossil fuel industry, we are somehow going to be able to continue to have economic growth. We have seen the environmental officials of the previous administration even admit before this body that things like the Clean Power Plan would result, if fully implemented, in a negligible impact on the environment.

So, again, I think that it is important to recognize that it is at the center of the agenda that we are pushing forward, frankly, with historic progress in this Congress to begin to generate the kind of economic growth that we really need to get back on track.

We have been stagnant now for 8 years. We have seen overreach from the Federal Government. We have seen a situation in which companies, industry, individuals, and small businesses are strangled by regulatory red tape.

No one is suggesting that there shouldn't be oversight. No one is suggesting that there shouldn't be environmental review, but what we know is we have got to streamline it.

We cannot be in a position where bureaucrats—and, frankly, it is often unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.—impose absolutely unattainable restrictions, impose rules that our industry can't meet and prevent us from being able to have access to our own energy sources. Again, it is that reliable, affordable energy that will allow our economy to grow and bring back the jobs that the gentleman says, and to which I agree, are so important for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to speak on behalf of H.R. 2910, Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, and the potential impact it could have on our Nation.

Right now, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, is the lead agency for coordinating required reviews and authorizations for interstate natural gas pipelines. In order to start a pipeline project, you need multiple permits from a variety of platforms as well as coordination from Federal, State, and local governments.

As history has shown us time and time again, a multistep approval process just does not work. Mixing three different levels of government has and always will be a recipe for total disaster. It makes for unnecessary delays that are caused by too many cooks in the kitchen.

I fully support my friend and colleague Representative BILL FLORES' bill that will promote more timely and efficient reviews. We need to strengthen FERC's lead agency role that it was designed to create accountability and transparency.

Overall, this bill will encourage more timely and efficient reviews and keep energy prices affordable for all Americans. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

In God we trust.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can take up the legislation that has just been outlined by Mr. PASCRELL.

There is no more responsibility that we have than creating good-paying jobs for the American people; and this is, after all, according to President Trump, "Make It in America" Week, which, in fact, is a centerpiece of the Democratic agenda. We have a number of bills that are designed to help rein-vigorate and strengthen American manufacturing.

It is shocking for the American people to learn that we have a Tax Code, as Mr. PASCRELL outlined, that gives a tax break to companies that ship American jobs overseas, exactly the opposite of what it should be if we are really concerned about creating good-paying jobs here in our own country. So defeating the previous question means we could take up the stop offshoring now legislation, which would get rid of this nonsensical provision in our Tax Code.

When you go out there and talk to constituents, you say: One of the reasons we can't keep good manufacturing jobs here in America is because we incentivize, we use some of your tax dollars to incentivize companies to ship those jobs overseas. It makes no sense.

So how about, during "Make It in America" Week, rather than just using that phrase, as the President has done, let's do something that will actually help promote making things in this country—I know, probably a challenging concept for the President, who does his manufacturing overseas, not in the United States.

Let's take a bold step today. Remove that provision of the Tax Code, and have a Tax Code provision that actually incentivizes creating jobs in our own country and giving tax credits to companies that create jobs in America. What a novel idea.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can take this piece of legislation up, and perhaps it will then encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to move forward on a number of bills that are part of the Democratic Make It in America agenda to help rebuild American manufacturing and put people back to work in good-paying jobs.

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

I understand that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to talk about energy. They don't want to talk about fossil fuels. They don't want to talk about how important these are to the economy.

I would propose, Mr. Speaker, maybe what we should do is turn out the lights in this Chamber. Maybe we ought to turn off the air conditioning, Mr. Speaker, and we could have the debate in the dark, which is where we would be, frankly, if we followed the energy policies in the approach of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

These bills are hugely important, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we are able to continue to get access to the energy that we need; and it is crucially important that we not skip over the burden that has been caused by the Federal Government, by the regulatory burden we have been feeling, and that we take action, as is our responsibility, to begin to help to roll back that over-reach, to begin to help to provide some relief so that we can, in fact, get the jobs back that our colleagues say they

desire so much and that we know we need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be recognized by the gentlewoman from Wyoming, and I rise in support of this combined rule that we have here.

I thought it was important that I speak to some of the provisions that are in the underlying bill and also the provisions that are not in the underlying bill.

□ 1315

I would characterize this rule, that is the rule for the reauthorization of the Department of Homeland Security—it is actually the authorization. It has never been authorized in that fashion before—the authorization of Homeland Security after 15 years. I think that it does a lot of good things in that it lays out a definition and frames the duties of the Department of Homeland Security broadly and pretty closely in their entirety.

There are some things that are missing from this that I would like to have plugged into this reauthorization language. However, I believe the goal was, all along, to draft a piece of reauthorization language that would be, I will say, compatible to both sides of the aisle and without particular dissent.

Therefore, we have a piece of legislation that isn't as impactful as I would like, and yet it is here on the floor under suspension with the idea that we can move this along and frame the Department of Homeland Security's duties in the fashion that is here.

I don't object to the provisions that are in the authorization language that exists, but I would point out that it sets the stage, and now there is an agreement that has been reached through a number of entities, including the White House, the DOJ, the DHS, and I understand from our leadership and others, that soon there will be the piece of legislation that we refer to as Davis-Oliver.

In Davis-Oliver, we actually have the enforcement provisions that are necessary to restore the respect for the rule of law, and especially the domestic enforcement of our immigration laws.

We are setting the stage for that and clearing the path for that with this rule on the legislation that will pass, I believe, under suspension.

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

Ms. CHENEY. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The provisions that are necessary that I would point out to the body, Mr. Speaker, are this:

The number one most important is this: We only have 5,000 ICE agents for 50 States and territories. They are spread so thin they can't possibly enforce immigration law. We need that number tripled. That is 10,000 ICE agents. That is the most important component of this to have the officers to bring that enforcement.

Second thing is we need to make sure that the ICE detainer language is there and in Davis-Oliver. That is something that had been neutralized by an action of the Obama administration, and they need to be certain that they have the full authority to carry firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I make these points so that the body can anticipate what is coming down the pike. I intend to support the rule and the underlying bills, and I intend to be here on the floor advocating all of the components of Davis-Oliver, also including the components I have articulated here today.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the American people may be scratching their heads wondering why, with everything going on in the world, we are prioritizing bills that put our environment at risk—bills the Senate may never take up.

Let me remind them that the majority is just doing the bidding of an administration that has shown a complete disregard for air, water, and land. The administration has already proposed a budget that would slash the Environmental Protection Agency by 32 percent. This would harm not only conservation and climate efforts, but thousands of jobs nationwide.

As a microbiologist, I know firsthand the importance of science in our legislative process, yet the majority has refused to give science and facts their rightful place in policy debates that we have.

From drastically reducing funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, and by discrediting climate change, to attempting to eliminate safeguards for our genetic privacy, the majority and this administration have worked hand in hand to ruthlessly roll back the scientific advancements that we have made.

It is shameful that we are here today considering bills that would silence experts and risk the health and safety of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question on the rule and the bills, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I am proud to be here, and I am proud of the agenda that we have taken up under the Republican leadership in this Congress. We are indeed doing the important work that the people sent us here to do.

So far, just a list of some of the things that we have done in the first few months of this Congress: We have taken the first step in our obligation to repeal and replace ObamaCare, a system that is absolutely failing, that is causing rising premiums. It is causing people to lose their insurance all across the Nation, a system that will collapse if we don't fix it. We, the House Republicans, have taken important steps in order to begin the repeal and replace process of ObamaCare.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have passed a bill to repeal and replace Dodd-Frank, legislation that was strangling our local community banks across the country. We have taken a step to begin to fix that and provide relief.

We have also dealt with important immigration issues and taken important action in terms of passing legislation to end human trafficking.

I am very proud, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, of the work that we have done to pass the National Defense Authorization Act to begin to rebuild our military and get the military the resources it needs so that it can defend us against a growing array of threats and a very complex array of enemies across the Nation.

We have also, Mr. Speaker, taken important steps using the congressional review action process to repeal regulations put in place over the last 8 years that have been damaging to our industry, to individuals, to small businesses all across the Nation.

We have been historically productive, and it may be that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't agree with the steps that we have taken, but it is simply not accurate to say we aren't focusing on what is important. We are focusing on those issues that matter most to the men and women across this Nation that will begin to make sure we can keep everybody safe, begin to make sure we can defend ourselves, begin the process of reforming our outdated and burdensome tax code, as well, Mr. Speaker, as ensuring we bring back the kind of economic growth we know we need and fixing our healthcare system.

These bills that we are debating today, the rule for these bills, are part of that process. I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. YOUNG, for their hard work on this legislation.

In Wyoming, which is one of our Nation's largest energy-producing States, we know how important it is that we work to develop our domestic energy resources. We know the technology that has been available that has helped us do that, that has helped us begin to, for the first time ever, have energy independence that has really helped us begin to have the kind of economic growth we need.

We cannot depend just on that technology. We also have got to improve the permitting process, Mr. Speaker. Improving the pipeline permitting process by promoting the kind of timely review, supporting interagency coordination, and creating a new and streamlined system for safety that will help us to transport our energy exports and imports are all crucial steps in our ability to ensure affordable energy and economic growth.

The other bill that we are considering under this rule, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 218, will provide a desperately needed road, as you heard my colleague Mr. YOUNG explain, to improve the safety and well-being of the residents

of King Cove, Alaska, and save lives, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, I urge adoption of both the rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 454 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 685) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 685.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately disclose his tax return information to the House of Representatives and the American people.

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed his tax return information to the public;

Whereas, the chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means, Joint Committee on

Taxation, and the Committee on Finance have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

Whereas, pursuant to Article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, often referred to as the Origination Clause, the House of Representatives has the sole authority to initiate legislation that raises revenue for the national government, and the Committee on Ways and Means is considering a comprehensive reform of the Tax Code;

Whereas, President Donald J. Trump holds interests as the sole or principal owner in approximately 500 separate business entities, and the President's tax plan proposes to cut the corporate tax from 35 percent to 15 percent, applicable to many of these entities;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses, has instead placed his assets in a trust which is run by his adult children, and the President can withdraw profits from his trust at any time of his choosing from any of the companies he owns;

Whereas, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, Walter Shaub, resigned on July 6, 2017, stating that "There isn't much more I could accomplish at the Office of Government Ethics, given the current situation. O.G.E.'s recent experiences have made it clear that the ethics program needs to be strengthened";

Whereas, according to media reports analyzing President Trump's leaked 2005 tax return, had his own tax plan been in place, he would have paid an estimated 3.48 percent rate instead of a 24 percent rate, saving him \$31.3 million in that year alone;

Whereas, without access to the President's tax returns, the American people cannot determine how much he will personally benefit from proposed changes to the Tax Code or from policy decisions he makes, nor can the American people fully understand the financial interests and motivations of the President;

Whereas, in June 2017, President Trump filed an updated financial disclosure with the Office of Government Ethics which showed that the President reported \$37.2 million income from the Mar-a-Lago resort between January 2016 and April 2017 where he hosted the President of China and from where he ordered missile strikes against Syria;

Whereas, during the same time period, President Trump reported \$288 million in income from all his golf courses, including \$19.7 million from his course in Bedminster, New Jersey;

Whereas, over the weekend of July 14, President Trump sent out eight tweets promoting the U.S. Women's Open Golf Tournament which took place at his Bedminster club;

Whereas, Mar-a-Lago doubled its new member fees to \$200,000 immediately following the 2016 election, and President Trump personally benefits from such new member fees;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns would help those investigating Russian interference in the 2016 election and assist them in better understanding the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation, Russian businesses, and Russian individuals;

Whereas, in 2013, President Trump said, "Well, I've done a lot of business with the Russians. They're smart and they're tough," and President Trump's son, Donald Trump, Jr., told a news outlet in 2008 that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets";

Whereas, President Trump fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James

Comey, who was overseeing an investigation into ties and any collusion between the Russian Government and President Trump's campaign;

Whereas, former Director Comey testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that President Trump asked him to "let go" of an investigation into former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn's business ties to Russia;

Whereas, President Trump stated on May 11, 2017, that he had decided that he was going to fire Comey because of "this Russia thing";

Whereas, at the G-20 Hamburg summit on July 7, 2017, President Trump took a more than 2 hour closed-door meeting with President Vladimir Putin, after which he claimed that he "strongly pressed" President Putin on Russian interference in U.S. elections and that it is "time to move forward";

Whereas, on June 9, 2016, then-Candidate Trump's son, Donald Trump, Jr., then-Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort, and Trump son-in-law and current White House adviser Jared Kushner met with a person described as "a Russian government attorney," and a former Russian military intelligence officer who promised to offer incriminating information about Hillary Clinton which had been collected as part of a Russian Government effort to assist President Trump in his campaign for President;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means has in the past used the authority under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means has now voted three times along party lines to continue to conceal President Trump's tax returns;

Whereas, the House of Representatives has now refused ten times to act on President Trump's tax returns;

Whereas, the Committee on the Judiciary has failed to conduct even basic oversight on the connections between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign;

Whereas, the Committee on the Judiciary has now voted twice along party lines to decline to request documents detailing the Trump administration's ties with Russian officials;

Whereas, the House of Representatives undermines its dignity and the integrity of its proceedings by continuing the cover-up of President Trump's tax returns: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return and return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as well as the tax return, and return information with respect to the President's businesses, of each business entity disclosed by Donald J. Trump on his Office of Government Ethics Form 278e, specifically each corporation and each partnership, within the meaning of subchapter K of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, where he is listed as an officer, director, or equivalent, or exercises working control; and

2. Postpone consideration of tax reform legislation until the elected Representatives of the American people in this House have obtained President Trump's tax returns and return information to ascertain how any changes to the Tax Code might financially benefit the President.

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island wish to present argument on the parliamentary question of whether the resolution

presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution raises the question of the privilege of the House pursuant to rule IX, clause 1, as it affects, “the rights of the House collectively, its dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings,” insofar as it raises the House’s failure to undertake its constitutional responsibility of oversight and the obligation of all elected officials to ensure decisions are made free of conflicts and with the public interest in mind.

In particular, matters related to the House’s constitutionally granted powers have been recognized as valid questions of the privileges of the House. The Origination Clause that requires that revenue bills originate in the House includes the issues related to revenues generated by our Tax Code.

Clearly, the issues raised by this resolution cover these matters contemplated by the Origination Clause. There is nothing more of a threat to the integrity of the House than ignoring our duty to provide a check and balance to the executive branch.

To restore the dignity of the House, we must use our authority to request President Trump’s tax returns and give the American people the transparency they deserve.

The stunning conflicts of interest are piling up as the President, his family, and his friends profit in their personal business endeavors while serving in public office. President Trump has not divested himself from his businesses as was recommended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman’s remarks must be confined to the question of order.

Mr. CICILLINE. I understand, Mr. Speaker. My point is, in order to rule on this, it is important for the Chair to understand that the severity of the questions with respect to the integrity of our proceedings are undermined because of the potential conflicts of interest and the lack of information about the tax returns and related materials of the President.

So you can’t make an argument about the rights of the House collectively, its dignity, and the integrity of the proceedings without understanding the presence, the evidence of the conflicts of interest, of the potential foreign entanglements, of the self-dealing that tax returns would reveal and help illuminate.

You also can’t protect the integrity of our responsibilities as a check on the executive branch without understanding that we have a responsibility to examine these financial interactions, the influence of the Russians, and interfering with our elections, the firing of Director Comey, the secret meetings between the President’s campaign.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is again reminded to keep his

remarks confined to the question of order.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I understand the ruling of the Chair with respect to confining my remarks. These remarks, in fact, relate directly to whether or not this resolution, which seeks the production of the President’s tax returns, relate to “the rights of the House collectively, its dignity, and the integrity of the proceedings.”

What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that in order for the House to fulfill its responsibilities, its constitutional responsibilities of oversight, and check and balance on the executive branch and to faithfully honor our responsibilities under the Origination Clause that says the House is the place that revenue generation must begin—and we are contemplating a reform of the Tax Code—in order to do that, free from the potential conflicts of interest, the House and the American people have a right to know what are the real interests of President Trump, where are his investments, what are the tax policies, will they benefit him, or will they benefit the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman to confine his remarks to the question of order. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Rhode Island seeks to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

In evaluating the resolution under rule IX, the Chair must determine whether the resolution affects “the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.”

The first resolving clause of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island seeks tax returns and tax return information of the President and certain of his business entities.

Section 702 of the House Rules and Manual states that “rule IX is concerned not with the privileges of the Congress, as a legislative branch, but only with the privileges of the House, as a House.”

As the Chair most recently ruled on June 21, 2017, a resolution offered under rule IX seeking information from actors entirely extramural to the House—such as the President and certain business entities in which the President may be involved—is not uniquely concerned with the privileges of the House, as a House.

Accordingly, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island does not constitute a question of privilege under rule IX.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Cheney moves that the appeal be laid on the table.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 454;

Adopting House Resolution 454, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 190, answered “present” 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

YEAS—235

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Farenthold | LoBiondo |
| Aderholt | Faso | Long |
| Allen | Ferguson | Loudermilk |
| Amash | Fitzpatrick | Love |
| Amodel | Fleischmann | Lucas |
| Arrington | Flores | Luetkemeyer |
| Babin | Fortenberry | MacArthur |
| Bacon | Fox | Marchant |
| Banks (IN) | Franks (AZ) | Marino |
| Barletta | Frelinghuysen | Marshall |
| Barr | Gaetz | Massie |
| Barton | Gallagher | Mast |
| Bergman | Garrett | McCarthy |
| Biggs | Gianforte | McCaul |
| Bilirakis | Gibbs | McClintock |
| Bishop (MI) | Gohmert | McHenry |
| Bishop (UT) | Goodlatte | McKinley |
| Black | Gosar | McMorris |
| Blackburn | Gowdy | Rodgers |
| Blum | Granger | McSally |
| Bost | Graves (GA) | Meadows |
| Brady (TX) | Graves (LA) | Meehan |
| Brat | Graves (MO) | Messer |
| Bridenstine | Griffith | Mitchell |
| Brooks (AL) | Grothman | Moolenaar |
| Brooks (IN) | Guthrie | Mooney (WV) |
| Buchanan | Handel | Mullin |
| Buck | Harper | Murphy (PA) |
| Bucshon | Harris | Newhouse |
| Budd | Hartzler | Noem |
| Burgess | Hensarling | Norman |
| Byrne | Herrera Beutler | Nunes |
| Calvert | Hice, Jody B. | Olson |
| Carter (GA) | Higgins (LA) | Palazzo |
| Carter (TX) | Hill | Palmer |
| Chabot | Holding | Paulsen |
| Cheney | Hollingsworth | Pearce |
| Coffman | Hudson | Perry |
| Cole | Huizenga | Pittenger |
| Collins (GA) | Hultgren | Poe (TX) |
| Collins (NY) | Hunter | Poliquin |
| Comer | Hurd | Posey |
| Comstock | Issa | Ratcliffe |
| Conaway | Jenkins (KS) | Reed |
| Cook | Jenkins (WV) | Reichert |
| Costello (PA) | Johnson (LA) | Renacci |
| Cramer | Johnson (OH) | Rice (SC) |
| Crawford | Johnson, Sam | Roby |
| Culberson | Jordan | Roe (TN) |
| Curbelo (FL) | Joyce (OH) | Rogers (AL) |
| Davidson | Katko | Rogers (KY) |
| Davis, Rodney | Kelly (MS) | Rohrabacher |
| Denham | Kelly (PA) | Rokita |
| Dent | King (IA) | Rooney, Francis |
| DeSantis | King (NY) | Rooney, Thomas |
| DesJarlais | Kinzing | J. |
| Diaz-Balart | Knight | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Donovan | Kustoff (TN) | Roskam |
| Duffy | LaHood | Ross |
| Duncan (SC) | LaMalfa | Rothfus |
| Duncan (TN) | Lamborn | Rouzer |
| Dunn | Lance | Royce (CA) |
| Emmer | Latta | Russell |
| Estes (KS) | Lewis (MN) | Rutherford |

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski

NAYS—190

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2910, PROMOTING INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2883, PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 218, KING COVE ROAD LAND EXCHANGE ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 454) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2883) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 218) to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 192, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

YEAS—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris

Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul

McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell

Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—192

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer

Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—7

Cummings
Gomez
Huffman
Labrador
McEachin
Napolitano
Scalise

□ 1401

Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. WELCH and PETERSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Pocan | Schrader | Titus |
| Polis | Scott (VA) | Tonko |
| Price (NC) | Scott, David | Torres |
| Quigley | Serrano | Tsongas |
| Raskin | Sewell (AL) | Vargas |
| Rice (NY) | Shea-Porter | Veasey |
| Richmond | Sherman | Vela |
| Rosen | Sinema | Velázquez |
| Roybal-Allard | Sires | Visclosky |
| Ruiz | Slaughter | Walz |
| Ruppersberger | Smith (WA) | Wasserman |
| Rush | Soto | Schultz |
| Ryan (OH) | Speier | Waters, Maxine |
| Sánchez | Suozzi | Watson Coleman |
| Sarbanes | Swallow (CA) | Welch |
| Schakowsky | Takano | Wilson (FL) |
| Schiff | Thompson (CA) | Yarmuth |
| Schneider | Thompson (MS) | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------|
| Cummings | McEachin | Scalise |
| Labrador | Napolitano | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1410

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

CONGRESSIONAL GOLF TOURNAMENT

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth year I have had the privilege of chairing the Members and former Members golf tournament to benefit Warfighters Sports and Tee It Up for the Troops, two charities that work with the most severely wounded warriors. This year, we had our biggest turnout ever. We had well over 200 participants, including 35 severely wounded golfers.

When I play golf, sometimes people ask me how I did. I tell them, “Unbelievable.” It could be either way. But the most unbelievable thing happened in this tournament. Finally, after many years of losses, we Republicans decided to let the Democrats win one year. The Democrats won by 4 points, and that is out of a several-thousand point system. So it was a very close match.

I want to offer my congratulations to my co-chairman, GENE GREEN, and thank every Member and former Member who participated. We had a great turnout.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for yielding.

We are proud to accept the Speaker's trophy for winning the golf tournament. The most important thing—and you said it—is that we raised \$144,000 to go to wounded warrior and warfighter programs. Over the last 10 years, Members of Congress, on a bipartisan basis, raised over \$1 million.

JIMMY, I am just glad we were able to take this trophy home. We will see you next year.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Rules Committee has posted a Rules Committee print of the Defense appropriations bill and that this committee version does not include the language added during the Defense appropriations markup on a bipartisan basis in committee that would repeal the 2001 authorization to use force and give 8 months for Congress to do what our Constitution requires, and that is to debate and to come up with a new vote and to decide what we are going to do on behalf of our country.

Further inquiry. Members don't really quite understand this. I can't explain to Members how in the heck this body can prevent this amendment from being undemocratically stripped from this bill.

Can the Chair explain that, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appreciates the gentlewoman's inquiry but also states to the gentlewoman that it does not relate to a pending question or matter at this time.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 194, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

YEAS—234

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Comstock | Granger |
| Aderholt | Conaway | Graves (GA) |
| Allen | Cook | Graves (LA) |
| Amodei | Costello (PA) | Graves (MO) |
| Arrington | Cramer | Griffith |
| Babin | Crawford | Grothman |
| Bacon | Culberson | Guthrie |
| Banks (IN) | Curbelo (FL) | Handel |
| Barletta | Davidson | Harper |
| Barr | Davis, Rodney | Harris |
| Barton | Denham | Hartzler |
| Bergman | Dent | Hensarling |
| Biggs | DeSantis | Herrera Beutler |
| Bilirakis | DesJarlais | Hice, Jody B. |
| Bishop (MI) | Diaz-Balart | Higgins (LA) |
| Bishop (UT) | Donovan | Hill |
| Black | Duffy | Holding |
| Blackburn | Duncan (SC) | Hollingsworth |
| Blum | Duncan (TN) | Hudson |
| Bost | Dunn | Huizenga |
| Brady (TX) | Emmer | Hultgren |
| Brat | Estes (KS) | Hunter |
| Bridenstine | Farenthold | Hurd |
| Brooks (AL) | Faso | Issa |
| Brooks (IN) | Ferguson | Jenkins (KS) |
| Buchanan | Fitzpatrick | Jenkins (WV) |
| Buck | Fleischmann | Johnson (LA) |
| Bucshon | Flores | Johnson (OH) |
| Budd | Fortenberry | Johnson, Sam |
| Burgess | Fox | Jones |
| Byrne | Franks (AZ) | Jordan |
| Calvert | Frelinghuysen | Joyce (OH) |
| Carter (GA) | Gaetz | Katko |
| Carter (TX) | Gallagher | Kelly (MS) |
| Chabot | Garrett | Kelly (PA) |
| Cheney | Gianforte | King (IA) |
| Coffman | Gibbs | King (NY) |
| Cole | Gohmert | Kinzinger |
| Collins (GA) | Goodlatte | Knight |
| Collins (NY) | Gosar | Kustoff (TN) |
| Comer | Gowdy | LaHood |

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| LaMalfa | Palmer | Smith (MO) |
| Lamborn | Paulsen | Smith (NE) |
| Lance | Pearce | Smith (NJ) |
| Latta | Perry | Smith (TX) |
| Lewis (MN) | Pittenger | Smucker |
| LoBiondo | Poe (TX) | Stefanik |
| Long | Poliquin | Stewart |
| Loudermilk | Posey | Stivers |
| Love | Ratcliffe | Taylor |
| Lucas | Reed | Tenney |
| Luetkemeyer | Reichert | Thompson (PA) |
| MacArthur | Renacci | Thornberry |
| Marchant | Rice (SC) | Tiberi |
| Marino | Roby | Tipton |
| Marshall | Roe (TN) | Trott |
| Mast | Rogers (AL) | Upton |
| McCarthy | Rogers (KY) | Valadao |
| McCaul | Rohrabacher | Wagner |
| McClintock | Rokita | Walberg |
| McHenry | Rooney, Francis | Walden |
| McKinley | Rooney, Thomas | Walker |
| McMorris | J. | Walorski |
| Rodgers | Ros-Lehtinen | Walters, Mimi |
| McSally | Roskam | Weber (TX) |
| Meadows | Ross | Webster (FL) |
| Meehan | Rothfus | Wenstrup |
| Messer | Rouzer | Westerman |
| Mitchell | Royce (CA) | Williams |
| Moolenaar | Russell | Wilson (SC) |
| Mooney (WV) | Rutherford | Wittman |
| Mullin | Sanford | Womack |
| Murphy (PA) | Schweikert | Woodall |
| Newhouse | Scott, Austin | Yoder |
| Noem | Sensenbrenner | Yoho |
| Norman | Sessions | Young (AK) |
| Nunes | Shimkus | Young (IA) |
| Olson | Shuster | Zeldin |
| Palazzo | Simpson | |

NAYS—194

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Adams | Eshoo | Maloney, |
| Aguilar | Españillat | Carolyn B. |
| Amash | Esty (CT) | Maloney, Sean |
| Barragán | Evans | Massie |
| Bass | Foster | Matsui |
| Beatty | Frankel (FL) | McCollum |
| Bera | Fudge | McEachin |
| Beyer | Gabbard | McGovern |
| Bishop (GA) | Gallego | McNerney |
| Blumenauer | Garamendi | Meeks |
| Blunt Rochester | Gomez | Meng |
| Bonamici | Gonzalez (TX) | Moore |
| Boyle, Brendan | Gottheimer | Moulton |
| F. | Green, Al | Murphy (FL) |
| Brady (PA) | Green, Gene | Nadler |
| Brown (MD) | Grijalva | Neal |
| Brownley (CA) | Gutiérrez | Nolan |
| Bustos | Hanabusa | Norcross |
| Butterfield | Hastings | O'Halleran |
| Capuano | Heck | O'Rourke |
| Carbajal | Higgins (NY) | Pallone |
| Cárdenas | Himes | Panetta |
| Carson (IN) | Hoyer | Pascrell |
| Cartwright | Huffman | Payne |
| Castor (FL) | Jackson Lee | Pelosi |
| Castro (TX) | Jayapal | Perlmutter |
| Chu, Judy | Jeffries | Peters |
| Ciilline | Johnson (GA) | Peterson |
| Clark (MA) | Johnson, E. B. | Pingree |
| Clarke (NY) | Kaptur | Pocan |
| Clay | Keating | Polis |
| Cleaver | Kelly (IL) | Price (NC) |
| Clyburn | Kennedy | Quigley |
| Cohen | Khanna | Raskin |
| Connolly | Kihuen | Rice (NY) |
| Conyers | Kilmer | Richmond |
| Cooper | Kildee | Rosen |
| Correa | Kilmer | Roybal-Allard |
| Costa | Kind | Ruiz |
| Courtney | Krishnamoorthi | Ruppersberger |
| Crist | Kuster (NH) | Rush |
| Crowley | Langevin | Ryan (OH) |
| Cuellar | Larsen (WA) | Sánchez |
| Davis (CA) | Larson (CT) | Sarbanes |
| Davis, Danny | Lawrence | Schakowsky |
| DeFazio | Lawson (FL) | Schiff |
| DeGette | Lee | Schneider |
| Delaney | Levin | Schrader |
| DeLauro | Lewis (GA) | Scott (VA) |
| DelBene | Lieu, Ted | Scott, David |
| Demings | Lipinski | Serrano |
| DeSaulnier | Loebach | Sewell (AL) |
| Deutch | Lofgren | Shea-Porter |
| Dingell | Lowenthal | Sherman |
| Doggett | Lowe | Sinema |
| Doyle, Michael | Lujan Grisham, | Sires |
| F. | M. | Slaughter |
| Ellison | Luján, Ben Ray | Smith (WA) |
| Engel | Lynch | Soto |

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| Speier | Torres | Wasserman |
| Suozi | Tsongas | Schultz |
| Swalwell (CA) | Vargas | Waters, Maxine |
| Takano | Veasey | Watson Coleman |
| Thompson (CA) | Vela | Welch |
| Thompson (MS) | Velázquez | Wilson (FL) |
| Titus | Visclosky | Yarmuth |
| Tonko | Walz | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|----------|------------|--------|
| Cummings | Napolitano | Turner |
| Labrador | Scalise | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1422

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-55)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days of the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2017.

Significant transnational criminal organizations continue to threaten the safety of the United States and its citizens through the scope and gravity of their actions. Such organizations derive revenue through widespread illegal conduct and overwhelmingly demonstrate a blatant disregard for human life through acts of violence and abuse. These organizations often facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts

and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons. As the sophistication of these organizations increases, they pose an increasing threat to the United States.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to transnational criminal organizations.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 19, 2017.

PROMOTING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2910.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 454 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2910.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1426

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, introduced by my colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

I want to congratulate him for his work on this very important piece of legislation that, in fact, will streamline the permit process for the building of energy infrastructure, which will strengthen our economy, create the jobs that we want, and, in fact, in-

crease our energy security. Very important.

This bill is going to address the critical need to expand and modernize the Nation's natural gas pipeline infrastructure by promoting a more timely and efficient review.

Mr. Chairman, by establishing FERC as the lead agency, this bill is going to bring greater certainty, accountability, and transparency to the siting process for interstate natural gas pipelines. Unfortunately, many important projects have been delayed unnecessarily while waiting for permits from participating agencies, and when siting a pipeline project, multiple permits are always required, permits under the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act.

So FERC often coordinates with a variety of Federal, State, and local governments and Indian Tribes to balance a wide range of issues, including the potential impacts on environmental and wildlife resources, land use, and, of course, property rights.

This bill is going to improve the permitting process by strengthening the lead agency role of FERC in further defining the process for participating in Federal and State agencies, and the intent of these provisions is to involve stakeholders sooner so that they can be involved in the setting of the schedule and identify issues of concern earlier in the process.

Further, the legislation requires that agencies conduct their respective reviews concurrently and in conjunction with the project-related review conducted by FERC in compliance with NEPA—in compliance with NEPA.

□ 1430

To be clear, we are not skipping steps, we are just saying that one part of the process shouldn't hold up the entire project if progress can be made on other required permits.

So this bill is going to encourage more timely and efficient reviews, a more robust and reliable energy pipeline system, more affordable energy prices for every American.

Mr. Chair, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas, who has brought this bill before us through the committee process.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2910. The bill shortcuts the important review process for interstate natural gas pipeline projects, a process which already boasts one of the quickest review periods for any type of major energy project. The bill is unnecessary.

To my colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee's point when he says that too many of these projects are being delayed; to the contrary. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission testified in front of our committee

that almost 90 percent of interstate natural gas pipeline projects are approved within 1 year. This is a dangerous bill because of what it does to short-circuit safety and environmental review processes.

Now, I want to say, at the outset, pipelines can be a safe and practical way to transport natural gas. Natural gas pipelines are part of a modern energy infrastructure system—I would say that almost all Democrats agree with that—but what this bill does is it shortcuts, it overrides safety, private property rights, environmental concerns.

This is a problem, because when you look at the long list of serious accidents involving natural gas pipelines, the fatalities, the accidents, the injuries, it is just inappropriate and very poor public policy to give those natural gas pipelines a pass.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on Energy.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a wonderful colleague and a Member who has really shown extraordinary leadership on this matter and other matters that appear before this Congress and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose H.R. 2910 because it is a bill that offers a solution in search of a problem.

As FERC testified before the Energy Subcommittee just this past May, a whopping 88 percent of natural gas pipeline applications are currently processed within a year, and the number one reason for the delays in the approval process was due to applicants submitting incomplete paperwork.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 2910 does nothing to actually address the reason behind the delays, but instead will allow incomplete applications to be considered, will allow incomplete data from aerial surveys to be considered, and would minimize the input of States and agencies responsible for protecting the environment, sensitive lands, and other natural resources.

However, that said, one of the most egregious aspects of this bill is that it would actually make it easier for private pipeline companies to claim eminent domain and seize private property of hardworking American citizens.

Mr. Chair, as we have seen in the past and continue to witness today, the issue of constructing these major pipelines through aquifers, private property, cultural sites, and other sensitive lands is a topic that causes great public consternation and great public concern.

Congress should be taking into account the sensitive nature of this extremely divisive issue by listening to our own constituents, the American people, and giving them more of a voice in these very difficult decisions, rather than trying to limit their input.

Mr. Chair, to address this critical issue, both Ranking Member PALLONE, as well as my colleague, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN of New Jersey, and I offered amendments to deny private companies the right to claim eminent domain unless constructing a pipeline was found to be in the public interest, and not solely as a way for companies to turn a profit.

Mr. Chair, even though this amendment was brought up and voted down by my Republican colleagues in the Energy and Commerce Committee, it was ruled nongermane to today's discussion for some very odd, but also for some very obvious reason.

In other words, Mr. Chair, the majority party has determined that although they are pushing a bill that would make it easier for private companies to seize lands from private citizens for financial gain, Members of Congress are not allowed to take up an up-or-down vote on that issue on the floor here today.

This Congress is telling the American people: Hell, no, you won't have a voice in this. We are here operating solely in the interests of private companies for their private profit.

Mr. Chair, I can assure you that the American people will not agree with this decision to place the interests of private natural gas companies above the rights and interests of private landowners.

Congress should not make it easier for private companies to claim eminent domain and potentially negatively impact historical sites, reservoirs, farms, and other private properties while at the same time limiting the ability for States, Tribes, and local communities to provide input into the process.

Mr. Chair, why are we allowing these private companies to have eminent domain over the private property, over the land of American citizens, without any input from States on this particular matter?

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I strongly oppose this bill, and I urge all my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, there is a reason why the parliamentarians ruled that the amendments on eminent domain are not applicable here: because they are not germane. Eminent domain is not part of this bill. In fact, the underlying natural gas act requires that eminent domain proceedings, "shall conform as nearly as may be with the practice and procedure in similar action or proceedings in the courts of the State where the property is situated."

This doesn't change that, and that is why those eminent domain amendments were not made in order.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman UPTON for yielding me time in his effort to bring this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2910. Thanks to the shale revolution, America is a top global producer of natural gas, and in the past several years, natural gas has become the top fuel choice for generating electricity in our Nation.

My constituents in Texas have seen the dramatic benefits of the shale revolution and pay some of the lowest electricity costs in the Nation. For example, last April, the residential price for electricity was just over 11 cents per kilowatt-hour. However, the average price in Massachusetts was almost 21 cents per kilowatt-hour.

America's domestic energy outlook has completely flipped from scarcity to abundance, yet why do some parts of the country, primarily in the northeast, pay twice as much for electricity? There is one clear reason: some areas lack the needed pipeline infrastructure to bring natural gas to consumers.

The reason for this is that some State and Federal agencies are failing to make timely decisions on the necessary pipeline permits to deliver natural gas to consumers.

We can and we should modernize our pipeline infrastructure to match our abundant natural gas resources. Making the permitting process more efficient enables and encourages a more robust and reliable pipeline infrastructure system; that way, all parts of the country can realize the benefits of clean, affordable, and abundant natural gas.

My bill, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, builds on important permit reforms under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 by bringing greater accountability, predictability, and transparency to the process to approve interstate natural gas pipelines.

This bill requires early notification to all participating agencies, States, and Indian Tribes, and it reinforces FERC's status as the lead agency for coordination.

It further establishes a clear process for consultation and concurrent reviews among Federal and State agencies and Indian Tribes, and sets deadlines for final decisions.

Mr. Chairman, these are common-sense reforms that reduce interagency bureaucracy, and I think that we can all agree that permitting should be more transparent and more accountable.

H.R. 2910 enhances certainty for pipeline applicants, but it is important to note that this bill does not guarantee an outcome, it does not guarantee an approval on any application, and it does not change any existing environmental laws. So all the rhetoric we just heard over the last few minutes about it changing the environment is absolutely 100 percent false.

It does not change any eminent domain laws or adversely affect private property rights. So all that argument we heard a few minutes ago is false. So

we could conclude this debate pretty quickly if the other side will acknowledge the fact of what this bill really does do and what it doesn't do.

It does, however, ensure that involved agencies do their job and that they act on appropriate projects in a timely manner.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Similar provisions have passed the House as stand-alone legislation and were also included in the comprehensive energy bill that passed the House last Congress. Additionally, H.R. 2910 passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee on a bipartisan vote.

My bill enables more reliable infrastructure to deliver affordable, environmentally friendly natural gas to consumers.

This American energy resource serves as an important energy source for hardworking families and powers our economy.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2910.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I think the point on eminent domain is the fact that this bill will trample on the rights of landowners, because my colleague is correct, current law gives natural gas pipeline companies access to Federal eminent domain authority, allowing these corporations to take private property to build their pipelines. But what the bill does, it would further narrow the already few opportunities that landowners and stakeholders have for review of safety and important environmental protections.

It also would allow surveying while circumventing local permitting and without property owner consent, and that is a very significant change, because it would allow Federal and State agencies to accept aerial survey data and provides that the agencies may grant conditional approvals based on that data, and that can be unwise and unsafe. So we wanted to highlight that as a very significant concern for those Members who are concerned about eminent domain and private property rights.

Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me some time to speak on what I consider to be a very important issue.

Mr. Chair, I rise to strongly oppose H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act.

□ 1445

This industry-backed bill provides FERC with unnecessary authorities that put the interest of companies over that of the people and the environment.

The current process that FERC uses to approve pipelines is inherently flawed, genuinely threatens our green spaces, water resources, and public and private lands.

By allowing this bill to pass, we are permitting FERC to exclude the input of those who would be directly impacted in exchange for benefiting the fossil fuel industry. We need to have a more comprehensive process that considers the effects these pipelines will have on local communities, which is why I introduced H.R. 2649, the Safer Pipelines Act of 2017.

My legislation is about inclusiveness, ensuring that the voice of communities impacted by a proposed pipeline are heard loud and clear.

I have seen this problem up close.

One project before FERC is a proposed PennEast pipeline, which would run through my congressional district. The PennEast plan has been fraught by community concerns on issues ranging from potential contamination of drinking water and destruction of environmentally sensitive areas.

Despite these issues, FERC's final environmental impact statement erroneously concluded that the project would have minimal impact.

Just last month, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection rejected the construction permits due to PennEast's continuous refusal to provide simple environmental surveys and information requested by the State.

Not only does this bill severely threaten clean water in environmentally sensitive areas, it also tramples on the rights of private property owners and communities.

Jacqueline Evans of New Jersey has shared this story with us:

The farm I built with my children would be completely destroyed by the 36-inch pipe built to the weakest standards allowable.

The pipeline route is less than 200 feet from my children's bedrooms, putting them in a designated "incineration zone."

Our well, that provides water for our family and our livestock, is threatened.

PennEast has threatened me by insisting I sign a "deal" of less than 4 percent of the value of our home, or lose it through eminent domain.

PennEast's intimidation tactics include telling us that FERC will approve the pipeline with or without surveys and environmental studies that are required.

Mr. Chairman, this is unacceptable.

I offered two amendments to this bill that the Rules Committee refused to allow on the floor. One would have limited the use of eminent domain for gas pipeline projects, and the other would have limited the use of area remote surveys.

We cannot prioritize the wishes of private pipeline companies at the expense of clean drinking water, our environment and natural resources, and the rights of private owners.

So I stand here today begging my colleagues to vote for the people and to reject this bill by voting against it.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ten-

nessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman UPTON and Mr. FLORES for the work that they have done on this piece of legislation. Mr. FLORES spoke of the need to do this and why it is so important for us to begin to simplify and clean up the rules and the regulation process so that we do provide certainty not only for our constituents, but also for industry.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, what we do is to provide hope to millions of workers who work in the energy sector.

I want to read from a letter of support. This is from the International Union of Operating Engineers. They sent a letter in support of Mr. FLORES' bill, and it gets right to the heart of the issue.

"Domestic energy production provides good-paying jobs for members of the IUOE and other construction craftworkers and continues to employ thousands of our members. Uncertainty and delay during environmental reviews, however, hinder the growth of jobs related to the Nation's energy infrastructure. Congress should give FERC additional tools to keep Federal agencies accountable and maximum coordination in the permitting process."

Mr. Chairman, this is from individuals who work in this energy sector, who understand the vital importance of having a secure, safe, and stable energy supply. They are individuals who want to see growth in this industry. They also want to make certain that we do this in the appropriate way—as we have done, as H.R. 2910 does—to respect individual and private property works.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Giving FERC the authority that they need to go in and consolidate and simplify this environmental process for these interstate gas projects is the right thing to do.

Many times, what slows these projects down and causes the situation that the International Union of Operating Engineers speaks to is the fact that you have multiple permits that are required, and they are from multiple agencies and multiple levels of government. Any time you are going through that, there are more opportunities for mistakes and it is going to be more costly.

So I congratulate my colleague for a job well done, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for and support H.R. 2910.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear: I heard the comments of my colleague from Tennessee, and the Democrats do support natural gas pipelines, a very important part of our energy infrastructure.

And, as a reminder, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approves

almost 90 percent of all pipeline applications within 1 year. And if there is any holdup recently, it is because the Republican-led Senate has not confirmed an additional FERC appointee. That is holding up the process of approving more natural gas pipelines.

What we don't approve of, however, is a spill that attempts to short-circuit very important safety and environmental review processes and take private property rights away from landowners.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem.

We heard from FERC that 88 percent of projects are certified within 1 year following a completed application. It is clear that, under the existing process, these projects are moving forward without significant delays.

We have not seen good evidence that we need to further tilt the process in favor of pipeline companies, which is what the bill before us today would do.

While I am concerned about a number of provisions in this bill, I specifically want to highlight the section that would require Federal and State agencies to accept aerial survey data, such as data collected by drones, and allow these agencies to grant conditional approvals based on that data.

Aerial data have limitations and can be insufficient. These data may not account for historic sites, endangered species, or wetlands. But, under this bill, agencies would be required to consider the project.

Granting conditional permits based on inadequate data will ultimately not speed up the process, but what it does instead is circumvent the rights of landowners.

We also should be more thoughtful about changing this process, given the implications that will impact private landowners' rights.

Under the law, pipeline companies are able to use eminent domain authority, allowing these corporations to take private property to build their pipelines. This bill would further restrict the already limited opportunities that private landowners and concerned citizens have to weigh in on proposed projects.

Streamlining is fine, but we are considering expediting a process that can result in the use of eminent domain. The bar for seizing private property should be high, and lowering that bar is to the detriment of private landowners.

Historically, when considering the use of eminent domain, the question has been: Is it in the public's interest?

But this bill is forcing the question to shift to: Is it in the company's interest?

That is not acceptable to me, and it certainly isn't acceptable to the general public.

If we continue to expedite and rubber stamp these projects, consumers will be on the hook for unviable and, eventually, stranded assets.

We need to look at our energy infrastructure based on holistic, regional needs that take into account how many projects are under consideration and how it would impact existing infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2910, legislation sponsored by my friend and Western Caucus member, BILL FLORES.

One area of wide bipartisan agreement is the need to support critical infrastructure in the United States. This bill presents an important opportunity to deliver on our commitment to modernize infrastructure, grow the economy, and support safe, reliable American-made energy.

By improving agency and industry coordination, we can provide more certainty regarding the timeframe and procedures of the pipeline review process. By making these improvements, we will ensure that the energy we produce right here in America can be transported in the safest possible manner.

If my colleagues are truly serious about protecting the environment, we should be promoting American-made energy, where we know it will be produced in adherence to the highest environmental and safety standards.

This bill does exactly that by making the improvements necessary to modernize our pipeline approval process. These improvements are necessary to match the advancements in shale gas technology and increased demand for safe, reliable, and domestically-sourced energy.

While roads and bridges often get the most attention when we talk about the need for updated infrastructure, modern pipelines and other energy infrastructure are sorely needed to support our economy and power our homes and businesses.

Promoting efficient and comprehensive cooperation within our regulatory process is an effort that is not only bipartisan, but plain common sense.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for sponsoring this much-needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, when we had a hearing earlier in the year in the Energy and Commerce Committee, I assumed there was a major backlog of unreviewed applications that spurred my colleagues on the other side of the

aisle to draft this bill. But then we heard from experts from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission about this, and they testified that nearly 90 percent of these major infrastructure projects are approved in less than a year.

Many companies working to have other interstate energy projects approved can only dream of a Federal review occurring in less than a year. So this is already a very efficient process.

I would say this bill is unnecessary, it is duplicative, and it is wasteful. And I know many in the Congress here are looking for ways to eliminate government waste and duplication.

The Congress has already taken action to streamline the Federal environmental permitting review process for major infrastructure projects. Sometimes our memories are short, but it was just last Congress where Congress adopted the major Transportation and Infrastructure bill, the FAST Act. It passed in a bipartisan manner and was signed into law.

The FAST Act authorized the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council, or FPISC, to improve the timeliness, predictability, and transparency of Federal environmental review processes for these major infrastructure projects.

Now, FPISC is already getting underway. It has set up this enhanced coordination and transparency by establishing a lead agency for the project, recommends performance schedules, and public project timetables. Many of the provisions in this bill, however, seem to be largely duplicative of the activities of FPISC and what they are already doing.

FPISC is already overseeing and coordinating permitting processes for 32 major infrastructure projects, including seven interstate natural gas pipelines—just to highlight that this is an unnecessary power grab that really is short-circuiting very important safety and environmental review processes.

□ 1500

There is no problem across this country right now with getting your natural gas pipeline approved unless there is a real problem in the details of the application.

Now, I used to practice environmental law in a previous lifetime, and what I learned is, when you provide for these short-circuited processes that keep the public out, that keep other stakeholders out, what you are going to do on the back end, you are going to cause more lawsuits, more delays, rather than just adhering to the proper process, answering questions as you go along, pressing ahead, altering the route when it needs to be rerouted.

So this is a very important issue. The details really matter here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I include in the RECORD three letters in support. The National Electrical

Contractors Association has a letter of support. The National Taxpayers Union has a letter of support, as well as the National Association of Manufacturers.

NATIONAL ELECTRICAL
CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION,
Bethesda, MD, July 18, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: On behalf of the National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA), I am writing in strong support of H.R. 2883, Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act which would establish a more uniform and transparent approval process for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity. NECA also supports H.R. 2910, Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, which would help address the need to modernize the nation's natural gas pipeline infrastructure by promoting more timely and efficient reviews by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). NECA believes these critical pieces of legislation will facilitate construction projects along the United States' borders and encourage energy independence.

NECA is the nationally recognized voice of the \$130 billion electrical construction industry that brings power, light, and communication technology to buildings and communities across the U.S. NECA's national office and its 119 local chapters are dedicated to enhancing the industry through continuing education, labor relations, safety codes, standards development, and government relations. NECA is committed to advocating for a comprehensive energy policy that addresses all available opportunities for energy exploration and independence.

By establishing a more concrete process for the approval of construction projects to import oil, natural gas, and electricity, this legislation would create more jobs in the construction industry while working towards America's energy independence. Construction along the U.S. border to import oil, natural gas, and electricity will greatly enhance our nation's energy security and promote energy independence. It is clear Congress plays a critical role in streamlining the approval process and enacting policies that support approval and construction of energy infrastructure projects. The benefits of these projects are clear: job creation, energy security, energy independence, and economic growth; such construction is in the national interest. NECA strongly endorses H.R. 2883 and H.R. 2910 and believes that these bills will deliver many benefits to our nation.

Sincerely,

MARCO A. GIAMBERARDINO, MPA,
Executive Director, Government Affairs.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2017.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION VOTE ALERT

NTU urges all Representatives to vote "YES" on the following bills that would reduce regulatory burdens and promote economic growth.

H.R. 806, "Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2017": This legislation would extend the timeframe for compliance with the 2008 and 2015 ozone standards and put in place process reforms going forward. The bungled 2008/2015 revisions have created an implementation headache for many states, now tasked with simultaneously working to enact dual standards. The costs are high for states and localities—regardless of whether

they achieve attainment. Nonattainment means lost funds for highways and other essential infrastructure projects. On the other hand, reaching attainment could require limits on new construction and manufacturing production, expensive retrofitting, and oppressive new rules. Either way, jobs and investment will go elsewhere without the more feasible, predictable reforms in H.R. 806.

H.R. 2883, "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act": This legislation would streamline the archaic cross-border permitting process for energy facilities that stretch across the borders we share with Mexico and Canada. The current Presidential Permit regime is far from clear and can leave projects in regulatory limbo for years on end. Creating a consolidated and standardized approval process would increase the Congressional accountability provided for in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution, granting Congress the authority to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations," while eliminating costly regulatory hurdles that stand between consumers and low-cost energy options.

H.R. 2910, "Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act": This legislation would facilitate the timely review of natural gas pipeline permitting by clearly designating the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the lead agency responsible for interstate natural gas pipeline site permitting. This, along with other measures to increase efficiency such as providing for concurrent reviews and commonsense timetables, would help avoid duplication and other unnecessary delays. In addition, H.R. 2910 would increase transparency in the permitting process through more public disclosure, as well as create new opportunities for public input.

In general, markets crave certainty in order to anticipate where resources should be allocated. This is doubly true for the giant infrastructure and manufacturing projects these bills address. Planning, personnel, and capital all depend on a transparent, predictable, consistent regulatory process. Together, these reforms would result in increased investment in our energy infrastructure, spurring job-growth in an essential and lucrative sector of our economy, and enhancing low-cost energy options for consumers.

Roll call votes on H.R. 806, H.R. 2883, and H.R. 2910 will be included in our annual Rating of Congress and a "YES" vote will be considered the pro-taxpayer position.

If you have any questions, please contact NTU Federal Affairs Manager.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MANUFACTURERS,
July 19, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, urges you to support H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, introduced by Rep. Bill Flores (R-TX).

Domestic natural gas has transformed the U.S. economy, made our companies more competitive, created jobs and put money back in the pockets of working Americans. Manufacturers use natural gas as a fuel for direct process uses, such as drying, melting, process cooling, machine drive and refrigeration; as a fuel for direct non-process uses in manufacturing establishments, such as heating, ventilation, HVAC and lighting; as a fuel for indirect purposes, such as boilers used to produce electricity and steam; and as a feedstock in refining, chemicals and pri-

mary metals sectors. Over the next decade, total demand for natural gas is projected to increase by 40 percent. Domestic manufacturing is poised to be a key driver of this growth. Consequently, major investments in new pipeline infrastructure are required to ensure manufacturers have a steady, reliable stream of natural gas.

Unfortunately, permitting these infrastructure projects remains a lengthy process. Permitting should follow a comprehensive process that ensures timely and predictable decision-making, but federal and state permitting agencies can create roadblocks and delays when coordination is inadequate. Strengthening the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC's) coordination of interagency processes is critical to the permitting of natural gas infrastructure and ensuring manufacturers have access to this affordable resource.

H.R. 2910 would reinforce FERC's role as the lead agency for siting interstate natural gas pipelines by directing FERC to identify and invite all agencies considering an aspect of an application to establish a schedule for concurrent reviews, and to impose deadlines for final decisions. H.R. 2910 would ensure projects undergo a robust agency review while completing that review in a timely and predictable manner.

The NAM's Key Vote Advisory Committee has indicated that votes on H.R. 2910, including procedural motions, may be considered for designation as Key Manufacturing Votes in the 115th Congress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ARIC NEWHOUSE,
Senior Vice President,
Policy and Government Relations.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire if the gentlewoman has any further speakers.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have one additional speaker and some submissions for the RECORD.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers at this point, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I include in the RECORD some information on pipeline incidents from the U.S. Government, just to highlight the fact that it is vitally important that these pipelines undergo safety and environmental reviews. These are the pipeline incident reports from 1997–2016 for all States. I will just read a few of these statistics here.

In 2016, you had 16 fatalities from natural gas pipeline incidents, 83 injuries, total cost of property damage, over \$300 million. In 2015, 10 fatalities, 49 injuries, over 328 incidents. There is a 3-year average from 2014–2016 of 312 incidents. The 5-year average across the country is 299 incidents; 10-year average, 286 incidents.

For fatalities, the 3-year average, 15 fatalities; the 5-year average, 13; the 10-year average, 13; the 20-year average, 16.

And for injuries, the 3-year average, 75 injuries; the 5-year average, 64 injuries; the 10-year average, 64 injuries; the 20-year average, 65 injuries. And the property damage report, just the 3-year average is about \$315 million.

PHMSA PIPELINE INCIDENTS: MULTI-YEAR AVERAGES (1997-2016)

Incident Type: Significant, System Type: All, State: All.

Incident count:

3 Year Average, (2014-2016), 312; 5 Year Average, (2012-2016), 299; 10 Year Average, (2007-2016), 286; 20 Year Average, (1997-2016), 284.

Fatalities:

3 Year Average, 15; 5 Year Average, 13; 10 Year Average, 13; 20 Year Average, 16.

Injuries:

3 Year Average, 75; 5 Year Average, 64; 10 Year Average, 64; 20 Year Average, 65.

Total cost:

3 Year Average, \$315,138,727; 5 Year Average, \$306,888,604; 10 Year Average, \$475,607,772; 20 Year Average, \$389,601,666.

2017 Year-to-date:

Incidents, 118; Fatalities, 1; Injuries, 16; Total Cost, \$49,385,394.

Calendar year, Number, Fatalities, Injuries, Total cost current year dollars:

1997, 267, 10, 77, \$110,377,793; 1998, 295, 21, 81, \$174,516,797; 1999, 275, 22, 108, \$178,313,209; 2000, 290, 38, 81, \$257,659,464; 2001, 233, 7, 61, \$79,086,596; 2002, 258, 12, 49, \$124,067,949; 2003, 297, 12, 71, \$163,459,897; 2004, 309, 23, 56, \$314,362,210; 2005, 336, 16, 46, \$1,476,994,582; 2006, 257, 19, 34, \$157,117,098; 2007, 265, 15, 46, \$147,800,810; 2008, 278, 8, 54, \$592,290,867; 2009, 275, 13, 62, \$180,360,208; 2010, 264, 19, 103, \$1,854,123,037; 2011, 287, 12, 51, \$447,059,777; 2012, 254, 10, 54, \$233,813,285; 2013, 304, 8, 42, \$355,213,552; 2014, 301, 19, 94, \$305,253,746; 2015, 328, 10, 49, \$338,297,940; 2016, 308, 16, 83, \$301,864,494; Grand Total, 5,681, 310, 1,302, \$7,792,033,312.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that it is inappropriate to short-circuit the very important safety and environmental review processes for our interstate natural gas pipelines. This is a solution in search of a problem.

We know that FERC approves these gas pipeline applications at about 90 percent. The only reason a little delay has fallen off recently is because the Senate has not approved the new FERC appointee over a matter of 5 months. If they would do that, I think they could get back on track as well.

The ones that are not approved are undergoing very significant review. Even in the case for the major projects now, we have a new system, a coordinated effort through the FPISC, the new council that is overseeing interstate natural gas pipeline, so it is duplicative as well.

It is inappropriate for a process that already grants eminent domain rights through pipeline companies to go through private property now to short-circuit the environmental and safety reviews. That is just really going too far for corporations and their profits, where landowners and other stakeholders have to have the ability to weigh in. Otherwise, you are going to cause more lawsuits and more delays at the very end of the process and, I think, do exactly the opposite of what the author of the legislation intends to do.

So at this point, based upon all of the evidence that has been presented, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill. Don't elevate corporate profits over the interests of the public.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Again, this streamlines the process. There are still no shortcuts that are here. We require that the agencies work concurrently with each other. At the end of the day, we know that pipelines are literally the safest way to transport whatever it is, oil, gas, to the consumers, and at a lower cost. It is safer and, obviously, helps the most vulnerable with lower costs.

We have literally millions of miles of pipelines. And I would note that we passed major, major bipartisan legislation in several Congresses—it was bipartisan—it was overwhelmingly bipartisan—that President Obama signed into law increasing the safety standards and fines for any new pipelines that are built. Those laws, obviously, stay on the books.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to vote for the bill. I look forward to the debate on a couple of the amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-28. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2910

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 "Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act".

SEC. 2. FERC PROCESS COORDINATION FOR NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.—The term "Federal authorization" has the meaning given that term in section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717n(a)).

(3) NEPA REVIEW.—The term "NEPA review" means the process of reviewing a proposed Federal action under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(4) PROJECT-RELATED NEPA REVIEW.—The term "project-related NEPA review" means any NEPA review required to be conducted with respect to the issuance of an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act.

(b) COMMISSION NEPA REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES.—In acting as the lead agency under section 15(b)(1) of the Natural Gas Act for the purposes of complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of

such Act, the Commission shall, in accordance with this section and other applicable Federal law—

(1) be the only lead agency;

(2) coordinate as early as practicable with each agency designated as a participating agency under subsection (d)(3) to ensure that the Commission develops information in conducting its project-related NEPA review that is usable by the participating agency in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization for which the agency is responsible; and

(3) take such actions as are necessary and proper to facilitate the expeditious resolution of its project-related NEPA review.

(c) DEFERENCE TO COMMISSION.—In making a decision with respect to a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, each agency shall give deference, to the maximum extent authorized by law, to the scope of the project-related NEPA review that the Commission determines to be appropriate.

(d) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION.—The Commission shall identify, as early as practicable after it is notified by a person applying for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, any Federal or State agency, local government, or Indian Tribe that may issue a Federal authorization or is required by Federal law to consult with the Commission in conjunction with the issuance of a Federal authorization required for such authorization or certificate.

(2) INVITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall invite any agency identified under paragraph (1) to participate in the review process for the applicable Federal authorization.

(B) DEADLINE.—An invitation issued under subparagraph (A) shall establish a deadline by which a response to the invitation shall be submitted to the Commission, which may be extended by the Commission for good cause.

(3) DESIGNATION AS PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—The Commission shall designate an agency identified under paragraph (1) as a participating agency with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act unless the agency informs the Commission, in writing, by the deadline established pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), that the agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the applicable Federal authorization;

(B) has no special expertise or information relevant to any project-related NEPA review; or

(C) does not intend to submit comments for the record for the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission.

(4) EFFECT OF NON-DESIGNATION.—

(A) EFFECT ON AGENCY.—Any agency that is not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (3) with respect to an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act may not request or conduct a NEPA review that is supplemental to the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission, unless the agency—

(i) demonstrates that such review is legally necessary for the agency to carry out responsibilities in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization; and

(ii) requires information that could not have been obtained during the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission.

(B) COMMENTS; RECORD.—The Commission shall not, with respect to an agency that is not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (3) with respect to an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural

Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act—

(i) consider any comments or other information submitted by such agency for the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission; or

(ii) include any such comments or other information in the record for such project-related NEPA review.

(e) SCHEDULE.—

(1) DEADLINE FOR FEDERAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—A deadline for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act set by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act shall be not later than 90 days after the Commission completes its project-related NEPA review, unless an applicable schedule is otherwise established by Federal law.

(2) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each Federal and State agency—

(A) that may consider an application for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act shall formulate and implement a plan for administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of Federal authorizations in compliance with schedules established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act; and

(B) in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, shall—

(i) formulate and implement a plan to enable the agency to comply with the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act;

(ii) carry out the obligations of that agency under applicable law concurrently, and in conjunction with, the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission, and in compliance with the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act, unless the agency notifies the Commission in writing that doing so would impair the ability of the agency to conduct needed analysis or otherwise carry out such obligations;

(iii) transmit to the Commission a statement—
(I) acknowledging receipt of the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act; and

(II) setting forth the plan formulated under clause (i) of this subparagraph;

(iv) not later than 30 days after the agency receives such application for a Federal authorization, transmit to the applicant a notice—

(I) indicating whether such application is ready for processing; and

(II) if such application is not ready for processing, that includes a comprehensive description of the information needed for the agency to determine that the application is ready for processing;

(v) determine that such application for a Federal authorization is ready for processing for purposes of clause (iv) if such application is sufficiently complete for the purposes of commencing consideration, regardless of whether supplemental information is necessary to enable the agency to complete the consideration required by law with respect to such application; and

(vi) not less often than once every 90 days, transmit to the Commission a report describing the progress made in considering such application for a Federal authorization.

(3) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—If a Federal or State agency, including the Commission, fails to meet a deadline for a Federal authorization set forth in the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural

Gas Act, not later than 5 days after such deadline, the head of the relevant Federal agency (including, in the case of a failure by a State agency, the Federal agency overseeing the delegated authority) shall notify Congress and the Commission of such failure and set forth a recommended implementation plan to ensure completion of the action to which such deadline applied.

(f) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION.—Federal and State agencies that may consider an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization shall identify, as early as possible, any issues of concern that may delay or prevent an agency from working with the Commission to resolve such issues and granting such authorization.

(B) ISSUE RESOLUTION.—The Commission may forward any issue of concern identified under subparagraph (A) to the heads of the relevant agencies (including, in the case of an issue of concern that is a failure by a State agency, the Federal agency overseeing the delegated authority, if applicable) for resolution.

(2) REMOTE SURVEYS.—If a Federal or State agency considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization requires the person applying for such authorization to submit data, the agency shall consider any such data gathered by aerial or other remote means that the person submits. The agency may grant a conditional approval for the Federal authorization based on data gathered by aerial or remote means, conditioned on the verification of such data by subsequent onsite inspection.

(3) APPLICATION PROCESSING.—The Commission, and Federal and State agencies, may allow a person applying for a Federal authorization to fund a third-party contractor to assist in reviewing the application for such authorization.

(g) ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, EFFICIENCY.—For an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act that requires multiple Federal authorizations, the Commission, with input from any Federal or State agency considering an aspect of the application, shall track and make available to the public on the Commission's website information related to the actions required to complete the Federal authorizations. Such information shall include the following:

(1) The schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act.

(2) A list of all the actions required by each applicable agency to complete permitting, reviews, and other actions necessary to obtain a final decision on the application.

(3) The expected completion date for each such action.

(4) A point of contact at the agency responsible for each such action.

(5) In the event that an action is still pending as of the expected date of completion, a brief explanation of the reasons for the delay.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 115–235. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 115–235.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, after line 9, add the following:

(h) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to any application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act with respect to which any part of a pipeline facility that is a subject of the application is to be located on lands required under Federal, State, or local law to be managed for purposes of natural resource conservation or recreation.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment protects a robust public review process for any proposed pipeline that seeks to cross protected conservation and recreation lands. The legislation before us today, with its short-circuited environmental reviews, puts treasured public lands at risk.

My home State of Massachusetts, like many areas around the country, faces real energy challenges. We need careful and strategic long-term planning in order to lower energy prices and maintain reliability and resiliency. Over the past several years, we have seen proposals for new natural gas pipelines that would stretch hundreds of miles and cross many different communities.

We must work to identify ways to lower energy prices for our homes and businesses, and increasing the supply of lower cost natural gas may be one way to achieve that objective while we transition to cleaner, more affordable, and sustainable alternatives. However, we cannot, in the long run, afford to be careless about our other environmental interests as we make that transition.

These major infrastructure proposals in New England and elsewhere around the country deserve close and careful scrutiny given the potential environmental impacts and the costs borne by ratepayers.

Regrettably, this legislation moves us in the wrong direction. This bill would force FERC to rush decision-making, including environmental reviews necessary to determine if pipelines will have negative impacts on State forests, parks, wildlife management areas, and wetlands, lands expressly put aside as a result of a public decision to protect them.

Our Nation has a longstanding history of preserving natural habitats and protecting open spaces for the public benefit, and we have invested enormous public resources toward these goals. These lands and the decisions behind them deserve to be honored.

In my district, we recently went through the public review process for a

proposed natural gas pipeline. Hundreds of my constituents expressed their concerns about the project. Construction of the pipeline could have jeopardized local wildlife and impacted both State and federally designated conservation land, as well as Massachusetts' scarce farmland.

Thanks to a robust review process, the public had numerous opportunities to question the project and express these legitimate concerns, and their views were able to be fully considered.

While I believe we must protect that review process for all infrastructure projects, my amendment focuses on pipelines that cross protected conservation and recreation lands.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and protect investments by Federal taxpayers, States, and local communities in preserving their natural and historic resources.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that all current reviews that we do now for pipeline siting, they all remain in place. None of it goes away. Those same reviews take place.

The gentlewoman's amendment, in our view, is unnecessary because nothing in this legislation would limit environmental protections or affect laws that govern the multiple use of our public lands.

Pipelines, we know, as I said earlier, are the safest, most efficient way to transport energy supplies. The overwhelming majority of Americans strongly support modernizing our infrastructure, including pipelines, to ensure stable, affordable supplies. And I would note, we have millions of miles of pipelines across the country.

So what is the alternative if you don't have a pipeline?

Well, it is going to be more expensive and, frankly, the accident record is not perfect either. It includes rail or truck, often at a higher cost, which then is passed along to those consumers, impacting the most vulnerable the most.

Infrastructure modernization and job growth go hand in hand with environmental and natural resource protection. Investing in our infrastructure is a smart investment for energy security, job growth, manufacturing, and creating the jobs that we want.

Maintaining and expanding these economywide benefits is dependent on a transparent and a predictable regulatory approval of infrastructure projects. That is what the underlying bill does.

This amendment, however, we would view as a step backward. I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, first, that energy infrastructure is critical to our economy; yet we cannot simply give the fossil

fuel industry carte blanche to build pipelines without robust public reviews.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to co-lead this amendment with my colleagues, Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. MCGOVERN.

FERC, as it is currently structured, is not adequately protecting our most valued public lands designed for recreation and conservation, and this bill will only make this particular mismanagement worse. We are witnessing this firsthand in my Virginia.

At stake is one of our Nation's treasured landscapes, the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, the A.T., and the surrounding national parkland and national forestlands. The A.T. was congressionally dedicated as a national scenic trail nearly 50 years ago, and it is one of the most significant land features in the Eastern United States. It is famous around the world.

Its cultural heritage, its recreational options, its natural resources all serve crucial roles in the lives and communities of the Appalachian region, but it is at risk.

The proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline route impacts 19 prominent views over nearly 100 miles of the Appalachian Trail. Tinker Cliffs, the Dragon's Tooth, even the totally iconic McAfee Knob all will be corrupted by this pipeline.

I am not anti-pipeline. I am not anti-energy. I am an avid Appalachian Trail hiker. I have crossed almost all of the 60 pipeline crossings that exist on the trail. But the Mountain Valley's proposal route doesn't take the least impactful route. It doesn't cross the trail. It runs alongside it for almost 100 miles.

□ 1515

You will be able to see the impact day after day after day. It doesn't sound like the developers thought about minimizing their impact on this important cultural icon.

It has also become clear that the proposed route would require an amendment to the Jefferson National Forest management plan, which was carefully constructed and well balanced.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and protect one of America's most treasured natural places.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I again remind my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115-235.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, after line 9, add the following:

SEC. 3. PIPELINE SECURITY.

In considering an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall consult with the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration regarding the applicant's compliance with security guidance and best practice recommendations of the Administration regarding pipeline infrastructure security, pipeline cybersecurity, pipeline personnel security, and other pipeline security measures.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I would like to thank Chairman UPTON and Ms. CASTOR, the ranking member from Florida, for their articulate debate this afternoon on this important issue.

I would also like to thank Chairman SESSIONS, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER, and all of the members of the Rules Committee for making this amendment in order.

This commonsense amendment will simply ensure that the Transportation Security Administration, the Federal agency with the primary jurisdiction over pipeline security on behalf of the American people, will retain a meaningful seat at the table when it comes to determinations made by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, on whether to approve a pipeline construction permit.

In particular, this amendment provides that, in considering a pipeline permit application, FERC must simply consult with TSA administrators as to whether a pipeline developer is compliant with existing TSA guidelines and best practice recommendations governing pipeline security. That includes an examination of facility security, cybersecurity, and other critical measures that are designed to safeguard the American people against the threat of terrorists and cyber attacks perpetrated on the U.S. pipeline system.

While H.R. 2910 seeks to expedite the FERC review process for pipeline construction projects in the name of efficiency, we also know that recent terrorist and cyber attacks launched against pipeline facilities nationwide

have more than demonstrated that we cannot place expediency above national security and public safety.

In 2015, a domestic terrorist received a maximum 20-year sentence after pleading guilty to Federal charges relating to his use of a highly volatile explosive device to damage a natural pipeline in Texas. Four years earlier than that, a similar attack was perpetrated in Oklahoma by an individual armed with a homemade improvised explosive device.

In addition, the 2017 series on “Pipelines in Peril,” published by Energy and Environment News, reported that advanced cyber threats targeting U.S. pipelines have only increased and evolved over the past 5 years, following a so-called pipeline hacking spree undertaken by members of the Chinese military. The theft of sensitive data from at least 23 separate U.S. pipeline companies in 2011 and 2012 constitute the sort of cyber breach that the Congressional Research Service has described as allowing hackers the ability to “disrupt pipeline service and cause spills, explosions, and fires all from remote locations.”

I would also like to express my concern regarding an issue that was the subject of an amendment of mine which was not ruled in order, and that is the issuance of pipeline construction permits by FERC in areas where a project site and its surrounding community is already experiencing pre-existing unsafe levels of air pollutants.

In my own congressional district in Massachusetts, FERC recently approved a proposal for a natural gas compressor station in the beautiful town of Weymouth, Massachusetts, and as evidenced by the certificate of independent and quality testing conducted by Dr. Curt Nordgaard and other community stakeholders, the air quality in Weymouth is already at toxic levels of so-called criteria air pollutants such as benzene.

My amendment would have suspended the certificate issued by FERC for the Weymouth compressor station and other projects that the commission approves for construction and communities that have unsafe air quality levels.

In addition to my concerns around air quality, I have to highlight the public safety issues surrounding the route of a natural gas pipeline that FERC approved in West Roxbury, a local neighborhood in the heart of my district. The pipeline runs through a densely populated neighborhood. It runs right through an active blasting area in a quarry that is located next to a residential area, and I don't know how that happens if public safety and national security are considerations.

Whether a pipeline is blown up because of stupidity because FERC has located it in a blasting zone or it is because of a nefarious attempt of outside actors, the bottom line is that FERC should sit down and talk with TSA when they are looking at these siting

decisions. The bottom line is, what this amendment will accomplish, it will require that to happen, that consultation to happen between TSA and FERC.

Mr. Chair, I ask Members to vote in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start out by saying that we are prepared to accept the amendment. I know that all of us here take pipeline safety very seriously, and certainly since my chairmanship of the Energy and Commerce Committee, we put safety at the forefront of our efforts to modernize our pipeline infrastructure. We passed two major bills that President Obama signed, and I think there may have been maybe a single Member that opposed that legislation over the years, but we care a lot about that.

In the last Congress, we passed the PIPES Act and the FAST Act. Again, major bipartisan initiatives that Mr. PALLONE and I worked out that got to President Obama's desk. Each of these two bills took important steps to update our laws to protect against emerging physical attacks as well as cyber attacks, threats to the grid, in our energy delivery systems, including pipelines.

We know that multiple Federal and State agencies have a role to play and an opportunity to lead with that expertise. While the Department of Energy is the lead sector-specific agency for cybersecurity and for the energy sector, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, is responsible for administering minimum pipeline safety standards, and the TSA, the Transportation Security Administration, does monitor threats to our transportation sector. I think that is where the gentleman from Massachusetts is coming from with this amendment.

The amendment, I have got to say, appears to be consistent with current law, while a rigid consultation requirement could end up resulting in delays if the TSA is not able to consult in a timely manner, but, again, the language is “consult.” I would hope that that would happen.

The amendment also appears to address pipeline facilities, but it is not clear whether it includes LNG as an example. Given the overlapping nature of Federal and State jurisdiction over pipeline safety, we want to make sure that we are doing it right and that we have got all the tools in the toolbox to make sure that that happens and we don't wonder what would have happened without this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment. We are ready to work with him, but certainly, at this point, ready to accept the amendment.

Mr. LYNCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, first of all, I thank the gentleman very much for accepting the amendment. I agree, there may be some other areas that are not particularly addressed, such as the LNG situation. Obviously, we want to increase the level of safety with respect to LNG as well, but I understand those questions can be answered during our debate with the Senate as well and in conference.

But the bottom line is I thank him for accepting the amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, it is my understanding, I believe, that a GAO report has been requested by some of our friends on both sides of the aisle, and we welcome the completion of that report and are anxious to see the result.

Mr. Chairman, again, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-235.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, after line 9, add the following:

(g) SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In conducting a project-related NEPA review, the Commission shall prepare a supplement to a draft environmental impact statement or a final environmental impact statement if—

(A) the Commission makes a substantial change in the proposed action that is relevant to environmental concerns; or

(B) there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act with respect to which the project-related NEPA review is being conducted, or its impacts.

(2) MITIGATION PLANS.—In conducting a project-related NEPA review, if a draft environmental impact statement does not include information about mitigation plans for adverse impacts that cannot reasonably be avoided, the Commission shall prepare a supplement to the draft environmental impact statement that includes such information.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, it is a great honor to come after this bipartisan discussion between Mr. LYNCH and Mr. UPTON. I hope a precedent has been set, Mr. Chairman.

I offered this amendment to improve the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's public comment period and transparency process.

This amendment would require FERC to issue a supplemental environmental impact statement if there is critical new information relevant to a pipeline proposal, and to require mitigation plans for adverse impacts if not already provided.

The case of the Mountain Valley Pipeline demonstrated how the current FERC process has failed us and why this amendment is necessary.

I recently wrote a letter to FERC on this very issue, asking that they initiate a supplemental environmental impact statement before moving forward with the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity.

Quite simply, the process was flawed.

In response to a September 2016 draft environmental impact statement, Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, had to present more information and an updated route for the pipeline proposal to FERC. Originally, Mr. Chairman, they offered 1,000 pages of updates for public comment, but then their updates extended beyond the public comment period, which ended in December 2016, and included thousands of additional pages of crucially important information—20,000 pages of crucially important information. Think about how long it would take to read 20,000 pages.

What is most egregious is that, because this document dump came after the public comment period had ended, affected stakeholders weren't able to offer their comments for FERC consideration. They had already closed the public comment period, but the pipeline company was still submitting thousands of pages.

Even more ridiculous, the developers have continued to add more documents, even after FERC issued the final environmental impact statement. So apparently it wasn't final in the eyes of the developers.

For many, FERC's recent decision to issue this final statement for the proposed Mountain Valley Pipeline is patently alarming.

The appropriate course would be to issue a supplemental environmental impact statement and allow for public comment on those 20,000 pages.

Let's fix this woefully incompetent process.

Local communities affected most by proposed energy infrastructure projects naturally have concerns regarding the projects near them.

On my extensive visits to southwest Virginia last summer, there were two kinds of signs everywhere, Mr. Chairman. There were "Make America Great Again, Donald Trump for President," and there were "No Mountain Valley Pipeline."

They deserve the opportunity to express their views fully and to participate in a robust public engagement process, especially for projects which will use eminent domain to seize their private land from homeowners and farmers.

If there are major changes offered after the public comment period is

open, let's make sure the public has the ability to weigh in with their proposals.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, FERC is the lead agency for siting interstate natural gas pipelines. We all know that. But there are a number of other Federal and State agencies that also have to issue associated permits for large-scale projects.

□ 1530

Through the FERC prefile process, sponsors engage with landowners, local communities, and government agencies to educate stakeholders and collect the information about the best location for siting that pipeline.

The underlying bill, H.R. 2910, brings much-needed certainty and transparency to the process by encouraging the stakeholders to participate in good faith early in the process. Unfortunately, this amendment, the way that we read it, would create more uncertainty and create more opportunities for delays.

The overwhelming majority of Americans strongly support expanding the infrastructure. Creating the jobs, the pipelines, ensures stable and affordable supplies. Flexibility, affordable, and reliable energy is important for American families and businesses to thrive.

I would note, at this point we still don't have a quorum with FERC, and we want that to change. That will be an issue that goes through the confirmation process in the Senate, but consumers really only benefit from domestic energy if we can get it to them.

Investing in infrastructure is a smart investment, so I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

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

I very much agree with the lead sponsor of the bill, Mr. UPTON, that we don't want any more uncertainty, and we certainly don't want more delays.

In fact, this amendment was originally in a bipartisan bill sponsored by my Republican friend from Virginia, MORGAN GRIFFITH. I literally lifted it word for word.

What we want to do is make sure that all of the information is on the table at the beginning. It is just not fair to the people who are affected by a pipeline that an environmental impact statement is issued and they wouldn't have a chance to comment on it.

So let's make sure that the developers are putting all of the information out first. And if they put it out and the public comment period closes and then they give you the rest of the information, then, clearly, FERC has made the

decision without all that, and the public has been cheated out of the ability to comment on what is going to happen to their land and to their homes. It is just not fair.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this good, bipartisan amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLORES) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2883.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution H.R. 2883 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2883.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1534

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2883) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

This legislation continues the great tradition of bipartisan legislation coming out of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Our focus has been and will continue to be building America's infrastructure, creating jobs, and strengthening our economy.

I want to congratulate my colleagues and sponsors of this bill, particularly Mr. MULLIN and Mr. GENE GREEN, Republican and Democrat, for their work on this legislation.

H.R. 2883 would establish coordinated procedures to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas, and the transmission of electricity. That is what the bill does.

The legislation would replace the requirements established under executive order that persons obtain a Presidential permit before constructing an oil and gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that crosses the border between the U.S., Mexico, and Canada.

To date, Congress has not asserted its authority to establish proceedings for permitting cross-border energy infrastructure. In the absence of a statutorily directed process, agencies have made decisions regarding cross-border energy infrastructure within the context of their interpretation of a series of executive orders dating back to the 1950s.

Recent proposals, most notably the Keystone XL pipeline, have faced significant and unnecessary delays as a result of political interference in what should have been a straightforward review. There is bipartisan agreement that we should have a free flow of energy in North America.

This bill is going to level the playing field for energy infrastructure projects located at the international border. The legislation takes important steps to bring fairness to the process and provide certainty to countries whom we already have a free trade agreement with and businesses that want to create jobs in the U.S. It is going to strengthen our effort to improve and update NAFTA and enhance our trilateral trading relationships.

It is time Congress exercised its constitutional authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and replace the Presidential permit requirement with a more transparent, efficient, and effective review process.

Establishing the cross-border permitting process in law would lead to more objective and timely decisions, which,

in turn, is going to create the jobs, strengthen our Nation's energy security, and support affordable and reliable energy for all Americans.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for their efforts on this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act. My Republican colleagues argue that we need more bills like H.R. 2883 to extract and transport more oil and gas as quickly as possible. But building a modern energy infrastructure for the 21st century requires a lot more than drilling wells, laying more pipelines, filling more railcars with crude oil, and putting more tanker trucks on our highways.

A modern, American, 21st century energy infrastructure plan must address the threat of climate change. This is the biggest energy challenge that we face as a country. We cannot have a meaningful conversation about America's energy infrastructure without also having a conversation about the changing climate and the huge costs heaped on hardworking American families and businesses because of the change in climate.

I am proud to represent the State of Florida, but here is what my neighbors are experiencing now: higher AC bills, more extreme weather events, heat waves, higher cost for flood insurance and property insurance, and property taxes that are having to go now to repair our water and wastewater infrastructure on the coast.

We have a rapidly diminishing window to act to reduce our carbon pollution before the catastrophic impacts of climate change are irreversible. The energy infrastructure decisions that we make today will have a real impact on whether we can mitigate climate change in the future. We need to understand this risk before we lock in infrastructure that will produce carbon pollution for decades to come.

This bill's supporters don't like to be reminded of the daunting challenges of the changing climate. That is reflected in our discussion today, and, frankly, it is reflected in the glaring inaction of this Republican Congress to address climate change.

If enacted into law, H.R. 2883 would move us backwards in our fight for the clean energy economy and the jobs of the future. H.R. 2883 would rubber-stamp permits for pipelines to carry oil, natural gas, even tar sands crude into the United States.

Tar sands crude is the dirtiest fuel on the planet from a climate perspective, and this bill creates a permitting process for cross-border pipelines that make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Federal Government to say no to any of these projects.

This bill asserts that every cross-border energy project is always in the pub-

lic interest. It is up to a project's opponent to try to prove otherwise. The bill even allows the oil industry to make major modifications to its pipelines without getting any approval at all. That means, if a company wants to increase its pipeline capacity or reverse an existing pipeline to carry more oil, natural gas, or tar sands crude into the United States, the company can do just that, no questions asked.

Building new pipelines or expanding existing ones could have a profound environmental impact, but the bill allows for no meaningful environmental review for a cross-border pipeline. The bill says the Federal Government can only examine the cross-border segment of the project.

Who thought that up? That is very creative.

It is almost hard to believe that this is what the bill does, but it is true. For a pipeline spanning hundreds of miles, the environmental review will focus on only that tiny part that crosses the U.S. border. That is irresponsible. That would eliminate the possibility of any meaningful examination of the carbon pollution impacts of these pipelines.

We should be examining the carbon impact of every pipeline before we approve it. Many are very important. But to do so without important environmental reviews in this day and age is frightening.

The future will belong to the country that builds an energy infrastructure to support a cleaner, lower carbon economy, and it is our responsibility to lead the country in the clean energy future with all of the jobs, consumer savings, and economic growth that would be provided.

This bill also provides more proof of what is plain: In this Republican-led Congress, it is, unfortunately, likely to go down in history as having failed to meet one of its greatest responsibilities of this time—the challenge of the changing climate. Our children and grandchildren will be poorer for it, and they will ask us, and especially my Republican colleagues: Why didn't you act when you had the chance?

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee for yielding me the time.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

The Presidential permitting process dates back through many administrations, beginning with the administration of Ulysses S. Grant. The executive branch has taken the necessary steps to ensure our cross-border infrastructure with Canada and Mexico was constructed.

These past administrations, and even the current administration, were

forced to issue executive orders because Congress failed to act. Congress has the duty to regulate the commerce of the United States, and cross-border energy infrastructure projects fall well within that space.

Opponents of this bill argue the executive permitting process has worked well in the past. It is true that in the past the process has been proven effective. Unfortunately, cross-border decisions have now fallen victim to election year-cycle politics.

We cannot build infrastructure in this country or on the continent based on who sits in the White House, whether they be Democrat or Republican. It is Congress' responsibility to create regulatory rules by which infrastructure is constructed.

□ 1545

This bill will create a regulatory process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Department of State, and the Department of Energy to permit cross-border infrastructure. It is not different than building roads, bridges, or railways. The Department of Transportation coordinates with the Federal, State, and local agencies to ensure projects are completed and the environment is protected. We will do the same thing for pipes and wires. We need to build electric transmission lines and pipelines to move resources from where they are to where they are needed.

The bill complies with the National Environmental Policy Act and requires a full environmental review of any cross-border facility including analysis of climate change impacts. More so, the entire length of the pipeline or electric transmission line will be reviewed for environmental impacts not just for the cross-border pipeline.

While there is some confusion on this issue, opponents of the bill talk about how we will gut the NEPA process—the National Environmental Policy Act. This is simply not the case. My colleague from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) will offer a bipartisan amendment to the bill clarifying that the scope of the National Environmental Policy Act review shall not be limited in any way by this act.

The bill is about the future and how to meet energy demands for the 21st century. We should embrace the changes taking place in North America and harmonize our policies with those of our neighbors both to the north with Canada and to the south with Mexico, and this bill, if it becomes law, will do that.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are here talking about how to take politics out of our infrastructure. As we just heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), this is a bipartisan bill. We hear a lot of stuff about it damaging the environment; it doesn't. We are talking about crossing a border and taking a situation that was held up for

8 years with the Keystone pipeline and making sure it has the transparent and consistent approach on how we regulate these permits.

The United States is a powerhouse around the world. We want to keep it that way. We want our country to compete freely in the global market and continue to positively benefit our economy. My bill, H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, supports the construction of energy infrastructure across our North America borders.

Simply put, this bill takes the politics out of energy infrastructure projects. The construction of these border-crossing facilities should be done effectively and efficiently without getting caught up in our Nation's politics. These facilities are used for importing and exporting oil, natural gas, and electricity that enhance the trade of our energy products that benefit our economy.

This bipartisan piece of legislation allows a transparent and efficient process to be followed the same way every time and for every project. Most importantly, it provides regulatory certainty to those charged with carrying out these projects. I want to thank this House for allowing such bills to come forth and the opportunity to allow this bill to be heard.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, lest anyone be left with the impression that there is a problem with cross-border pipeline approvals, the U.S. Energy Information Administration, from a December 2016 report, says that over the last 5 years, natural gas pipeline capacity between the U.S. and Mexico has grown substantially and is projected to double through 2018.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

This bill would enact crucial reforms allowing efficient trade of energy products with our North American friends and allies. Unfortunately, the existing process has politicized vital cross-border energy infrastructure.

H.R. 2883 offers a narrowly crafted, sensible solution to this problem. The bill will create a process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, State Department, and the Department of Energy to permit cross-border infrastructure projects.

This new procedure will bring regulatory certainty while ensuring these projects are environmentally sound and within public interest. These projects create jobs in my district in south Texas and across the country.

I congratulate and thank Mr. GREEN and Mr. MULLIN for this important piece of legislation. Energy security, targeted regulatory reforms, and smart infrastructure investments are things

we can all support, and we should all support.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on this sensible bipartisan legislation.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, as you have heard, two of my colleagues from Texas have just come out, obviously, in support of this bill. There is not a lot that Texas and Oklahoma agree on, especially this time of the year when we enter football season. Other than that, we agree that Oklahoma is better at football than Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman MULLIN for partnering together.

Like he said, Texas and Oklahoma have a lot of things in common. We both are energy States. But believe me, the Red River does divide us on football.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Union of Operating Engineers, a letter from Edison Electric Institute, a letter from the IOSA, and a letter from the Plains All American Pipeline all in support of this bill.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING
ENGINEERS, AFFILIATED WITH THE
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL OR-
GANIZATIONS,

July 18, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) supports H.R. 2883, the Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, legislation that provides clear congressional authority to the process of evaluating transnational pipeline projects. Further, the IUOE endorses H.R. 2910, a bill Promoting Inter-Agency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act.

We respectfully request that you support both of these pieces of legislation when they come to the floor of the House of Representatives this week.

The International Union of Operating Engineers represents 400,000 working men and women in the United States and Canada, thousands of whom build and maintain the nation's energy infrastructure. We are one of four unions that are signatory to the National Pipeline Agreement. Operating Engineers perform millions of hours of work on pipeline projects around the United States every year; millions of additional hours were performed on pipeline work by IUOE members in Canada.

North America's energy network is inextricably linked. Eliminating legal and regulatory uncertainty regarding the permitting of cross-border energy facilities will promote investment and job creation in North America, and that is why the IUOE supports H.R. 2883. Removing these regulatory barriers will ultimately increase the interconnection of the North American energy network and at the same time improve reliability, security, and affordability.

Today, the process for permitting this energy infrastructure lives only through Executive Order. North America's energy future is simply too important to leave to the ambiguity and imprecision of administrative fiat.

Granting clear legislative authority and delegating responsibility to an agency experienced with the National Environmental Policy Act and permitting processes, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), rather than the Department of State, will increase the competency and capacity of the review of cross-border energy projects. It is a clear improvement in the administration of major project permitting.

Updating the American domestic permitting and regulatory framework for natural-gas pipelines is also essential. Several steps are necessary in this regard, and H.R. 2910 is one of them. Domestic energy production provides good-paying jobs for members of the IUOE and other construction craftworkers and continues to employ thousands of our members. Uncertainty and delay during environmental reviews, however, hinder the growth of jobs related to the nation's energy infrastructure. Congress should give FERC additional tools to keep federal agencies accountable and maximize coordination in the permitting process.

H.R. 2910 requires reporting and transparency in the review of major projects. These requirements raise the bar for regulators and provides the public with a better understanding of the environmental impacts that are receiving particular rigor and examination—or perhaps needlessly delaying the overall project-review timeline. Democrats and Republicans supported similar reporting and transparency in the FAST Act. Enactment of H.R. 2910 is a necessary step to help place the booming energy sector on a sound footing for the future.

The International Union of Operating Engineers supports both H.R. 2883 and H.R. 2910 and respectfully requests that you support the legislation this week when it comes before you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE,
July 18, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The Edison Electric Institute supports H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, which is scheduled for floor action this week.

Timely decisions for the siting and permitting of energy infrastructure are essential to building the smarter and more resilient infrastructure that electric companies need to deliver reliable, affordable, safe, and increasingly clean energy to Americans. H.R. 2883 would replace the need for a presidential permit for transmission lines or pipelines that cross a U.S. border with a certificate of crossing to be approved by the Department of Energy for electric transmission facilities, or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for oil or natural gas pipelines. The National Environmental Policy Act and other federal laws that apply to the project would not be affected.

H.R. 2883 would improve the process for decisions on cross-border projects while protecting the public's interest in such projects. We urge the House to pass H.R. 2883.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. KUHN,
President.

Rep. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Energy Subcommittee,
Washington, DC.
Rep. BOBBY RUSH,
Ranking Member,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON AND RANKING MEMBER RUSH: The In Situ Oil Sands Alliance (IOSA) offers strong support for the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act reintroduced by Congressman Markwayne Mullin (R-OK) and Congressman Gene Green (D-TX) and urges you to back its timely passage. IOSA is an alliance of Canadian oil sands developers dedicated to the responsible development of the resource using drilling technologies. We support this legislation as it establishes greater predictability in the process of developing additional energy transportation links between our two countries which will serve a critical role in continuing towards North American energy independence and reducing dependence on unstable overseas suppliers. These links will help to ensure that growing Canadian oil sands production remains a secure, affordable, environmentally responsible and economically beneficial source of supply for the United States.

Historically, Canada and the United States have enjoyed a mutually beneficial energy trade relationship. The Canadian oil sands provide substantial economic benefits to U.S.—for every two oil sands jobs created in Canada, one job is created in the U.S. Nearly 1,600 U.S. companies directly supply the oil sands, representing \$1.9 billion in sales in 2014 and 2015. Canada is the United States' most trusted trading partner, providing 41% of U.S. oil imports in 2016.

Canada's oil sands represent the third largest reserves in the world and are well-positioned to provide a secure and affordable supply for American refining and consumption for years to come. However, the benefits accruing to the United States from Canadian oil sands development depend on sufficient energy transportation infrastructure capacity. The Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act proposes four key modernizations of the cross-border infrastructure regulatory process that can ensure the timely development of projects:

Introduction of a Definitive Decision Timeline: Introducing timing and development certainty currently absent from the approval process, the Act requires a decision no later than 120 days after any applicable environmental review is complete.

Determination of National Interest: Lead agencies would be able to make national interest determination for cross border energy infrastructure projects but the assumption would be that cross border energy projects are in the national interest unless determined otherwise by that lead agency.

Agency Decision-Making: By removing the requirement for a Presidential permit, the relevant official or agency would serve as final authority, further streamlining the process while assuring that the lead agency is the Federal agency with relevant subject-matter expertise. The bill would designate FERC as the responsible official for oil and gas pipelines and the Secretary of Energy for electric transmission lines. These agencies already have responsibility for evaluating aspects affecting the national interest with respect to these types of projects. The only change from current practice is to substitute FERC for the Secretary of State as lead with respect to oil pipelines. This change is appropriate given the level of expertise at FERC for review and approval of liquid pipeline projects, including rate setting and ensuring equal access.

IOSA,
June 19, 2017.

Streamlining of the approval process: New certificates of crossings and Presidential permits would not be required for modifications to existing border-crossing projects that are operating or for which approvals have previously been issued.

The Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act will serve to enhance the existing mutually beneficial Canada-U.S. energy partnership. Thank you for your consideration and support for the Act.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA NELSON,
Vice Chair, In Situ Oil Sands Alliance.

PLAINS ALL AMERICAN
PIPELINE, L.P.
July 18, 2017.

Hon. MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GENE GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULLIN AND CONGRESSMAN GREEN: I am writing on behalf of Plains All American Pipeline, L.P. in support of your legislation, H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

This legislation will provide the needed reform of the existing Presidential Permit process for liquid pipeline projects crossing international borders. As you know, there is no authorizing statute from the Congress laying out the requirements for this program. There is no guidance in the law on what should be reviewed, and what can be exempted because it is too small to make a difference. There are no laws on what criteria to use, what to examine, or a time certain for completing a review. The unfortunate result of the lack of clear guidance is uncertainty and delay. In fact, the sum total of State Department rules and procedures for this process is one single page, so almost all applications can be dealt with subjectively, which results in a lack of certainty for our business.

Plains All American experienced this uncertainty first hand when we purchased seven pipelines crossing the U.S.-Canadian border. The guidelines used by the State Department triggered our need to apply for a new presidential permit in 2012. These pipelines already had an ownership "name change" permit application that remained pending from their previous change of ownership in 2007. Plains applications for "name change" permits remained pending until 2016. So, for 4 years, the State Department had been considering whether to issue a presidential permit for something almost as simple as a name change at the top of the permit. There were no operational changes of the pipelines, no change in materials or any physical or environmental impacts.

Hopefully, having this process come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will provide an objective standard with set timelines that will provide greater certainty.

Thank you for your work,
Best,

HARRY N. PEFANIS,
President & COO,
Plains All American
Pipeline.

Mr. MULLIN. Once again, I understand that there is opposition to the bill because of a fear. But the true fear is: Are we willing to hold up the infrastructure needs of this country for political gain? For the years that we had from the previous administration, that is exactly what happened. It was political.

What we are trying to do when we take it out of the State Department's hands and put it with FERC is put it with a bipartisan oversight agency that takes an approach to looking at the infrastructure needs that this country has and saying: Is this in the country's best interest?

They have been doing it, and they do it well.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters from a number of environmental and other organizations in opposition to the bill.

They write, in part: "On behalf of the undersigned organizations and our millions of members and supporters across the country, we write today to express our strong opposition to H.R. 2883, the 'Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.' This bill represents a fourth irresponsible attempt to pass the previously titled 'North American Energy Infrastructure Act' in as many years. For the reasons below, we are opposed to the passage of this legislation and its attempt to ram through permits for new cross-border oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission lines without meaningful environmental review or public participation."

JUNE 26, 2017.

Re Please Oppose H.R. 2883, the "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act".

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations and our millions of members and supporters across the country, we write today to express our strong opposition to H.R. 2883, the "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act." This bill represents a fourth irresponsible attempt to pass the previously titled "North American Energy Infrastructure Act" in as many years. For the reasons below, we are opposed to the passage of this legislation and its attempt to ram through permits for new cross-border oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission lines without meaningful environmental review or public participation.

Our reasons for opposing H.R. 2883 are as follows:

It is unnecessary and eliminates longstanding procedure. Executive Order 13337 established a longstanding process that has been used by both Republican and Democratic administrations for decades to ensure that energy transmission projects crossing our international borders from Canada and Mexico are in the national interest.

It eliminates critical environmental and economic analysis. H.R. 2883 eliminates the current requirement that proposed oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission lines that cross the U.S. border with Mexico or Canada obtain a presidential permit, after an environmental review and determination that the project is in the national interest.

It irresponsibly narrows the scope of environmental review. HR 2883 replaces existing processes with one that limits environmental review to a narrow portion of the project, exempts certain types of projects from any permit requirement, and shifts the burden of proof to make it difficult to not approve a project.

It undermines the National Environmental Policy Act. The bill effectively exempts

cross-border projects from meaningful environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by dramatically narrowing the focus of that review. Under the bill, the permit requirement and NEPA review apply only to the cross-border segment of the project. Trans-boundary pipelines and transmission lines are multi-billion dollar infrastructure investments that stretch hundreds of miles, last for decades, and pose environmental risks well beyond their border crossings. However, contrary to NEPA, the bill precludes review of the project's full impacts, such as oil spills and the consequences for landowners, public safety, drinking water, climate change, and wildlife.

It eliminates the need to justify projects as in the national interest. The bill eliminates the requirement that to issue a permit, the federal permitting agency must find the project to be in the national interest. Instead, the bill requires an agency to approve the project, unless it finds that the narrow segment that crosses the border "is not in the public interest of the United States." By shifting the burden of proof to require a showing that the project is contrary to the public interest and sharply narrowing the focus of that inquiry, this provision makes it extremely difficult for an agency to ever deny a permit, and it largely eliminates the ability to approve a permit subject to protective conditions.

Large, complicated, risky projects like oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities are precisely the types of activities that ought to be well-planned and reviewed before they are built. Failure to do so not only results in threats to public safety, but can also harm our economy and environment.

Instead of improving responsible siting, construction, and operation of oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities, this bill goes in the opposite direction by forcing these projects through no matter what the costs may be. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose this bill.

Sincerely,

350.org; Bold Alliance; Clean Water Action; Defenders of Wildlife; Greenpeace USA; Indigenous Environmental Network; League of Conservation Voters; Natural Resources Defense Council; Oil Change International; Power Shift Network; Seeding Sovereignty; Sierra Club.

JULY 18, 2017.

Re Oppose H.R. 2910 and H.R. 2883, Dangerous Handouts to the Oil and Gas Industry.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on H.R. 2910, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, and H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

H.R. 2910 sacrifices public input and thorough environmental review in favor of giving the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) more power to fast-track approval of interstate natural gas pipelines. FERC has no accountability to the public or the environment, yet this bill would allow it to limit the participation and input of other state and federal agencies with relevant expertise in reviews required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Additionally, H.R. 2910 would allow FERC to establish the

scope of the environmental review and conditionally approve projects with incomplete environmental impact analysis, which could result in irreversible harm to our environment and public health. Given FERC's history of rash approval of pipelines, H.R. 2910 is unnecessary, dangerous, and nothing more than a handout to the oil and gas industry at the expense of the health and safety of our communities.

H.R. 2883 would greenlight permitting of new, potentially harmful cross-border oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission lines without meaningful and thorough review and oversight. It eliminates many important longstanding procedures, undermining critical environmental and economic review by abolishing the requirement that a project obtain a presidential permit and be affirmatively determined to be in the public interest. H.R. 2883 also narrows the scope of environmental review under NEPA, exempting certain projects altogether and severely limiting the review of these massive, expensive, long-lasting infrastructure projects to only the section that crosses the border, ignoring the potential damaging impacts from the project as a whole. By only reviewing a small portion of these projects and essentially erasing the national interest requirement, this bill would make it almost impossible for an agency to ever deny a permit and could result in irreversible damage to our health, public safety, climate, environment, and economy.

Again, we urge you to REJECT H.R. 2910 and H.R. 2883, and will consider including votes on these bills in the 2017 Scorecard.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

JULY 18, 2017.

Re Please Oppose H.R. 2883, the "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act".

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations and our millions of members and supporters across the country, we write today to express our strong opposition to H.R. 2883, the "Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act." This bill represents a fourth irresponsible attempt to pass the previously titled "North American Energy Infrastructure Act" in as many years. We are opposed to the passage of this legislation and its attempt to ram through permits for new cross-border oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission lines without meaningful environmental review or public participation.

Our reasons for opposing H.R. 2883 are as follows:

It is unnecessary and eliminates longstanding procedure. Executive Order 13337 established a longstanding process that has been used by both Republican and Democratic administrations for decades to ensure that energy transmission projects crossing our international borders from Canada and Mexico are in the national interest.

It eliminates critical environmental and economic analysis. H.R. 2883 eliminates the current requirement that proposed oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission lines that cross the U.S. border with Mexico or Canada obtain a presidential permit, after an environmental review and determination that the project is in the national interest.

It irresponsibly narrows the scope of environmental review. H.R. 2883 replaces existing processes with one that limits environmental review to a narrow portion of the project, exempts certain types of projects from any permit requirement, and shifts the burden of proof to make it difficult to not approve a project.

It undermines the National Environmental Policy Act. The bill effectively exempts cross-border projects from meaningful environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by dramatically narrowing the focus of that review. Under the bill, the permit requirement and NEPA review apply only to the cross-border segment of the project. Trans-boundary pipelines and transmission lines are multi-billion dollar infrastructure investments that stretch hundreds of miles, last for decades, and pose environmental risks well beyond their border crossings. However, contrary to NEPA, the bill precludes review of the project's full impacts, such as oil spills and the consequences for landowners, public safety, drinking water, climate change, and wildlife.

It eliminates the need to justify projects as in the national interest. The bill eliminates the requirement that to issue a permit, the federal permitting agency must find the project to be in the national interest. Instead, the bill requires an agency to approve the project, unless it finds that the narrow segment that crosses the border "is not in the public interest of the United States." By shifting the burden of proof to require a showing that the project is contrary to the public interest and sharply narrowing the focus of that inquiry, this provision makes it extremely difficult for an agency to ever deny a permit, and it largely eliminates the ability to approve a permit subject to protective conditions.

Large, complicated, risky projects like oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities are precisely the types of activities that ought to be well-planned and reviewed before they are built. Failure to do so not only results in threats to public safety, but can also harm our economy and environment.

Instead of improving responsible siting, construction, and operation of oil and gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities, this bill goes in the opposite direction by forcing these projects through no matter what the costs may be. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose this bill.

Sincerely,

350.org; Bold Alliance; Center for Biological Diversity; Clean Water Action; Defenders of Wildlife; Earthjustice; Environment America; Greenpeace USA; Indigenous Environmental Network; League of Conservation Voters; Natural Resources Defense Council; Oil Change International; Power Shift Network; Public Citizen; Seeding Sovereignty; Sierra Club.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2883 eliminates the current requirement that proposed oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission lines that cross the U.S. border obtain a Presidential permit. That only happens after an environmental review and a determination that the project is in the national interest. I know this might be tempting to some of my colleagues, but I encourage you to have a closer look at what this bill really does.

The bill replaces this process with a new process that limits environmental review to a narrow portion of the project, just the portion that crosses the border. It exempts certain types of projects from any permit requirement and shifts the burden of proof to make it difficult to disapprove a project.

The bill also allows a project that is rejected under current law to reapply

under the new, weaker process and exempts all modifications to existing cross-border projects from any requirement for Federal review or approval.

In essence, it grants a get-out-of-jail-free card, or, actually, I guess it is more akin to whatever you roll, you get to pass go, and you get to collect your \$200. That is not okay for some international oil pipelines, natural gas pipelines, and electric transmission lines. These are major infrastructure projects, and we have got to maintain the ability to have a meaningful review; otherwise, we are going to suffer significant incidents, accidents, fatalities, and more.

So let me close my remarks and my portion of the debate here today. I have enjoyed this debate, but I want to highlight again that the Congress is really missing an opportunity to address one of the most significant challenges that we face, and that is the challenge of climate change.

What is particularly troubling about this bill, as well, is it keeps the public in the dark. Think about it. If you live near a major international pipeline project, shouldn't you have the right to participate and understand what such project will allow in your backyard?

The bill would allow large and long-lived cross-border energy projects to be approved with no understanding or consideration of their environmental impact or to be exempted from any permitting requirement at all. The bill assumes that these projects are always in the public interest regardless of the merits. It is an unjustifiable giveaway. It elevates corporate profits over the public interest, and it is wrong.

The public, including communities and landowners directly affected by the projects, would have little or no information and no opportunity to object or request mitigating action except to the extent provided under limited State laws.

For all of these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the bills we are considering today which would short-circuit the approval process of fossil fuel projects at the expense of our environment and private property owners.

In my home State of New Hampshire, Granite Staters are all too familiar with the problems of siting natural gas projects and the disruption this can cause for small rural towns.

In 2015, energy giant Kinder Morgan proposed a large natural gas pipeline project that would have cut through 17 New Hampshire towns in my district which are home to numerous environmentally sensitive areas that would have been negatively impacted by this project.

Throughout the review process, I heard from thousands of my constituents whose concerns were not being

heard by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Thanks to the commitment and tireless efforts of these advocates, Kinder Morgan eventually pulled the plug on the project, but there is so much more that needs to be done to give average citizens a seat at the table during FERC's review process.

The bills we are considering today would do nothing to elevate the concerns of impacted communities during the FERC proceedings, and these bills aim to jam through risky pipeline projects while constraining other agencies from concluding important environmental reviews.

We all know that FERC acts as a rubber stamp for fossil fuel projects, and the bills we are considering today further narrow the opportunities for private landowners to push back against projects and try to protect their land from eminent domain.

□ 1600

At a time when pipeline expansion has increased dramatically, we should be working on bipartisan solutions that increase public participation during FERC proceedings. That is why I have cosponsored legislation to create an Office of Public Participation within FERC that would level the playing field for average citizens and give them a seat at the table.

H.R. 2910, which we just debated, does nothing to achieve this goal and will only lead to more communities being left in the dark during FERC proceedings.

H.R. 2883 would eliminate the need for a Presidential permit for cross-border energy projects and dramatically narrow the environmental review to the narrow portion of the project that crosses the border. These cross-border projects are oftentimes hundreds of miles long. It simply makes no sense to conduct an environmental review on the small portion that crosses the border. That is just common sense.

For the good of our environment, for the good of our communities and public lands, I urge my colleagues to oppose these harmful pieces of legislation.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I actually have a couple of more speakers.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida may reclaim her time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I was under the impression the other side had yielded back the balance of her time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is correct, but by unanimous consent, the gentlewoman may reclaim the time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to allow the minority to reclaim the balance of her time.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, introduced by my friend and Great Plains colleague to the south, MARKWAYNE MULLIN.

This bill could not come at a better time. As we continue to have discussions in this country about both our future as an energy leader and our trading relationship with Mexico and Canada, it is time to review bureaucratic permitting processes that constrain new energy transportation projects. This bill does just that. It improves and streamlines the permitting process for pipelines and energy transmission equipment when they are crossing U.S. international borders.

Energy trade within North America is a nearly \$150 billion business that provides significant benefits here at home. This bill shows that we can focus on protecting our environment and being an energy leader. It maintains full environmental reviews and continues compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

We saw how broken our current regulatory structure was when politics and personal interests nearly ended the Keystone XL pipeline without any regard to science, facts, or the livelihoods of the people who needed those jobs. This legislation will allow American entrepreneurs to stop fighting endless red tape and uncertain timelines and get back to doing what we do best: creating jobs, innovating, and making North America a leader in energy production.

Voters have told us time and time again to get the bureaucratic morass of Big Government out of the way. They have asked us to promote an all-of-the-above energy strategy that includes oil and gas and to unleash the power of free trade and American innovation. They have asked for good jobs and more energy security.

I thank my good friend from Oklahoma for sponsoring this. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2838, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY).

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I stand up to oppose H.R. 2883.

Basically, what this bill does is preapproves border-crossing energy products by making it extremely difficult to put a stop to them on any grounds.

As a general matter, specifically for oil pipelines, within the United States, oil pipelines don't need Federal approval. No Federal reviews or permits on these projects are required. If the pipeline harms endangered species, the ESA will apply. If the construction destroys wetlands, a project permit may be needed from the Corps of Engineers. But generally, neither of these require-

ments trigger a broader evaluation of the project. Currently, the only reason to prepare an environmental assessment or impact for cross-border pipelines or transmission lines is because the existing Presidential permit requirement triggers NEPA.

Under this bill, there would be no projectwide Federal environmental assessment for all these projects. State laws don't substitute for NEPA. Many States don't have approval authority over pipelines within their States.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. McNERNEY. Even those States with some instate authority don't have the resources or expertise to develop the information provided by a Federal environmental impact statement. No State has permitting authority over the portions of a pipeline located in other States. Without NEPA, there would be no broad Federal environmental review of cross-border transmission lines.

Mr. Chair, we need these protections, and I ask my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2883.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my good friend.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, there seems to be some confusion here that this bill takes away National Environmental Policy Act enforcement. That is just not true. In fact, during a committee hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, we produced a Congressional Research Service report that said that nothing in this bill will take away the responsibility for the NEPA process, the National Environmental Policy Act.

To make sure that every inch of those pipelines will be studied for environmental issues is not our intention. Our intention is just to move product. We will go through all the efforts.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a report from the Congressional Research Service that we got in committee.

[From the Congressional Research Service, May 2, 2017]

MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable Gene Green; Attention: Justin Ackley

From: Linda Luther, Analyst in Environmental Policy, ext. 7-6852

Subject: Scope of NEPA Review Required for Federal Agency Approvals

This memorandum responds to your request asking CRS to clarify the scope of an environmental review prepared by federal agencies under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). More specifically, you asked CRS to identify the scope of environmental impacts that a federal agency would be likely to evaluate before making a final decision on a request to approve certain energy infrastructure projects that would cross a United States border, such as the issuance of a "certificate of crossing" that would be required in the Promoting Cross-Border En-

ergy Infrastructure Act (discussion draft released April 25, 2017). This memorandum identifies the range of environmental impacts that federal agencies currently evaluate when demonstrating compliance with NEPA. It also discusses current agency practices, for similar projects, that generally involve the evaluation of the environmental impacts of any new facilities constructed in the United States (i.e., impacts that may occur as a result of approving a cross-border energy infrastructure project). Information in this memorandum may be used or may have been used in other CRS products.

Before a federal agency can make a final decision on a proposed federal action, NEPA requires that agency to identify the proposal's effects on the "quality of the human environment." The scope and level of review required under NEPA depends on whether those effects will be "significant." To make that determination, each agency must identify and evaluate the proposal's—

Direct effects—impacts caused by the project and occurring at the same time and place, including impacts directly associated with the construction and operation of the facilities.

Indirect effects—impacts that are later in time or farther removed in distance, but still reasonably foreseeable; and

Cumulative effects—impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impacts of the action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes that other action.

If an agency is authorized to approve a cross-border facility (e.g., issue a certificate of crossing for certain energy infrastructure projects as in the proposed bill), that agency's decision must be informed by appropriate environmental review required under NEPA. As federal agencies currently implement NEPA, the requirement to identify and consider direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts has meant that the agency evaluates the effects of siting, building and operating the entire structure in the United States (not just the cross-border segment they are authorized to approve). That is, if a federal agency is authorized to approve a cross-border project, that agency's existing NEPA practices would likely continue to involve analysis of impacts associated with the approval of the facility that physically crosses the border, as well as any new facilities constructed in the United States.

I hope this information is useful to you. Please feel free to contact me if you have additional questions.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, the other issue, though, is we are going to do belts and suspenders. That is an old saying I heard. We already had a belt, but now we are going to deal with an amendment from Congressman VEASEY. We will make sure it is belts and suspenders and that the National Environmental Policy Act is applied to these pipelines, because that is not our intent.

So we not only have the Congressional Research Service saying it is, we are going to put language into this bill, and I understand it will be accepted by our side, to make sure that is there.

What we need to do is make sure that our closest neighbors, Canada and Mexico—right now, Mexico needs the natural gas that we are producing in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and New Mexico; but 20 years from now, our wells may be dry for natural gas, and

we will need that natural gas that Mexico will be producing when they work in northern Mexico.

So that is why we need to structuralize this, if we are really going to have a North American energy market for electric transmission like they do up in the New England States or electric transmissions even along the border in Texas. I know they do the same thing in southern California. We need to have some certainty with our closest neighbors.

We have a free trade agreement with these two countries. It is already decided it is in our national interest. Why would we set aside energy as something different? That is why this bill is so important.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote for this legislation.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2883, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, introduced by my friend and Western Caucus member MARKWAYNE MULLIN.

H.R. 2883 streamlines the permitting process for pipelines and electricity transmission equipment that crosses the United States’ international borders.

Energy trade between the U.S., Mexico, and Canada is nearly a \$150 billion business that provides significant benefits to America. This bill will prevent another Keystone XL-like delay and takes politics out of the decision-making process.

Cross-border oil and gas pipelines and cross-border electric transmission facilities should not be held up by government bureaucracies. Without this legislation, important projects that provide benefits to our economy will continue to incur unnecessary delays and government red tape.

Edison Electric Institute supports H.R. 2883, stating:

Timely decisions for the sifting and permitting of energy infrastructure are essential to building more resilient infrastructure that electric companies need to deliver reliable, affordable, safe, and increasingly clean energy to Americans.

The National Taxpayers Union supports the bill, stating:

This legislation would streamline the archaic cross-border permitting process for energy facilities that stretch across the borders we share with Mexico and Canada.

The current Presidential permit regime is far from clear and can leave projects in regulatory limbo for years to come. Creating a consolidated and standardized approval process would increase the congressional accountability provided for in Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

The bill requires a full environmental review and complies with NEPA. This legislation makes so much sense that even labor unions support it.

Let’s fulfill our constitutional obligations, streamline important energy infrastructure projects, and advance a true all-of-the-above energy strategy.

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for sponsoring this much-needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge the Members of this body to oppose this misguided bill so that the Congress can turn its attention to the most daunting challenge of our time: climate change, our clean energy future, and the clean energy economy and all of the jobs it entails.

Mr. Chair, again, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, this bill has absolutely no effect on any environmental law. The bill expressly provides that approval of a project under this act does not affect the application of any other Federal laws that are applicable to the construction, operation, or maintenance of a project. The Congressional Research Service has reviewed the legislation and has confirmed that fact.

My point is, other than the fact that they just want to oppose this because, maybe, people oppose fossil fuels as a whole, this makes sense. This is a bill that moves forward. As we stated earlier, it takes politics out of our permitting process. It brings structure and certainty to those that are providing our infrastructure needs.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2883

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 “Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act”.

SEC. 2. APPROVAL FOR BORDER-CROSSING FACILITIES.

(a) *AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT AN INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.—*

(1) *AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (e), no person may*

construct, connect, operate, or maintain a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity, across an international border of the United States without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility under this subsection.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(A) *REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken, by the relevant official or agency identified under subparagraph (B), under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a border-crossing facility for which a person requests a certificate of crossing under this subsection, the relevant official or agency, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility unless the relevant official or agency finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the border-crossing facility is not in the public interest of the United States.*

(B) *RELEVANT OFFICIAL OR AGENCY.—The relevant official or agency referred to in subparagraph (A) is—*

(i) *the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of oil or natural gas pipelines; and*

(ii) *the Secretary of Energy with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of electric transmission facilities.*

(C) *ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility consisting of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A), that the border-crossing facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—*

(i) *the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and*

(ii) *any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the border-crossing facility.*

(3) *EXCLUSIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity—*

(A) *if the border-crossing facility is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;*

(B) *if a permit described in subsection (d) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or*

(C) *if an application for a permit described in subsection (d) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—*

(i) *the date on which such application is denied; or*

(ii) *two years after the date of enactment of this Act, if such a permit has not been issued by such date.*

(4) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(A) *APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility is requested under this subsection.*

(B) *NATURAL GAS ACT.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the requirement to obtain approval or authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act for the siting, construction, or operation of any facility to import or export natural gas.*

(C) *OIL PIPELINES.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the authority of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to oil pipelines under section 60502 of title 49, United States Code.*

(b) *IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—Section 3(c)*

of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "In the case of an application for the importation of natural gas from, or the exportation of natural gas to, Canada or Mexico, the Commission shall grant the application not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission receives the complete application."

(c) TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—

(1) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is amended by striking "insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission's powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)".

(B) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a-4(b)) is amended by striking "the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary."

(d) NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.—No Presidential permit (or similar permit) required under Executive Order No. 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, Executive Order No. 12038, Executive Order No. 10485, or any other Executive order shall be necessary for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any border-crossing facility thereof.

(e) MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.—No certificate of crossing under subsection (a), or permit described in subsection (d), shall be required for a modification to—

(1) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility for which a permit described in subsection (d) has been issued; or

(3) a border-crossing facility for which a certificate of crossing has previously been issued under subsection (a).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) through (e), and the amendments made by such subsections, shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official or agency described in subsection (a)(2)(B) shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a); and

(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a).

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "border-crossing facility" means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at an international boundary of the United States;

(2) the term "modification" includes a reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, change in flow volume, addition or removal of an interconnection, or an adjustment to main-

tain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations);

(3) the term "natural gas" has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a);

(4) the term "oil" means petroleum or a petroleum product;

(5) the terms "Electric Reliability Organization" and "regional entity" have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o); and

(6) the terms "Independent System Operator" and "Regional Transmission Organization" have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-235. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-235.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, after line 16, insert the following:

(i) the Secretary of State with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of oil pipelines;

Page 2, line 17, strike "(i)" and insert "(ii)".

Page 2, line 19, strike "oil or".

Page 2, line 21, strike "(ii)" and insert "(iii)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, since 1968, oil pipelines that cross international borders have been reviewed and authorized by the Department of State. That is nearly 50 years. This is common sense. After all, the State Department handles diplomacy, the State Department manages treaties related to our international boundaries, and the State Department is responsible for the security of pathways for our pipelines.

But the bill we are considering today would shift decisionmaking authority for those pipelines from the State Department, which is equipped to handle all aspects of this issue, to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which isn't equipped.

So it just doesn't make any sense to me, Mr. Chairman. It seems quite arbitrary and quite foolish and moving in the wrong direction. This is change for change's sake, and it wouldn't improve the process.

My amendment would prevent this mistake. It would simply ensure that permitting authority for cross-border oil pipelines remains with the Department of State. That is the permitting authority for cross-border oil pipelines to remain with the Department of State.

In each of the past two Congresses, my friends in the majority agreed. They passed substantially similar legislation to change the cross-border pipeline permitting process, but they kept the final approval authority where it belongs, with the Department of State.

Cross-border oil pipelines are matters of international diplomacy and national security, and oversight should remain with the State Department. The old adage, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," I don't know what we are trying to do here. So I urge support for my amendment.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, H.R. 2883 was designated the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the lead agency of the permitting cross-border oil pipelines.

FERC is an independent agency made up of a bipartisan commission that regulates interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas, and oil. FERC also reviews proposals to build liquefied natural gas terminals, interstate natural gas pipelines, and cross-border natural gas facilities.

FERC has a proven track record of working with a wide array of stakeholders on complex pipeline projects to balance the public interest. It is clearly the best suited agency for the job of permitting cross-border oil pipelines.

As we learned from the Keystone XL experience during the Obama administration, the State Department lacks the ability to pull out politics from our Nation's infrastructure. There is nothing in this bill that would prevent the State Department from being consulted about an application, but FERC should take the lead on cross-border oil pipelines.

H.R. 2883 would provide the permitting process with much-needed consistency and transparency. The gentleman's amendment would double down on the failures of the past and reinject bipartisan politics into the process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the

amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-235.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 14, insert the following:

(D) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR OIL AND NATURAL GAS PIPELINE FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility consisting of an oil or natural gas pipeline facility, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may not issue a certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A) if any part of the oil or natural gas pipeline project is to be located on lands required under Federal, State, or local law to be managed for purposes of natural resource conservation or recreation.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment protects a robust public review process for any proposed pipeline that seeks to cross protected conservation and recreation lands, this time for pipelines that includes a crossing with Canada or Mexico. The legislation before us today, with its narrowly defined environmental reviews and limited public input, puts treasured public resources at risk.

My home State of Massachusetts, like many areas around the country, faces real energy challenges. We need careful and strategic long-term planning in order to lower energy prices and increase reliability and resiliency.

However, as with H.R. 2910 that we considered earlier this afternoon, H.R. 2883 moves us in the wrong direction. In fact, it doesn't allow any careful or strategic planning when it comes to fossil fuel pipelines.

Cross-border and natural gas pipeline interests should not be permitted to cavalierly tread on public lands, lands expressly set aside by Federal taxpayers, State and local communities for the benefit of conservation and public recreation.

Our Nation has a longstanding history of preserving natural habitats and protecting open spaces for the public benefit, and we have invested significant public resources toward these goals. These lands and the decisions behind them deserve to be honored.

The potential negative environmental impacts of an oil or natural gas pipeline are too great to risk such treasured investments by Federal taxpayers and State and local communities, and we should not quickly forego the essential public review process that has helped ensure these public treasures are available to future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I don't have any additional speakers.

I would just like to say that energy infrastructure is critical to our economy, yet we cannot simply give the fossil fuel industry a carte blanche to build pipelines that adversely impact conservation and recreation lands.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. In the United States today, there is 150 million acres of protected land set aside in the National Wildlife Refuge System for protected designation for America's fish, wildlife, and plants.

Conservation efforts like the National Wildlife Refuge System build up America's great conservation legacy that began with Teddy Roosevelt. Ensuring that future generations of Americans have access to these great traditions must be our priority as a body going forward.

In this 150 million acres of National Wildlife Refuge System land, though, there currently stretches 1,339 miles of pipeline already. Protecting our natural resources and building much-needed infrastructure are not mutually exclusive goals.

These pipelines are already there. They are not destroying the lands or their ecosystem or prohibiting the American people from enjoying access to this public land. Companies must pay the government for use of the land for pipelines. That money, in turn, goes into acquiring more land for conservation efforts and recreational use.

The Department of Transportation's review of safety accidents conducted under President Obama's administration showed that in addition to providing a substantial cost advantage, pipelines result in fewer spillage incidents and personal injuries than either road or rail.

As coal-fired power plants continue to shut down, the demand for natural gas, a lower emission alternative, is going to keep going up. Whether the gas is produced in Canada, Alaska, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, or the Gulf of Mexico, it will be used all over the country, and we need to ensure that a regulatory framework is in place that allows us to get this supply to where it is needed.

The amendment is a backhanded way to prevent any pipelines or electrical transmission infrastructure from being built.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, H.R. 2883 strikes a right balance for wise management of our multiuse public lands and natural resources. The amendment would upset this careful balance.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GENE GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 115-235.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. VEASEY, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 3, insert the following:

(D) SCOPE OF NEPA REVIEW.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall affect the scope of any review required to be conducted under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to a project for which a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility is requested under this subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 454, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, again, this is Congressman VEASEY's idea, and I am doing it for him because he couldn't be here.

Our intent when crafting the bill was never to reduce or limit the National Environmental Policy Act applicability when considering whether to approve a cross-border project.

Before a Federal agency can make a final determination on a proposed Federal action, the National Environmental Policy Act requires that the agency identify the proposal's effects on the quality of human environment and whether these effects will be significant.

To make this determination, Federal agencies identify and evaluate the direct and indirect cumulation of effects of the proposal. Direct effects are the impacts caused by the project occurring at the same time and place. Indirect effects are the impacts that are later in time or further removed but still reasonably foreseeable. And cumulative effects are impacts on the environment that result with incremental

impacts on the action, regardless of what person or agency undertakes that action.

The Federal agencies currently implement NEPA. The requirement to identify all three of these impacts has required the analysis of impacts to include not just the cross-border section of the project, but any new facility or structure constructed within the United States.

Our office had the bill analyzed by the experts at the Congressional Research Office, who confirmed that the underlying bill did not in any way limit the scope of future National Environmental Policy Act reviews under it. Under our language, they will continue to involve reviews of the entire project, not just that part that crosses the border section.

With that said, I have heard concerns from Members who are worried that the bill will limit the NEPA in some way. I am happy to support this bipartisan amendment with my colleague, Mr. VEASEY, which unequivocally states that nothing in this act or the amendments made by this act shall affect the scope of any review required to be conducted by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

I support this good faith amendment—and like I said earlier, it is belts and suspenders, but sometimes we need them to pass legislation—and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, which would clarify the intent of the legislation not to affect the application of any or other Federal laws that are applicable to the construction, operation, or maintenance of the project.

Despite the talking points used by some of my friends, nothing in this bill would exempt a project from complying with applicable environmental laws or restrict the scope of environmental review.

The gentleman from Texas' amendment makes this abundantly clear. H.R. 2883 would lead to a more objective and timely decision, create jobs, strengthen our Nation's energy security, and support affordable and reliable energy for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1630

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments

printed in part B of House Report 115–235 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. ENGEL of New York.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 246, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—182

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Frankel (FL) |
| Aguilar | Fudge |
| Barragan | Gabbard |
| Bass | Gallego |
| Beatty | Garamendi |
| Bera | Gomez |
| Beyer | Green, Al |
| Bishop (GA) | Grijalva |
| Blumenauer | Gutiérrez |
| Blunt Rochester | Hanabusa |
| Bonamici | Hastings |
| Boyle, Brendan | Heck |
| F. | Higgins (NY) |
| Brown (MD) | Himes |
| Brownley (CA) | Hoyer |
| Bustos | Huffman |
| Butterfield | Jackson Lee |
| Capuano | Jayapal |
| Carbajal | Jeffries |
| Cárdenas | Johnson (GA) |
| Carson (IN) | Johnson, E. B. |
| Cartwright | Kaptur |
| Castor (FL) | Keating |
| Castro (TX) | Quigley |
| Chu, Judy | Kelly (IL) |
| Cicilline | Kennedy |
| Clark (MA) | Khanna |
| Clarke (NY) | Kihuen |
| Clay | Kildee |
| Cleaver | Kilmer |
| Clyburn | Kind |
| Connolly | Krishnamoorthi |
| Conyers | Kuster (NH) |
| Cooper | Langevin |
| Courtney | Larsen (WA) |
| Crist | Larson (CT) |
| Crowley | Lawrence |
| Davis (CA) | Lawson (FL) |
| Davis, Danny | Lee |
| DeFazio | Levin |
| DeGette | Lewis (GA) |
| Delaney | Lieu, Ted |
| DeLauro | Lipinski |
| DelBene | Loebbeck |
| Demings | Lofgren |
| DeSaulnier | Lowenthal |
| Deutch | Lowe |
| Dingell | Lujan Grisham, |
| Doggett | M. |
| Doyle, Michael | Lujan, Ben Ray |
| F. | Lynch |
| Ellison | Maloney, |
| Engel | Carolyn B. |
| Eshoo | Maloney, Sean |
| Españillat | Matsui |
| Esty (CT) | McCollum |
| Evans | McEachin |
| Foster | McGovern |
| | McNerney |

| | |
|-----------|----------------|
| Torres | Walz |
| Tsongas | Wasserman |
| Vargas | Schultz |
| Velázquez | Waters, Maxine |
| Visclosky | Watson Coleman |

NOES—246

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Gibbs | Noem |
| Aderholt | Gohmert | Norman |
| Allen | Gonzalez (TX) | Nunes |
| Amash | Goodlatte | Olson |
| Amodei | Gosar | Palazzo |
| Arrington | Gottheimer | Palmer |
| Babin | Gowdy | Paulsen |
| Bacon | Granger | Pearce |
| Banks (IN) | Graves (GA) | Perry |
| Barletta | Graves (LA) | Peterson |
| Barr | Graves (MO) | Pittenger |
| Barton | Green, Gene | Poe (TX) |
| Bergman | Griffith | Poliquin |
| Biggs | Grothman | Posey |
| Bilirakis | Guthrie | Ratcliffe |
| Bishop (MI) | Handel | Reed |
| Bishop (UT) | Harper | Renacci |
| Black | Harris | Rice (SC) |
| Blackburn | Hartzler | Roby |
| Blum | Hensarling | Roe (TN) |
| Bost | Herrera Beutler | Rogers (AL) |
| Brady (PA) | Hice, Jody B. | Rogers (KY) |
| Brady (TX) | Higgins (LA) | Rohrabacher |
| Brat | Hill | Rokita |
| Bridenstine | Holding | Rooney, Francis |
| Brooks (AL) | Hollingsworth | Rooney, Thomas |
| Brooks (IN) | Hudson | J. |
| Buchanan | Huizenga | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Buck | Hultgren | Roskam |
| Bucshon | Hunter | Ross |
| Budd | Hurd | Rothfus |
| Burgess | Issa | Rouzer |
| Byrne | Jenkins (KS) | Russell |
| Calvert | Jenkins (WV) | Rutherford |
| Carter (GA) | Johnson (LA) | Sanford |
| Carter (TX) | Johnson (OH) | Schrader |
| Chabot | Johnson, Sam | Schweikert |
| Cheney | Jones | Scott, Austin |
| Coffman | Jordan | Sensenbrenner |
| Cohen | Joyce (OH) | Sessions |
| Cole | Katko | Shimkus |
| Collins (GA) | Kelly (MS) | Shuster |
| Collins (NY) | Kelly (PA) | Simpson |
| Comer | King (IA) | Smith (MO) |
| Comstock | King (NY) | Smith (NE) |
| Conaway | Kinzing | Smith (NJ) |
| Cook | Knight | Smith (TX) |
| Correa | Kustoff (TN) | Snucker |
| Costa | LaHood | Stefanik |
| Costello (PA) | LaMalfa | Stewart |
| Cramer | Lamborn | Stivers |
| Crawford | Lance | Taylor |
| Cuellar | Latta | Thompson (PA) |
| Culberson | Lewis (MN) | Thornberry |
| Curbelo (FL) | LoBiondo | Tiberi |
| Davidson | Long | Tipton |
| Davis, Rodney | Loudermilk | Trott |
| Denham | Love | Turner |
| Dent | Lucas | Upton |
| DeSantis | Luetkemeyer | Valadao |
| DesJarlais | MacArthur | Veasey |
| Diaz-Balart | Marchant | Vela |
| Donovan | Marino | Wagner |
| Duffy | Marshall | Walberg |
| Duncan (SC) | Massie | Walden |
| Duncan (TN) | Mast | Walker |
| Dunn | McCarthy | Walorski |
| Emmer | McCaul | Walters, Mimi |
| Estes (KS) | McClintock | Weber (TX) |
| Farenthold | McHenry | Webster (FL) |
| Faso | McKinley | Wenstrup |
| Ferguson | McMorris | Westerman |
| Fitzpatrick | Rodgers | Williams |
| Fleischmann | McSally | Wilson (SC) |
| Flores | Meadows | Wittman |
| Fortenberry | Meehan | Womack |
| Fox | Messer | Woodall |
| Franks (AZ) | Mitchell | Yoder |
| Frelinghuysen | Moolenaar | Yoho |
| Gaetz | Mooney (WV) | Young (AK) |
| Gallagher | Mullin | Young (IA) |
| Garrett | Murphy (PA) | Zeldin |
| Gianforte | Newhouse | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|----------|------------|--------|
| Cummings | Napolitano | Tenney |
| Labrador | Scalise | |

□ 1658

Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. VELA, GOTTHEIMER, PALAZZO, BURGESS,

VEASEY, CHABOT, CUELLAR, WALBERG, and MEADOWS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. FUDGE changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 247, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—179

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Adams | Frankel (FL) | Meeks |
| Aguilar | Fudge | Meng |
| Barragán | Gabbard | Moore |
| Bass | Gallego | Moulton |
| Beatty | Garamendi | Murphy (FL) |
| Bera | Gomez | Nadler |
| Beyer | Gottheimer | Neal |
| Bishop (GA) | Green, Al | Nolan |
| Blumenauer | Grijalva | O'Halleran |
| Blunt Rochester | Gutiérrez | O'Rourke |
| Bonamici | Hanabusa | Pallone |
| Boyle, Brendan | Hastings | Panetta |
| F. | Heck | Pascarell |
| Brown (MD) | Higgins (NY) | Payne |
| Brownley (CA) | Himes | Pelosi |
| Bustos | Hoyer | Perlmutter |
| Butterfield | Huffman | Peters |
| Capuano | Jackson Lee | Pingree |
| Carbajal | Jayapal | Pocan |
| Cárdenas | Jeffries | Polis |
| Carson (IN) | Johnson (GA) | Price (NC) |
| Cartwright | Johnson, E. B. | Quigley |
| Castor (FL) | Kaptur | Raskin |
| Castro (TX) | Keating | Rice (NY) |
| Chu, Judy | Kelly (IL) | Richmond |
| Cicilline | Kennedy | Rosen |
| Clark (MA) | Khanna | Roybal-Allard |
| Clarke (NY) | Kihuen | Ruiz |
| Clay | Kildee | Ruppersberger |
| Cleaver | Kilmer | Rush |
| Clyburn | Kind | Ryan (OH) |
| Cohen | Krishnamoorthi | Sánchez |
| Connolly | Kuster (NH) | Sarbanes |
| Conyers | Langevin | Schakowsky |
| Cooper | Larsen (WA) | Schiff |
| Correa | Larson (CT) | Schneider |
| Courtney | Lawrence | Scott (VA) |
| Crist | Lee | Scott, David |
| Crowley | Levin | Serrano |
| Davis (CA) | Lewis (GA) | Sewell (AL) |
| Davis, Danny | Lieu, Ted | Shea-Porter |
| DeFazio | Lipinski | Sherman |
| DeGette | Loeb | Sires |
| Delaney | Lofgren | Slaughter |
| DeLauro | Lowenthal | Smith (WA) |
| DeBene | Lowey | Soto |
| Demings | Lujan Grisham, | Speier |
| DeSaulnier | M. | Suozi |
| Deutch | Luján, Ben Ray | Swalwell (CA) |
| Dingell | Lynch | Takano |
| Doggett | Maloney, | Thompson (CA) |
| Ellison | Carolyn B. | Thompson (MS) |
| Engel | Maloney, Sean | Titus |
| Eshoo | Matsui | Tonko |
| Espallat | McCollum | Torres |
| Esty (CT) | McEachin | Tsongas |
| Evans | McGovern | Vargas |
| Foster | McNerney | Velázquez |

Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs

Cummings
Hudson
Labrador

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—247

Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Norman

NOT VOTING—7

Napolitano
Scalise
Tenney

Yarmuth

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained from the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 396 (Tsongas Amendment to H.R. 2833).

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2833) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity, and, pursuant to House Resolution 454, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'Halleran moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2833 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 3, after line 14, insert the following:

(D) AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL.—As a condition of issuing a certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A), the relevant official or agency shall require that all of the iron and steel products used in the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the border-crossing facility are produced in the United States, as determined by the relevant official or agency in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

Mr. MULLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking families across Arizona and across our country are sick and tired of Congress putting partisan politics ahead of creating jobs at home.

As I travel across rural Arizona and speak to workers, miners, farmers, and families, I am asked the same questions: "When is Congress going to get serious about helping rural America?"

"When are you guys going to work together and create good-paying jobs?"

"When are we going to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and roads?"

"When are we finally going to get reliable broadband?"

In my 7 months in Congress, I have seen firsthand the failure to address these problems in a truly bipartisan manner. American workers are counting on all of us, Democrats and Republicans, to focus on bringing back jobs to our country.

The underlying bill before us does not go far enough to ensure pipelines, which involve major investments and can span hundreds of miles across sensitive areas, are made with quality, reliable, American-made materials.

My commonsense amendment simply requires Federal agencies to certify that all of the iron and steel products used in any cross-border pipelines are produced in the United States before they can be approved.

Mr. Speaker, foreign steelmakers now supply half the oil and gas drilling and extraction pipes used in the United States, and it is only getting worse. The American Iron and Steel Institute estimates that imports of steel pipes for the oil and gas industry are up 237 percent in the first half of 2017 from a year earlier.

Earlier this year, President Trump signed an executive order instructing the Secretary of Commerce to develop a plan that would require any company building a pipeline within U.S. borders to use American-made materials and equipment. My amendment mirrors the spirit of that executive order by applying the same rules to any proposed cross-border pipelines.

Mr. Speaker, we need to rebuild America. We need to rebuild America's infrastructure. We need to rebuild America's energy infrastructure, but we need to rebuild America by creating American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better message to send during President Trump's "Made in America Week"

than by standing up for American workers and supporting this common-sense amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, this is just a procedural motion to deny the important benefits of this legislation to the American workers, businesses, and our collective energy security. It fits a pattern of delay and obstruction that we simply cannot support. I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and vote "yes" on final passage.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—193

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Courtney | Hanabusa |
| Aguilar | Crist | Hastings |
| Barragán | Crowley | Heck |
| Bass | Cuellar | Higgins (NY) |
| Beatty | Davis (CA) | Himes |
| Bera | Davis, Danny | Hoyer |
| Beyer | DeFazio | Huffman |
| Bishop (GA) | DeGette | Jackson Lee |
| Blumenauer | Delaney | Jayapal |
| Blunt Rochester | DeLauro | Jeffries |
| Bonamici | DeBene | Johnson (GA) |
| Boyle, Brendan | Demings | Johnson, E. B. |
| F. | DeSaulnier | Jones |
| Brady (PA) | Deutch | Kaptur |
| Brown (MD) | Dingell | Keating |
| Brownley (CA) | Doggett | Kelly (IL) |
| Bustos | Doyle, Michael | Kennedy |
| Butterfield | F. | Khanna |
| Capuano | Duncan (TN) | Kihuen |
| Carbajal | Ellison | Kildee |
| Cárdenas | Engel | Kilmer |
| Carson (IN) | Eshoo | Kind |
| Cartwright | Españal | Krishnamoorthi |
| Castor (FL) | Esty (CT) | Kuster (NH) |
| Castro (TX) | Evans | Langevin |
| Chu, Judy | Foster | Larsen (WA) |
| Cicilline | Frankel (FL) | Larson (CT) |
| Clark (MA) | Fudge | Lawrence |
| Clarke (NY) | Gabbard | Lawson (FL) |
| Clay | Gallo | Lee |
| Cleaver | Garamendi | Levin |
| Clyburn | Gomez | Lewis (GA) |
| Cohen | Gonzalez (TX) | Lieu, Ted |
| Connolly | Gottheimer | Lipinski |
| Conyers | Green, Al | Loeb |
| Cooper | Green, Gene | Lofgren |
| Correa | Grijalva | Lowenthal |
| Costa | Gutiérrez | Lowey |

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Lujan Grisham, M. | Peters | Sinema |
| Luján, Ben Ray | Peterson | Sires |
| Lynch | Pingree | Slaughter |
| Maloney, | Pocan | Smith (WA) |
| Carolyn B. | Polis | Soto |
| Maloney, Sean | Price (NC) | Speier |
| Matsui | Quigley | Suozi |
| McCollum | Raskin | Swalwell (CA) |
| McEachin | Rice (NY) | Takano |
| McGovern | Richmond | Takano |
| McNerney | Rosen | Thompson (CA) |
| Meeks | Roybal-Allard | Thompson (MS) |
| Meng | Ruiz | Titus |
| Moore | Ruppersberger | Tonko |
| Moulton | Rush | Torres |
| Murphy (FL) | Ryan (OH) | Tsongas |
| Nadler | Sánchez | Vargas |
| Neal | Sarbanes | Veasey |
| Nolan | Schakowsky | Vela |
| Norcross | Schiff | Velázquez |
| O'Halleran | Schneider | Visclosky |
| O'Rourke | Schrader | Walz |
| Pallone | Scott (VA) | Wasserman |
| Panetta | Scott, David | Schultz |
| Pascrell | Serrano | Waters, Maxine |
| Payne | Sewell (AL) | Watson Coleman |
| Perlmutter | Shea-Porter | Welch |
| | Sherman | Wilson (FL) |
| | | Yarmuth |

NOES—232

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Fortenberry | Mast |
| Aderholt | Fox | McCarthy |
| Allen | Franks (AZ) | McCaul |
| Amash | Frelinghuysen | McClintock |
| Amodel | Gaetz | McHenry |
| Arrington | Gallagher | McKinley |
| Babin | Garrett | McMorris |
| Bacon | Gianforte | Rodgers |
| Banks (IN) | Gibbs | McSally |
| Barletta | Gohmert | Meadows |
| Barr | Goodlatte | Meehan |
| Barton | Gosar | Messer |
| Bergman | Gowdy | Mitchell |
| Biggs | Granger | Moolenaar |
| Bilirakis | Graves (GA) | Mooney (WV) |
| Bishop (MI) | Graves (LA) | Mullin |
| Bishop (UT) | Graves (MO) | Murphy (PA) |
| Black | Griffith | Newhouse |
| Blackburn | Grothman | Noem |
| Blum | Guthrie | Norman |
| Bost | Handel | Nunes |
| Brady (TX) | Harper | Olson |
| Brat | Harris | Palazzo |
| Bridenstine | Hartzler | Palmer |
| Brooks (AL) | Hensarling | Paulsen |
| Brooks (IN) | Herrera Beutler | Pearce |
| Buchanan | Hice, Jody B. | Perry |
| Buck | Higgins (LA) | Pittenger |
| Bucshon | Hill | Poe (TX) |
| Budd | Holding | Poliquin |
| Burgess | Hollingsworth | Posey |
| Byrne | Hudson | Ratcliffe |
| Calvert | Huizenga | Reichert |
| Carter (GA) | Hultgren | Renacci |
| Carter (TX) | Hunter | Rice (SC) |
| Chabot | Hurd | Roby |
| Cheney | Issa | Roe (TN) |
| Coffman | Jenkins (KS) | Rogers (AL) |
| Cole | Jenkins (WV) | Rohrabacher |
| Collins (GA) | Johnson (LA) | Rokita |
| Collins (NY) | Johnson (OH) | Rooney, Francis |
| Comer | Johnson, Sam | Rooney, Thomas |
| Comstock | Jordan | J. |
| Conaway | Joyce (OH) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Cook | Katko | Roskam |
| Costello (PA) | Kelly (MS) | Ross |
| Cramer | Kelly (PA) | Rothfus |
| Crawford | King (IA) | Rouzer |
| Culberson | King (NY) | Royce (CA) |
| Curbelo (FL) | Kinzing | Russell |
| Davidson | Knight | Rutherford |
| Davis, Rodney | Kustoff (TN) | Sanford |
| Denham | LaHood | Schweikert |
| Dent | LaMalfa | Scott, Austin |
| DeSantis | Lamborn | Sensenbrenner |
| DesJarlais | Lance | Sessions |
| Diaz-Balart | Latta | Shimkus |
| Donovan | Lewis (MN) | Shuster |
| Duffy | LoBiondo | Simpson |
| Duncan (SC) | Long | Smith (MO) |
| Dunn | Loudermilk | Smith (NE) |
| Emmer | Love | Smith (NJ) |
| Estes (KS) | Lucas | Smith (TX) |
| Farenthold | Luetkemeyer | Smucker |
| Faso | MacArthur | Stefanik |
| Ferguson | Marchant | Stewart |
| Fitzpatrick | Marino | Stivers |
| Fleischmann | Marshall | Taylor |
| Flores | Massie | Tenney |

Thompson (PA) Walden Wilson (SC)
 Thornberry Walker Wittman
 Tiberi Walorski Womack
 Tipton Walters, Mimi Woodall
 Trott Weber (TX) Yoder
 Turner Webster (FL) Yoho
 Upton Webster Young (AK)
 Wagner Westerman Young (IA)
 Walberg Williams Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Cummings Pelosi Scalise
 Labrador Reed Valadao
 Napolitano Rogers (KY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1718

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 397.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 175, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—254

Abraham Comstock Gosar
 Aderholt Conaway Gottheimer
 Allen Conyers Gowdy
 Amash Cook Granger
 Amodei Correa Graves (GA)
 Arrington Costa Graves (LA)
 Babin Costello (PA) Graves (MO)
 Bacon Cramer Green, Gene
 Banks (IN) Crawford Griffith
 Barletta Cuellar Grothman
 Barr Culberson Guthrie
 Barton Curbelo (FL) Handel
 Bergman Davidson Harper
 Biggs Davis, Rodney Harris
 Bilirakis Denham Hartzler
 Bishop (GA) Dent Hensarling
 Bishop (MI) DeSantis Herrera Beutler
 Bishop (UT) DesJarlais Hice, Jody B.
 Black Diaz-Balart Higgins (LA)
 Blackburn Donovan Hill
 Blum Duffy Holding
 Bost Duncan (SC) Hollingsworth
 Brady (PA) Duncan (TN) Hudson
 Brady (TX) Dunn Huizenga
 Brat Emmer Hultgren
 Bridenstine Estes (KS) Hunter
 Brooks (AL) Farenthold Hurd
 Brooks (IN) Faso Issa
 Buchanan Ferguson Jackson Lee
 Buck Fitzpatrick Jenkins (KS)
 Bucshon Fleischmann Jenkins (WV)
 Budd Flores Johnson (LA)
 Burgess Fortenberry Johnson (OH)
 Byrne Foxx Johnson, Sam
 Calvert Franks (AZ) Jones
 Carter (GA) Frelinghuysen Jordan
 Carter (TX) Gaetz Joyce (OH)
 Chabot Gallagher Katko
 Cheney Garrett Kelly (MS)
 Coffman Gianforte Kelly (PA)
 Cole Gibbs King (IA)
 Collins (GA) Gohmert King (NY)
 Collins (NY) Gonzalez (TX) Kinzinger
 Comer Goodlatte Knight

Kustoff (TN) Palazzo
 LaHood Palmer
 LaMalfa Paulsen
 Lamborn Pearce
 Lance Perry
 Larsen (WA) Peterson
 Latta Pittenger
 Lewis (MN) Poe (TX)
 LoBiondo Poliquin
 Long Ratcliffe
 Loudermilk Reed
 Love Reichert
 Lucas Renacci
 Luetkemeyer MacArthur
 Marchant Rice (SC)
 Marino Richmond
 Marshall Roby
 Massie Roe (TN)
 Mast Rogers (AL)
 McCarthy Rogers (KY)
 McCaul Rohrabacher
 McClintock Rokita
 McHenry Rooney, Francis
 McKinley Rooney, Thomas
 McMorris J.
 Rodgers Ros-Lehtinen
 McSally Roskam
 Meadows Rothfus
 Meehan Rouzer
 Messer Royce (CA)
 Mitchell Russell
 Moolenaar Rutherford
 Mooney (WV) Sanford
 Mullin Schrader
 Murphy (PA) Schweikert
 Newhouse Scott, Austin
 Noem Sensenbrenner
 Norcross Sessions
 Norman Shimkus
 Nunes Shuster
 Olson Simpson

NAYS—175

Adams Evans
 Aguilar Foster
 Barragán Frankel (FL)
 Bass Fudge
 Beatty Gabbard
 Bera Gallego
 Beyer Garamendi
 Blumenauer Gomez
 Blunt Rochester Green, Al
 Bonamici Grijalva
 Boyle, Brendan Gutiérrez
 F. Hanabusa
 Brown (MD) Hastings
 Brownley (CA) Heck
 Bustos Higgins (NY)
 Butterfield Himes
 Capuano Hoyer
 Carbajal Huffman
 Cárdenas Jayapal
 Carson (IN) Jeffries
 Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Castro (TX) Kaptur
 Chu, Judy Keating
 Cicilline Kelly (IL)
 Clark (MA) Kennedy
 Clarke (NY) Khanna
 Clay Kihuen
 Cleaver Kildee
 Clyburn Kilmer
 Cohen Kind
 Connolly Krishnamoorthi
 Cooper Kuster (NH)
 Courtney Langevin
 Crist Larson (CT)
 Crowley Lawrence
 Davis (CA) Lawson (FL)
 Davis, Danny Lee
 DeFazio Levin
 DeGette Lewis (GA)
 Delaney Lieu, Ted
 DeLauro Lipinski
 DelBene Loeb sack
 Demings Lofgren
 DeSaulnier Lowenthal
 Deutsch Lowey
 Dingell Lujan Grisham,
 Doggett M.
 Doyle, Michael Luján, Ben Ray
 F. Lynch
 Ellison Maloney,
 Engel Carolyn B.
 Eschuo Maloney, Sean
 Espallat Matsui
 Esty (CT) McCollum

Titus Velázquez Waters, Maxine
 Tonko Visclosky Watson Coleman
 Torres Walz Welch
 Tsongas Wasserman Wilson (FL)
 Vargas Schultz Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Cummings Napolitano
 Labrador Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1724

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 454 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2910.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1725

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-235 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 115-235 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 249, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

AYES—180

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Gallego | Neal |
| Aguilar | Garamendi | Nolan |
| Barragán | Gomez | O'Halleran |
| Bass | Gottheimer | O'Rourke |
| Beatty | Green, Al | Pallone |
| Bera | Grijalva | Panetta |
| Beyer | Gutiérrez | Pascarell |
| Bishop (GA) | Hanabusa | Payne |
| Blumenauer | Hastings | Pelosi |
| Blunt Rochester | Heck | Perlmutter |
| Bonamici | Higgins (NY) | Peters |
| Brown (MD) | Himes | Pingree |
| Brownley (CA) | Hoyer | Pocan |
| Bustos | Huffman | Polis |
| Butterfield | Jackson Lee | Price (NC) |
| Capuano | Jayapal | Quigley |
| Carbajal | Jeffries | Raskin |
| Cárdenas | Johnson (GA) | Rice (NY) |
| Carson (IN) | Johnson, E. B. | Richmond |
| Cartwright | Kaptur | Rosen |
| Castor (FL) | Keating | Roybal-Allard |
| Castro (TX) | Kelly (IL) | Ruiz |
| Chu, Judy | Kennedy | Ruppersberger |
| Cicilline | Khanna | Rush |
| Clark (MA) | Kihuen | Sánchez |
| Clarke (NY) | Kildee | Sarbanes |
| Clay | Kilmer | Schakowsky |
| Cleaver | Kind | Schiff |
| Clyburn | Krishnamoorthi | Schneider |
| Cohen | Kuster (NH) | Scott (VA) |
| Connolly | Langevin | Scott, David |
| Conyers | Larsen (WA) | Serrano |
| Cooper | Larson (CT) | Sewell (AL) |
| Correa | Lawrence | Shea-Porter |
| Courtney | Lawson (FL) | Sherman |
| Crist | Lee | Sires |
| Crowley | Levin | Slaughter |
| Davis (CA) | Lewis (GA) | Smith (WA) |
| Davis, Danny | Lieu, Ted | Soto |
| DeFazio | Lipinski | Speier |
| DeGette | Loeb sack | Suo zzi |
| Delaney | Lofgren | Swalwell (CA) |
| DeLauro | Lowenthal | Takano |
| DeBene | Lowe y | Thompson (CA) |
| Demings | Lujan Grisham, | Thompson (MS) |
| DeSaulnier | M. | Titus |
| Deutch | Luján, Ben Ray | Tonko |
| Dingell | Lynch | Torres |
| Doggett | Maloney, | Tsongas |
| Doyle, Michael | Maloney, Sean | Vargas |
| F. | Matsui | Velázquez |
| Ellison | McCollum | Visclosky |
| Engel | McEachin | Walz |
| Eshoo | McGovern | Wasserman |
| Españlat | McNerney | Schultz |
| Esty (CT) | Meeks | Waters, Maxine |
| Evans | Meng | Watson Coleman |
| Fitzpatrick | Moore | Welch |
| Foster | Moulton | Wilson (FL) |
| Frankel (FL) | Murphy (FL) | Yarmuth |
| Fudge | Nadler | |
| Gabbard | | |

NOES—249

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Bost | Coffman |
| Aderholt | Boyle, Brendan | Cole |
| Allen | F. | Collins (GA) |
| Amash | Brady (PA) | Collins (NY) |
| Amodei | Brady (TX) | Comer |
| Arrington | Brat | Comstock |
| Babin | Bridenstine | Conaway |
| Bacon | Brooks (AL) | Cook |
| Banks (IN) | Brooks (IN) | Costa |
| Barletta | Buchanan | Costello (PA) |
| Barr | Buck | Cramer |
| Barton | Bucshon | Crawford |
| Bergman | Budd | Cuellar |
| Biggs | Burgess | Culberson |
| Billirakis | Byrne | Curbelo (FL) |
| Bishop (MI) | Calvert | Davidson |
| Bishop (UT) | Carter (GA) | Davis, Rodney |
| Black | Carter (TX) | Denham |
| Blackburn | Chabot | Dent |
| Blum | Cheney | DeSantis |

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| DesJarlais | King (IA) | Rohrabacher |
| Diaz-Balart | King (NY) | Rokita |
| Donovan | Kinzinger | Rooney, Francis |
| Duffy | Knight | Rooney, Thomas |
| Duncan (SC) | Kustoff (TN) | J. |
| Duncan (TN) | LaHood | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Dunn | LaMalfa | Roskam |
| Emmer | Lamborn | Ross |
| Estes (KS) | Lance | Rothfus |
| Farenthold | Latta | Rouzer |
| Faso | Lewis (MN) | Royce (CA) |
| Ferguson | LoBiondo | Russell |
| Fleischmann | Long | Rutherford |
| Flores | Loudermilk | Ryan (OH) |
| Fortenberry | Love | Sanford |
| Fox | Lucas | Schrader |
| Franks (AZ) | Luetkemeyer | Schweikert |
| Frelinghuysen | MacArthur | Scott, Austin |
| Gaetz | Marchant | Sensenbrenner |
| Gallagher | Marino | Sessions |
| Garrett | Marshall | Shimkus |
| Gianforte | Massie | Shuster |
| Gibbs | Mast | Simpson |
| Gohmert | McCarthy | Sinema |
| Gonzalez (TX) | McCaul | Smith (MO) |
| Goodlatte | McClintock | Smith (NE) |
| Gosar | McHenry | Smith (NJ) |
| Gowdy | McKinley | Smith (TX) |
| Granger | McMorris | Smucker |
| Graves (GA) | Rodgers | Stefanik |
| Graves (LA) | McSally | Stewart |
| Graves (MO) | Meadows | Stivers |
| Green, Gene | Meehan | Taylor |
| Griffith | Messer | Tenney |
| Grothman | Mitchell | Thompson (PA) |
| Guthrie | Moolenaar | Thornberry |
| Handel | Mooney (WV) | Tiberi |
| Harper | Mullin | Tipton |
| Harris | Murphy (PA) | Trott |
| Hartzler | Newhouse | Turner |
| Hensarling | Noem | Upton |
| Herrera Beutler | Norcross | Valadao |
| Hice, Jody B. | Norcross | Veasey |
| Higgins (LA) | Nunes | Vela |
| Hill | Olson | Wagner |
| Holding | Palazzo | Walberg |
| Hollingsworth | Palmer | Walden |
| Hudson | Paulsen | Walker |
| Huizenga | Pearce | Walorski |
| Hultgren | Perry | Walters, Mimi |
| Hunter | Peterson | Weber (TX) |
| Hurd | Pittenger | Webster (FL) |
| Issa | Poe (TX) | Wenstrup |
| Jenkins (KS) | Poliquin | Westerman |
| Jenkins (WV) | Posey | Williams |
| Johnson (LA) | Ratcliffe | Wilson (SC) |
| Johnson (OH) | Reed | Wittman |
| Johnson, Sam | Reichert | Womack |
| Jones | Renacci | Woodall |
| Jordan | Rice (SC) | Yoder |
| Joyce (OH) | Roby | Yoho |
| Katko | Roe (TN) | Young (AK) |
| Kelly (MS) | Rogers (AL) | Young (IA) |
| Kelly (PA) | Rogers (KY) | Zeldin |

NOT VOTING—4

| | |
|----------|------------|
| Cummings | Napolitano |
| Labrador | Scalise |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1730

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 236, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]

AYES—192

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Garamendi | Nolan |
| Aguilar | Gomez | Norcross |
| Barragán | Gonzalez (TX) | O'Halleran |
| Bass | Goodlatte | O'Rourke |
| Beatty | Green, Al | Pallone |
| Bera | Green, Gene | Panetta |
| Beyer | Griffith | Pascarell |
| Bishop (GA) | Grijalva | Payne |
| Blumenauer | Gutiérrez | Pelosi |
| Blunt Rochester | Hanabusa | Perlmutter |
| Bonamici | Harris | Peters |
| Boyle, Brendan | Hastings | Pingree |
| F. | Heck | Pocan |
| Brady (PA) | Higgins (NY) | Polis |
| Brown (MD) | Himes | Price (NC) |
| Brownley (CA) | Hoyer | Quigley |
| Bustos | Huffman | Raskin |
| Butterfield | Jackson Lee | Rice (NY) |
| Capuano | Jayapal | Richmond |
| Carbajal | Jeffries | Rosen |
| Cárdenas | Johnson (GA) | Roybal-Allard |
| Carson (IN) | Johnson, E. B. | Ruiz |
| Cartwright | Kaptur | Ruppersberger |
| Castor (FL) | Keating | Rush |
| Castro (TX) | Kelly (IL) | Ryan (OH) |
| Chu, Judy | Kennedy | Sánchez |
| Cicilline | Khanna | Sarbanes |
| Clark (MA) | Kihuen | Schakowsky |
| Clarke (NY) | Kildee | Schiff |
| Clay | Kilmer | Schneider |
| Cleaver | Kind | Schrader |
| Clyburn | Krishnamoorthi | Scott (VA) |
| Cohen | Kuster (NH) | Scott, David |
| Connolly | Langevin | Serrano |
| Conyers | Larsen (WA) | Sewell (AL) |
| Cooper | Larson (CT) | Shea-Porter |
| Correa | Lawrence | Sherman |
| Courtney | Lawson (FL) | Sinema |
| Crist | Lee | Sires |
| Crowley | Levin | Slaughter |
| Cuellar | Lewis (GA) | Smith (WA) |
| Davis (CA) | Lieu, Ted | Soto |
| Davis, Danny | Lipinski | Speier |
| DeFazio | Loeb sack | Suo zzi |
| DeGette | Lofgren | Swalwell (CA) |
| Delaney | Lowenthal | Takano |
| DeLauro | Lowe y | Thompson (CA) |
| DeBene | Lujan Grisham, | Thompson (MS) |
| Demings | M. | Titus |
| DeSaulnier | Luján, Ben Ray | Tonko |
| Deutch | Lynch | Torres |
| Dingell | Maloney, | Tsongas |
| Doggett | Carolyn B. | Vargas |
| Doyle, Michael | Maloney, Sean | Veasey |
| F. | Matsui | Vela |
| Ellison | McCollum | Velázquez |
| Engel | McEachin | Visclosky |
| Eshoo | McGovern | Walz |
| Españlat | McNerney | Wasserman |
| Esty (CT) | Meeks | Schultz |
| Evans | Meng | Waters, Maxine |
| Fitzpatrick | Moore | Watson Coleman |
| Foster | Moulton | Welch |
| Frankel (FL) | Murphy (FL) | Wilson (FL) |
| Fudge | Nadler | Yarmuth |
| Gabbard | | |

NOES—236

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Brady (TX) | Conaway |
| Aderholt | Brat | Cook |
| Allen | Bridenstine | Costa |
| Amash | Brooks (AL) | Costello (PA) |
| Amodei | Brooks (IN) | Cramer |
| Arrington | Buchanan | Crawford |
| Babin | Buck | Culberson |
| Bacon | Bucshon | Curbelo (FL) |
| Banks (IN) | Budd | Davidson |
| Barletta | Burgess | Davis, Rodney |
| Barr | Byrne | Denham |
| Barton | Carter (GA) | Dent |
| Bergman | Carter (TX) | DeSantis |
| Biggs | Chabot | DesJarlais |
| Bilirakis | Cheney | Diaz-Balart |
| Bishop (MI) | Coffman | Donovan |
| Bishop (UT) | Cole | Duffy |
| Black | Collins (GA) | Duncan (SC) |
| Blackburn | Collins (NY) | Duncan (TN) |
| Blum | Comer | Dunn |
| Bost | Comstock | Emmer |

| | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Estes (KS) | LaMalfa | Rooney, Francis |
| Farenthold | Lamborn | Rooney, Thomas |
| Faso | Lance | J. |
| Ferguson | Latta | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Fitzpatrick | Lewis (MN) | Roskam |
| Fleischmann | LoBiondo | Ross |
| Flores | Long | Rothfus |
| Fortenberry | Loudermilk | Rouzer |
| Fox | Love | Royce (CA) |
| Franks (AZ) | Lucas | Russell |
| Frelinghuysen | Luetkemeyer | Rutherford |
| Gaetz | MacArthur | Sanford |
| Gallagher | Marchant | Schweikert |
| Garrett | Marino | Scott, Austin |
| Gianforte | Marshall | Sensenbrenner |
| Gibbs | Massie | Sessions |
| Gohmert | Mast | Shimkus |
| Gosar | McCarthy | Shuster |
| Gottheimer | McCauley | Simpson |
| Gowdy | McClintock | Smith (MO) |
| Granger | McHenry | Smith (NE) |
| Graves (GA) | McKinley | Smith (NJ) |
| Graves (LA) | McMorris | Smith (TX) |
| Graves (MO) | Rodgers | Smucker |
| Grothman | McSally | Stefanik |
| Guthrie | Meadows | Stewart |
| Handel | Meehan | Stivers |
| Harper | Messer | Taylor |
| Hartzer | Mitchell | Tenney |
| Hensarling | Moolenaar | Thompson (PA) |
| Herrera Beutler | Mooney (WV) | Thornberry |
| Hice, Jody B. | Mullin | Tiberi |
| Higgins (LA) | Murphy (PA) | Tipton |
| Hill | Newhouse | Trott |
| Holding | Noem | Turner |
| Hollingsworth | Norman | Upton |
| Hudson | Nunes | Valadao |
| Huizenga | Olson | Wagner |
| Hultgren | Palazzo | Walberg |
| Hunter | Palmer | Walden |
| Hurd | Paulsen | Walker |
| Issa | Pearce | Walorski |
| Jenkins (KS) | Perry | Walters, Mimi |
| Jenkins (WV) | Peterson | Weber (TX) |
| Johnson (LA) | Pittenger | Webster (FL) |
| Johnson (OH) | Poe (TX) | Wenstrup |
| Johnson, Sam | Poliquin | Westerman |
| Jones | Posey | Williams |
| Jordan | Ratcliffe | Wilson (SC) |
| Joyce (OH) | Reed | Wittman |
| Katko | Reichert | Womack |
| Kelly (MS) | Renacci | Woodall |
| Kelly (PA) | Rice (SC) | Yoder |
| King (IA) | Roby | Yoho |
| King (NY) | Roe (TN) | Young (AK) |
| Kinzinger | Rogers (AL) | Young (IA) |
| Knight | Rogers (KY) | Zeldin |
| Kustoff (TN) | Rohrabacher | |
| LaHood | Rokita | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------|
| Calvert | Labrador | Scalise |
| Cummings | Napolitano | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1735

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2910) to provide for Federal and State agency coordination in the approval of certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 454, he reported the bill back to the House

with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Watson Coleman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2910 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. NO EMINENT DOMAIN.

An application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act may not be approved unless the applicant agrees not to exercise eminent domain authority under section 7(h) of such Act.

Mr. FLORES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to add language prohibiting the use, really the abuse, of Federal eminent domain authority by large gas pipeline companies.

Currently, the law allows pipeline companies—given authorization by FERC—to circumvent landowner opposition and exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire land necessary for pipeline construction, which is privately owned, so that the pipeline construction can operate and maintain—meaning for-profit pipeline companies can seize private land from owners who are unwilling to sell.

More often than not, compensation provided to the property owner is far from fair or just and the negotiations are rarely conducted in good faith. In the event that fair compensation is paid, no one should be forced to sell against their will.

The bottom line is simple: too often eminent domain authority is exercised without the determination of a true public benefit. Certificate holders can manipulate this authority to take whatever land they deem necessary for their gas pipeline projects.

With the recent boom in domestic gas production, this is happening all across the United States and harming property owners in many of our districts. This practice is wrong, and it must be stopped.

In my home State of New Jersey, residents, including my own constituents, are very concerned about the pending PennEast Pipeline Project—a proposed 118-mile, 36-inch gas pipeline stretching from northeast Pennsylvania to my district.

Their proposal crosses the property of more than 500 landowners, many of whom have strongly objected to this project going forward.

My constituents and our neighbors who are affected by this project will receive little, if any, local benefits from the project, because most of the natural gas transported through the pipeline is likely destined for markets outside of New Jersey, including for export overseas.

PennEast would cut through districts represented by both Republicans and Democrats, and it is opposed by my colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle.

Democrats and Republicans alike can agree that one of the most important rights for all Americans is the right to own private property. But today, the growth in gas pipeline projects threatens this right for many Americans.

Everyone deserves a good place to live and a safe place to raise their children. No one should have to worry about losing their hard-earned property, through no fault of their own, just to pad private company coffers.

Preventing these private for-profit companies from having access to the eminent domain authority in section 7(h) of the Natural Gas Act would not only make this law better by halting abuse of that authority by private gas pipeline companies, but also place public interests over private profit.

This motion presents an opportunity to send a clear message to our constituents who have worked hard to own their property and a piece of the American Dream.

Their choice is clear, and it is yours, but I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on the motion to recommit and stand with landowners over land takers.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit and to vote “yes” on final passage.

I am going to make everybody happy because I am going to be really quick about this. This MTR is just a rehash of an amendment that the other side of the aisle tried to introduce during the original bill. That amendment was not germane, and the reason it wasn't germane is because this bill does not affect eminent domain in any way whatsoever.

So the bottom line is, that this is just another procedural motion to deny the important benefits of this legislation to American workers, to American businesses, and to our collective energy security. It fits a pattern of delay and obstruction that we simply cannot support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our Members to oppose this procedural motion, 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. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 239, not voting 5, as follows: (vote result)

[Roll No. 401]

AYES—189

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Cuellar | Jackson Lee |
| Aguilar | Davis (CA) | Jayapal |
| Barragán | Davis, Danny | Jeffries |
| Bass | DeFazio | Johnson (GA) |
| Beatty | DeGette | Johnson, E. B. |
| Bera | Delaney | Jones |
| Beyer | DeLauro | Kaptur |
| Bishop (GA) | DeBene | Keating |
| Blumenauer | Demings | Kelly (IL) |
| Blunt Rochester | DeSaulnier | Kennedy |
| Bonamici | Deutch | Khanna |
| Boyle, Brendan | Dingell | Kihuen |
| F. | Doggett | Kildee |
| Brady (PA) | Doyle, Michael | Kilmer |
| Brown (MD) | F. | Kind |
| Brownley (CA) | Ellison | Krishnamoorthi |
| Bustos | Engel | Kuster (NH) |
| Butterfield | Eshoo | Langevin |
| Capuano | Españillat | Larsen (WA) |
| Carbajal | Esty (CT) | Larson (CT) |
| Cárdenas | Evans | Lawrence |
| Carson (IN) | Foster | Lawson (FL) |
| Cartwright | Frankel (FL) | Lee |
| Castor (FL) | Fudge | Levin |
| Castro (TX) | Gabbard | Lewis (GA) |
| Chu, Judy | Gallego | Lieu, Ted |
| Ciçilline | Garamendi | Lipinski |
| Clark (MA) | Gomez | Loeb sack |
| Clarke (NY) | Gonzalez (TX) | Lofgren |
| Clay | Gottheimer | Lowenthal |
| Cleaver | Green, Al | Lowe y |
| Clyburn | Grijalva | Lujan Grisham, |
| Cohen | Gutiérrez | M. |
| Connolly | Hanabusa | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Conyers | Hastings | Lynch |
| Cooper | Heck | Maloney, |
| Correa | Higgins (NY) | Carolyn B. |
| Courtney | Himes | Maloney, Sean |
| Crist | Hoyer | Matsui |
| Crowley | Huffman | McCollum |

| | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|---------|---------------|------------|
| McEachin | Quigley | Soto | Tiberi | Walorski | Womack |
| McGovern | Raskin | Speier | Tipton | Walters, Mimi | Woodall |
| McNerney | Rice (NY) | Suo zzi | Trott | Weber (TX) | Yoder |
| Meeks | Richmond | Swalwell (CA) | Turner | Webster (FL) | Yoho |
| Meng | Rosen | Takano | Upton | Wenstrup | Young (AK) |
| Moore | Roybal-Allard | Thompson (CA) | Wagner | Westerman | Young (IA) |
| Moulton | Ruiz | Thompson (MS) | Walberg | Williams | Zeldin |
| Murphy (FL) | Ruppersberger | Titus | Walden | Wilson (SC) | |
| Nadler | Rush | Tonko | Walker | Wittman | |
| Neal | Ryan (OH) | Torres | | | |
| Nolan | Sánchez | Tsongas | | | |
| Norcross | Sarbanes | Vargas | | | |
| O'Halleran | Schakowsky | Veasey | | | |
| O'Rourke | Schiff | Vela | | | |
| Pallone | Schneider | Velázquez | | | |
| Panetta | Scott (VA) | Visclosky | | | |
| Pascarell | Scott, David | Walz | | | |
| Payne | Serrano | Wasserman | | | |
| Pelosi | Sewell (AL) | Schultz | | | |
| Perlmutter | Shea-Porter | Waters, Maxine | | | |
| Peters | Sherman | Watson Coleman | | | |
| Pingree | Sinema | Welch | | | |
| Pocan | Sires | Wilson (FL) | | | |
| Polis | Slaughter | Yarmuth | | | |
| Price (NC) | Smith (WA) | | | | |

NOES—239

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Foxx | McClintock |
| Aderholt | Franks (AZ) | McHenry |
| Allen | Frelinghuysen | McKinley |
| Amash | Gaetz | McMorris |
| Amodei | Gallagher | Rodgers |
| Arrington | Garrett | McSally |
| Babin | Gianforte | Meadows |
| Bacon | Gibbs | Meehan |
| Banks (IN) | Gohmert | Messer |
| Barletta | Goodlatte | Mitchell |
| Barr | Gosar | Moolenaar |
| Barton | Gowdy | Mooney (WV) |
| Bergman | Granger | Mullin |
| Biggs | Graves (GA) | Murphy (PA) |
| Bilirakis | Graves (LA) | Newhouse |
| Bishop (MI) | Graves (MO) | Noem |
| Bishop (UT) | Green, Gene | Norman |
| Black | Griffith | Nunes |
| Blackburn | Grothman | Olson |
| Blum | Guthrie | Palazzo |
| Bost | Handel | Palmer |
| Brady (TX) | Harper | Paulsen |
| Brat | Harris | Pearce |
| Bridenstine | Hartzler | Perry |
| Brooks (AL) | Hensarling | Peterson |
| Brooks (IN) | Herrera Beutler | Pittenger |
| Buchanan | Hice, Jody B. | Poe (TX) |
| Buck | Higgins (LA) | Poliquin |
| Bucshon | Hill | Posey |
| Budd | Holding | Ratcliffe |
| Burgess | Hollingsworth | Reed |
| Byrne | Hudson | Reichert |
| Calvert | Huizenga | Renacci |
| Carter (GA) | Hultgren | Rice (SC) |
| Carter (TX) | Hunter | Roby |
| Chabot | Hurd | Roe (TN) |
| Cheney | Issa | Rogers (AL) |
| Coffman | Jenkins (KS) | Rogers (KY) |
| Cole | Jenkins (WV) | Rohrabacher |
| Collins (GA) | Johnson (LA) | Rokita |
| Collins (NY) | Johnson (OH) | Rooney, Francis |
| Comer | Johnson, Sam | Rooney, Thomas |
| Costack | Jordan | J. |
| Conaway | Joyce (OH) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Cook | Katko | Roskam |
| Costa | Kelly (MS) | Ross |
| Costello (PA) | Kelly (PA) | Rothfus |
| Cramer | King (IA) | Rouzer |
| Crawford | King (NY) | Royce (CA) |
| Culberson | Kinzing er | Russell |
| Curbelo (FL) | Knight | Rutherford |
| Davidson | Kustoff (TN) | Sanford |
| DeSantis | LaHood | Schrader |
| DesJarlais | LaMalfa | Schweikert |
| Diaz-Balart | Lamborn | Scott, Austin |
| Donovan | Latta | Sensenbrenner |
| Duffy | Lewis (MN) | Sessions |
| Duncan (SC) | LoBiondo | Shimkus |
| Duncan (TN) | Long | Shuster |
| Dunn | Loudermilk | Simpson |
| Emmer | Love | Smith (MO) |
| Estes (KS) | Luetkemeyer | Smith (NE) |
| Farenthold | MacArthur | Smith (NJ) |
| Faso | Marchant | Smith (TX) |
| Ferguson | Marino | Smucker |
| Fitzpatrick | Marshall | Stefanik |
| Fleischmann | Massie | Stivers |
| Flores | Mast | Taylor |
| Fortenberry | McCarthy | Tenney |
| | McCaul | Thompson (PA) |
| | | Thornberry |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------|
| Cummings | Napolitano | Valadao |
| Labrador | Scalise | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1749

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 179, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

YEAS—248

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Cuellar | Hill |
| Aderholt | Culberson | Holding |
| Allen | Curbelo (FL) | Hollingsworth |
| Amash | Davidson | Hudson |
| Amodei | Davis, Rodney | Huizenga |
| Arrington | Denham | Hultgren |
| Babin | Dent | Hunter |
| Bacon | DeSantis | Hurd |
| Banks (IN) | DesJarlais | Issa |
| Barletta | Diaz-Balart | Jenkins (KS) |
| Barr | Donovan | Jenkins (WV) |
| Barton | Duffy | Johnson (LA) |
| Bergman | Duncan (SC) | Johnson (OH) |
| Biggs | Duncan (TN) | Johnson, Sam |
| Bilirakis | Dunn | Jones |
| Bishop (MI) | Emmer | Jordan |
| Bishop (UT) | Estes (KS) | Joyce (OH) |
| Black | Farenthold | Katko |
| Blackburn | Faso | Kelly (MS) |
| Blum | Ferguson | Kelly (PA) |
| Bost | Fitzpatrick | King (IA) |
| Boyle, Brendan | Fleischmann | King (NY) |
| F. | Flores | Kinzing er |
| Brady (PA) | Fortenberry | Knight |
| Brady (TX) | Foxx | Kustoff (TN) |
| Brat | Franks (AZ) | LaHood |
| Bridenstine | Frelinghuysen | LaMalfa |
| Brooks (AL) | Gaetz | Lamborn |
| Brooks (IN) | Gallagher | Latta |
| Buchanan | Garrett | Lewis (MN) |
| Buck | Gianforte | LoBiondo |
| Bucshon | Gibbs | Long |
| Budd | Gohmert | Loudermilk |
| Burgess | Gonzalez (TX) | Love |
| Byrne | Goodlatte | Lucas |
| Calvert | Gosar | Luetkemeyer |
| Carter (GA) | Gowdy | MacArthur |
| Carter (TX) | Granger | Marchant |
| Chabot | Graves (GA) | Marino |
| Cheney | Graves (LA) | Marshall |
| Coffman | Graves (MO) | Massie |
| Cole | Green, Gene | Mast |
| Collins (GA) | Griffith | McCarthy |
| Collins (NY) | Grothman | McCaul |
| Comer | Guthrie | McClintock |
| Costack | Handel | McHenry |
| Conaway | Harper | McKinley |
| Cook | Harris | McMorris |
| Correa | Hartzler | Rodgers |
| Costa | Hensarling | McSally |
| Costello (PA) | Herrera Beutler | Meadows |
| Cramer | Hice, Jody B. | Meehan |
| Crawford | Higgins (LA) | Messer |

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Mitchell | Rohrabacher | Tenney |
| Moolenaar | Rokita | Thompson (PA) |
| Mooney (WV) | Rooney, Francis | Thornberry |
| Mullin | Rooney, Thomas | Tiberi |
| Murphy (PA) | J. | Tipton |
| Newhouse | Roskam | Trott |
| Noem | Ross | Turner |
| Norcross | Rothfus | Upton |
| Norman | Rouzer | Valadao |
| Nunes | Royce (CA) | Vela |
| O'Halleran | Russell | Wagner |
| Olson | Rutherford | Walberg |
| Palazzo | Sanford | Walden |
| Palmer | Schrader | Walker |
| Paulsen | Schweikert | Walorski |
| Pearce | Scott, Austin | Walters, Mimi |
| Perry | Sensenbrenner | Weber (TX) |
| Peterson | Sessions | Webster (FL) |
| Pittenger | Shimkus | Wenstrup |
| Poe (TX) | Shuster | Westerman |
| Poliquin | Simpson | Williams |
| Posey | Sinema | Wilson (SC) |
| Ratcliffe | Smith (MO) | Wittman |
| Reed | Smith (NE) | Womack |
| Reichert | Smith (NJ) | Woodall |
| Renacci | Smith (TX) | Yoder |
| Rice (SC) | Smucker | Yoho |
| Roby | Stefanik | Young (AK) |
| Roe (TN) | Stewart | Young (IA) |
| Rogers (AL) | Stivers | Zeldin |
| Rogers (KY) | Taylor | |

□ 1756

Mr. MESSER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call votes No. 395, No. 396, No. 397, No. 398, No. 399, No. 400, No. 401, and No. 402 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the Engel Amendment. I would have also voted “yea” on the Tsongas/McGovern/Beyer Amendment. I would have also voted “yea” on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2883. I would have also voted “nay” on the Final Passage of H.R. 2883—Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act. I would have also voted “yea” on the Tsongas/McGovern/Beyer Amendment. I would have also voted “yea” on the Beyer Amendment. I would have also voted “yea” on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2910. I would have also voted “nay” on the Final Passage of H.R. 2910—Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on Tuesday, July 18, I was unavoidably detained on constituency business.

On rollcall vote No. 382, motion on ordering the previous question on the rule, if I had been present, I would have voted “no.”

On rollcall vote No. 383, House Resolution 451 covering H.R. 806, if I had been present, I would have voted “no.”

On rollcall vote No. 384 on H.R. 2786, if I had been present, regarding qualifying conduit hydropower facility by Mr. HUDSON, I would have voted “yes.”

COMMEMORATING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF ERIE CANAL

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Erie Canal. Construction first began in 1817 in Rome, New York, with the first completed portion connecting two cities in the 22nd Congressional District, Rome and Utica.

The Erie Canal was transformative in establishing New York as the Empire State. The canal opened the interior of our Nation, allowing westward expansion and the free flow of goods. With a drastic 90 percent reduction in shipping costs, the canal established our region as a hub of economic activity in the early 20th century and made New York the busiest port in the entire Nation.

In addition to the vast economic impact, the Erie Canal had an important cultural effect. Nearly 80 percent of upstate New York's population lives

within 25 miles of the canal. From Albany to Buffalo, today, the Erie Canal is designated as a National Heritage Area, continuing its rich legacy.

This Saturday, a first dig celebration in Rome, New York, will recognize this historic and monumental achievement in both New York's and our Nation's history.

In the words of the famous Erie Canal song: “You'll always know your neighbor, and you'll always know your pal, if you've ever navigated on the Erie Canal.”

□ 1800

HOMELESSNESS

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today, homeless advocates from Rhode Island, including from Crossroads Rhode Island and from Rhode Island Housing, came to visit my office.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to express in words how important their work is. These groups take care of the least among us. They provide shelter for the working poor and those affected by the opioid crisis, and they assist those not working because of age, infirmity, or disability. They help keep lives together. They help keep families together.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to provide strong funding for these programs in our appropriations bills. We still have not fully emerged from the financial crisis and people are still trying to make ends meet. Foster youth are particularly vulnerable, with as many as 40 percent who age out of the system becoming homeless.

Mr. Speaker, social services organizations and nonprofits can only do so much on their own. They need support to keep our vulnerable brothers and sisters from falling off a cliff. We can do better and we deserve to support them.

RECOGNIZING THE PADUCAH AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Paducah Area Chamber of Commerce for their designation as the 2017 Chamber of the Year by the Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives. This national honor was awarded at the ACCE National Convention in Nashville, Tennessee, on July 18.

This is the second win for the Paducah Area Chamber of Commerce in the last 6 years, and is national recognition of the area's national business leaders whose community contributions are unparalleled. Ranking among the top 10 percent of Chambers nationwide, their mission of promotion, advocacy, and education develops well-

NAYS—179

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Garamendi | Neal |
| Aguilar | Gomez | Nolan |
| Barragán | Gottheimer | O'Rourke |
| Bass | Green, Al | Pallone |
| Beatty | Grijalva | Panetta |
| Bera | Gutiérrez | Pascrell |
| Beyer | Hanabusa | Payne |
| Bishop (GA) | Hastings | Pelosi |
| Blumenauer | Heck | Perlmutter |
| Blunt Rochester | Higgins (NY) | Peters |
| Bonamici | Himes | Pingree |
| Brown (MD) | Hoyer | Pocan |
| Brownley (CA) | Huffman | Polis |
| Bustos | Jackson Lee | Price (NC) |
| Butterfield | Jayapal | Quigley |
| Capuano | Jeffries | Raskin |
| Carbajal | Johnson (GA) | Rice (NY) |
| Cárdenas | Johnson, E. B. | Richmond |
| Carson (IN) | Kaptur | Rosen |
| Cartwright | Keating | Roybal-Allard |
| Castor (FL) | Kelly (IL) | Ruiz |
| Castro (TX) | Kennedy | Ruppersberger |
| Chu, Judy | Khanna | Rush |
| Cicilline | Kihuen | Ryan (OH) |
| Clark (MA) | Kildee | Sánchez |
| Clarke (NY) | Kilmer | Sarbanes |
| Clay | Kind | Schakowsky |
| Cleaver | Krishnamoorthi | Schiff |
| Clyburn | Kuster (NH) | Schneider |
| Cohen | Lance | Scott (VA) |
| Connolly | Langevin | Scott, David |
| Conyers | Larsen (WA) | Serrano |
| Cooper | Larson (CT) | Sewell (AL) |
| Courtney | Lawrence | Shea-Porter |
| Crist | Lawson (FL) | Sherman |
| Crowley | Lee | Sires |
| Davis (CA) | Levin | Slaughter |
| Davis, Danny | Lewis (GA) | Smith (WA) |
| DeFazio | Lieu, Ted | Soto |
| DeGette | Lipinski | Speier |
| Delaney | Lofgren | Suozi |
| DeLauro | Lowenthal | Swalwell (CA) |
| DelBene | Lowe | Takano |
| Demings | Lujan Grisham, | Thompson (CA) |
| DeSaulnier | M. | Thompson (MS) |
| Deutch | Luján, Ben Ray | Titus |
| Dingell | Lynch | Tonko |
| Doggett | Maloney, | Torres |
| Doyle, Michael | Carolyn B. | Tsongas |
| F. | Maloney, Sean | Vargas |
| Ellison | Matsui | Veasey |
| Engel | McCollum | Velázquez |
| Eshoo | McEachin | Visclosky |
| Espallat | McGovern | Walz |
| Esty (CT) | McNerney | Wasserman |
| Evans | Meeks | Schultz |
| Foster | Meng | Waters, Maxine |
| Frankel (FL) | Moore | Watson Coleman |
| Fudge | Moulton | Welch |
| Gabbard | Murphy (FL) | Wilson (FL) |
| Gallo | Nadler | Yarmuth |

NOT VOTING—6

| | | |
|----------|------------|--------------|
| Cummings | Loeb sack | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Labrador | Napolitano | Scalise |

rounded, lifelong business leaders with a pride and responsibility to their fellow community members.

As the largest city in the First District of Kentucky, the chamber's efforts have benefited not only the Paducah area, but positively impact communities throughout western Kentucky.

I would like to thank President Sandra Wilson and Board Chair Tammy Zimmerman, as well as the board of directors, staff, and chamber members for their unwavering dedication to the betterment of local industry. I look forward to many future accomplishments for the chamber, and I am proud to represent the thriving business leaders of Paducah.

NAFTA AND MADE IN AMERICA WEEK

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise because President Trump has dubbed this week "Made in America Week." But one can't pretend one's way to creating jobs in the United States, even if you are President.

A key index that gives you a clue to the truth of job creation in the United States is the trade deficit: How many more products and services are country exports, rather than imports from off-shore sweatshops?

Well, for every month of the Trump administration—that is what the red line is—the jobs hole for America is growing deeper.

You see here that the May 2017 deficit on this scorecard confirms the failing Trump trade record, with a \$46 billion trade and jobs deficit for May alone—larger than last year, larger than every other month.

The President spoke endlessly about trade during the campaign and promised turning NAFTA into a good deal for Americans. Without a doubt, working people of the Midwest put him in the Presidency because he promised to renegotiate NAFTA, that bad deal. Now it is his turn to live up to the bargain.

There is an old expression, "Don't tell me what he says, show me what he does."

Well, President Trump could start by onshoring all foreign goods he makes abroad—everything from ties, suits, bracelets, and so forth.

I haven't seen any inclination to date by this President reshoring items so that he creates jobs again in this country. He contributes to a growing trade surplus, not a deficit.

[From the guardian.com, July 18, 2017]

TRUMP'S "MADE IN AMERICA" WEEK: THE PRESIDENT'S HYPOCRISY IS ON DISPLAY

(By Adam Gabbatt)

The White House celebrates US-manufactured products this week, even though Trump's vodka, menswear and even board games have been made overseas.

Donald Trump has declared this week "Made in America" week. According to the White House, it's an opportunity for the president to showcase "products that are made in America".

Unfortunately for Trump, that description would rule out many of the products he and members of his family have made and sold. From Donald J Trump Collection clothing to Trump Vodka to Trump: the Game, the president has a track record of not making things in America.

The week was scheduled to kick off at the White House on Monday, with Trump walking around some tables looking at products made in all 50 states. So in honour of the president's communist-dictator-esque photo opportunity, here's a look at some not-made-in-America Trump gear.

ALCOHOL

Trump Vodka ("The finish is disappointingly harsh"—InternetWines.com) was an ill-fated attempt by Trump to branch into the spirits world. The vodka ("No discernable flavor"—Chicagoist) was manufactured in the Netherlands by a company called Wanders Distillery and launched in the US in 2006.

But the beverage ("My taste buds unfortunately associate the flavor with the smell of paint"—VodkaBuzz) failed to sell. The trademark was abandoned in 2008, according to Rolling Stone. By 2011, Trump Vodka was "out of circulation".

"We don't need Chinese products," Trump told Fox News in 2010. "The stuff that's been sent over from China is—it falls apart after a year and a half. It's crap."

It was an odd thing to say for a self-described master businessman offering to the American public many menswear products—featured in the Donald J Trump Signature Collection—that were made in China.

Donald J Trump eyeglasses were made in China. Donald Trump's ties were made in China. Some of the Donald J Trump suits were made in China.

To be fair, Trump is an equal opportunity overseas manufacturer. His dress shirts have been manufactured in Bangladesh, Honduras and Vietnam. And China.

It turned out Trump was right about people not needing Chinese products. In 2015, the Donald J Trump Signature Collection was jettisoned by Macy's. His famous red hats, meanwhile, actually are made in the US. It's the unofficial ones that aren't.

EDUCATION

Trump University ("A fraud from beginning to end"—New York attorney general Eric Schneiderman) was a US business.

But the university, which was not actually an accredited university, encouraged students to outsource jobs overseas.

"We hear terrible things about outsourcing jobs—how sending work outside of our companies is contributing to the demise of American businesses," Trump wrote on the Trump University blog in 2005. "But in this instance I have to take the unpopular stance that it is not always a terrible thing."

In November 2016, Trump settled three fraud lawsuits relating to the university for \$25m.

HOMEWARE

"Several Trump Home items are listed as made in China or imported from China the Washington Post reported in 2016.

According to the Post, foreign-made items in Trump's furniture collection include mirrors, ceramic vases, wall decorations, kitchen items and lighting fixtures. They were all made in China. Some Trump Home picture frames were manufactured in India.

Earlier this year, Peter York, who wrote a 2006 book about the homes of autocrats, in-

cluding Saddam Hussein and Nicolae Ceaușescu, wrote about the similarities between their tastes and Trump's interior decor preferences.

"The best aesthetic descriptor of Trump's look, I'd argue, is dictator style," York said.

BOARD GAMES

Trump: the Game ("I loathed every miserable second of it"—Ars Technica) was launched in 1989, then pushed out again in 2004 after Trump became host of The Apprentice.

The game ("Bizarre"—Business Insider) was manufactured in the US by Milton Bradley Company. But the dice, according to this photo of the Trump: the Game packaging, were made in China.

It is difficult to tell if the dice were "crap" and fell apart after a year and a half, because Trump: the Game sold poorly. In 2011, Time magazine listed the game as one of Trump's top 10 business failures.

IVANKA TRUMP CLOTHING

It's not just Donald Trump who has a track record of overseas manufacturing. In December, the New York Times, citing two trade databases, reported that "almost all" of Ivanka Trump's clothing line is made overseas.

In May, New York-based activists were arrested in China while investigating the making of Ivanka Trump shoes. In July, the Washington Post traced Ivanka Trump products to Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia and Vietnam.

More than 20 stores have dropped Ivanka Trump's products since her father started his run for president.

POLL MISREPRESENTS THE ELECTORATE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent Washington Post-ABC News poll states that only 36 percent of Americans approve the job President Trump is doing. But the results of this poll are flawed because it did not use a representative sample of Republican and Democratic participants.

This Washington Post-ABC NEWS poll used a population sample that was 35 percent Democratic and only 23 percent Republican, underrepresenting Republican voters by about 10 percent.

As noted by strategist Jim McLaughlin, "If the poll reflected the actual electorate, Trump would be in mid-40s, which is what his favorability rating was on election day when he won an overwhelming electoral college victory."

The same Washington Post pollsters gave Hillary Clinton a four-point advantage over Donald Trump on the eve of the election. They consistently predicted a significant Clinton victory, only to be proved wrong. Their credibility is questionable.

SUPPORT NATIONAL CLINICIANS HIV/AIDS TESTING AND AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize this Friday as the 10th annual National Clinicians HIV/AIDS Testing and Awareness Day.

It is a harsh reality that HIV/AIDS touches every community across the country. Although we made great progress in treating the disease, it is imperative to continue striving for prevention, effective treatments, and a cure.

This is particularly important in my home State of New Jersey. In 2013 alone, over 2,000 adults and adolescents were diagnosed with HIV, making New Jersey the sixth highest in the country of new diagnoses. In ages 13 to 24, diagnoses have increased from 10 to 18 percent, and in the African-American community, rates are above the national average.

We must remain vigilant to combat this epidemic that continues to plague communities across our Nation, especially in light of the continued efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and remove insurance protections for millions. We must be vocal against all efforts to take away the ability to receive adequate care and do our part to fight HIV/AIDS. Encourage your loved ones to get tested.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP'S ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks President Donald Trump's first 6 months in office, and I appreciate his many successes for the American people.

His leadership for jobs has inspired record highs today for the Dow, S&P 500, and NASDAQ. President Trump has advanced a decisive foreign policy positively addressing the Muslim world, upholding the United States commitment to NATO, and working with our allies for peace through strength. Additionally, the President has taken firm action against rogue regimes.

In Syria, President Trump was clear that America will not tolerate chemical weapons attacks by the Assad regime against his citizens. In North Korea, the President has made clear that he will challenge the continued provocation by the communist, totalitarian regime; and that the U.S. will expose Iran for their ballistic missile testing and human rights abuses.

As of June 30, the House has passed 269 bills, the most of the last five administrations, with 37 laws signed to date, the most of the last five administrations.

I look forward to continuing to work with President Donald Trump and Vice President MIKE PENCE for positive achievements to promote American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

RECOGNIZING CAROLYN WHITAKER-TANDY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, I set off on a long-shot campaign run by a talented and passionate but also overworked and inexperienced staff, many of whom were learning on the job. Yet everything went pretty smoothly—smoothly enough, obviously.

A big reason for this was an unpaid volunteer who just seemed to know how to do everything. She would show up with a warm, ever-present smile, eager to tackle the smallest task or take on the most challenging responsibility. Whatever was needed, Carolyn Whitaker-Tandy made everything easier. When it was time to hire a district director, Carolyn made that decision easy, too.

I am fortunate to have had my friend Carolyn running my Louisville office since day one. Though I will miss her leadership, I am proud that she is moving on to new opportunities. I know the people of Louisville are better off because of her service. I saw it firsthand every day for more than a decade.

For all she accomplished, her commitment, and her continued friendship, I am forever grateful. I expect great things from Carolyn and her amazing family, and I wish them nothing but the best going forward.

TURKISH TYRANT NOT WELCOME IN UNITED STATES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was joined by some Members of Congress, along with other Americans, in taking a stand for the First Amendment right of freedom of expression.

We stood across the street from the Turkish Embassy, where, a few weeks ago, Turkish President Erdogan was visiting. But while a peaceful protest was taking place in May, Dictator Erdogan's security detail crossed the street and assaulted and beat up U.S. citizens protesting the rogue regime.

People were injured. The outlaws escaped arrest and fled to Turkey. No apology was issued by the Turks, but, rather, the government justified the assault on Americans. Erdogan should not be welcome back into the United States until he apologizes. Also, the culprits must face justice in American courts.

The First Amendment right of freedom of expression is the First Amendment because it is the most important of all of our rights. No foreign tyrant can assault the First Amendment or assault Americans without consequences. This should never occur on our soil.

And that is just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING THE YOUNG GUNS AT QUAIL CREEK

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Young Guns at Quail Creek for winning the 2017 Scholastic Clay Target Program National Championship. Based out of my hometown, Okeechobee, Florida, the Young Guns have won the SCTP State championship for the past 3 years.

The Young Guns had the highest combined team score of all 38 teams competing. Specifically, one participant, Nicholas Blenker, had the highest overall score in the competition for trap, skeet, and sporting clays. Over the course of the 2-day competition, Nicholas shot 575 out of 600, only missing 25 shots.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the whole team on their success and for making Okeechobee proud.

FINI PROGRAM SHOULD BE REAUTHORIZED IN NEXT FARM BILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, I rise today to speak about an important program that gives SNAP participants access to more fruits and vegetables.

SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, helps provide low-income families with the resources they need to consume more nutritious food. The Agriculture Act of 2014 created the Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive program, or FINI, which provided \$100 million to support produce incentive programs around the country for SNAP participants.

This means SNAP benefits could be used at farmers' markets, grocery stores, and other farmer-to-consumer retailers serving rural and urban communities.

Mr. Speaker, the FINI program is successful in achieving the established goal of encouraging SNAP households to consume fresh, healthy produce. More than 74 percent of shoppers reported that they were eating more produce.

As the Agriculture Committee works to develop the next farm bill, I know the FINI program should be reauthorized. The benefits of this program are twofold: it supports local American farmers and provides more Americans with quality food. That is what I call made in America.

□ 1815

RECOGNIZING OFFICER KASSIDY GROVE AND OFFICER RYAN MORRISON

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Middletown Township's two newest police officers: Officer Kassidy Grove and Officer Ryan Morrison.

Officers Grove and Morrison, both 23 years old, were sworn in by the Middletown Township Board of Supervisors this week.

Kassidy Grove is a graduate of Pennsbury High School and attended Lock Haven University where she played rugby. She went on to work at the Lehigh County Sheriff's Office and for the Yardley Borough Police Department.

Ryan Morrison graduated from Neshaminy High School, after which he enlisted as a military police officer. He recently graduated from the Temple University Police Academy.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Kassidy Grove and Ryan Morrison joining the police department of my hometown, Middletown Township, we recognize the larger commitment of all law enforcement to step up and serve their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in solidarity with my brothers and sisters of the thin blue line, and I urge all Americans to honor their sacrifice. Together, let us recommit ourselves to the daily ideals and laws that Officers Grove and Morrison and so many others are sworn to uphold.

—

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

—

POLICE AND CIVILIAN RELATIONS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to take this time from the minority leader on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. We are doing a Special Order hour this evening on police and civilian relations.

We are joined by the very distinguished Congressman KEITH ELLISON. Before we start, though, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

HONORING THE LIFE OF NADADUR VARDHAN

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my good friend of 30 years, Nadadur Vardhan, a leader in the Indian-American community, who passed away on July 3 of this year at age 70 in Los Angeles, surrounded by his extended family.

Nadadur Vardhan was born in India and immigrated to the United States in

1978. Arriving in America with just the clothes on his back, he poured his energy into building a career as an international tax consultant. Over four decades, he grew his Santa Monica-based accounting practice to a thriving firm.

Nadadur served as President of the Malibu Hindu Temple, one of the largest Hindu temples in the United States, and invited me to speak there and to be there on many occasions. As president of the temple, he was regularly invited to speak to political, cultural, and religious groups across the world. Nadadur also founded the Indo-American Vision Foundation, a pioneering independent think tank that empowered Indian-American political activism.

For his work in promoting the Indo-American community, he received the Ellis Island Medal of Honor. A passionate community leader, he personally met with many U.S. Presidents, Prime Ministers of India, and other elected officials. Nadadur was responsible for organizing several major cultural and political events, many of which I was honored to attend, including the World Hindu Economic Forum, forums with Indian Ambassadors to the United States, and events with a wide range of public figures.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in honoring his many contributions to our Nation and to extend condolences to his wife, Dr. Indubala Nadadur Vardhan; his daughters, Dr. Malini Nadadur and Anjani Nadadur; his brother, Nadadur Kumar; his sisters, Dr. Pushpa Kasturi and Alamelu Krishnamachary; his extended family; and to all whose lives he touched.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SHERMAN for his comments. And again, the Progressive Caucus Special-Order hour tonight is on the subject of the police power in America, and its uses, its abuses, what has been taking place in different parts of the country, and we are going to kick off with KEITH ELLISON, who has been the chair of the Progressive Caucus. And in addition to being a distinguished member of the Congress from Minnesota, he is the vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to talk about a tragic situation involving Justine Damond. Justine Damond was a young woman who saw what she believed to be a sexual assault outside of her home. She then made a call to the police and asked them to come to give assistance.

Ms. Damond then went outside to try to meet with the police to report what she saw, and for some reason, which no one really knows quite yet, she was shot in the abdomen and died.

Ms. Damond, 40 years old, she was due to be married in only a few weeks. She leaves behind a fiancée, her fiancée's son, her family, her parents, and here

we are again dealing with a tragic situation in which an unarmed civilian has been shot by a member of law enforcement.

Now, as I speak today, Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear. I know many police officers personally. I know how hard they work. I know the dangers that they incur. I know that they, by and large, join the force because they want to help people, because they are courageous and brave and are willing to put themselves in harm's way in order to protect other citizens. And I myself, and many people I know, have called on the police to stop crimes from happening, to report them, and we are grateful when they report.

But it is also true, Mr. Speaker, that officer-involved shootings happen with tremendous frequency, and it is not even a matter of blaming the officer. We have to ask ourselves what is going on with the system of policing which allows us to return to this tragic scenario again and again and again.

Justine Damond, again, was reportedly in her pajamas, and she was trying to help another person, yet somehow the officer, who was on the passenger side of the squad car, shot through the door or the window, and that is not clear, and she sustained lethal injuries.

One of the most disturbing things about this particular case, Mr. Speaker, is that the officer's body cameras were not turned on. The dash cam did not capture the interaction between Justine and the officers, and the body cams were, again, as I mentioned, not on. This is despite the fact that all Minneapolis police officers have worn body cameras since the end of 2016. Why the body cameras were not on, we can only speculate.

But I urge, with everything I have, that the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Minneapolis Police Department, and everyone and anyone who has jurisdictional authority investigate the reason for these tools to not be in use.

Justine is dead. Justine is not coming back. And it is true that innocent people get killed by criminals all day, and that is a sad reality of our world. It doesn't just happen in my city of Minneapolis. It happens all over the country. It happens all over the globe.

But I think that citizens expect that members of law enforcement, who are sworn to protect us, would take due care to protect life, not end it, unless there was a legal basis to do so.

Now, again, I don't know what happened here. Nobody really knows what caused the officer to somehow reach over his partner and shoot Ms. Damond in the abdomen and kill her when she is unarmed and wearing pajamas and is the reporter of a crime. The weeks and days ahead will reveal what happened. But I assure you that this will not be the last time that it happens unless, as a society, we begin to ask ourselves why these things are happening.

In our community in Minnesota, we are still trying to figure out how to

deal with it, how to cope with the death of Philando Castile. Philando Castile was shot and killed on videotape, captured on live-stream Facebook. To the credit of John Choi, who was the prosecutor, district attorney in Ramsey County, Minnesota, that officer was charged with the criminal offense of manslaughter, and after a jury trial, that officer was acquitted.

When I looked at the dash cam and saw the officer discharge his firearm into the body of Philando Castile, it was absolutely horrifying, and I couldn't possibly understand why this happened. I don't know what the jurors saw, and I am a lawyer myself, and I support the jury system, but I can tell you that Philando Castile, who did have a firearm, said: Officer, I have a firearm; I have a license to carry a firearm. And the next thing you know, bam, bam, bam, bam, bam, young man dead.

Philando Castile was a beloved member of his community. He was the lunch attendant. He was the lunch manager at Hill Elementary School in St. Paul, and the children needed counseling, and the families needed somebody to explain why was Philando Castile shot this way.

The children are raised to respect the police, but they knew Philando Castile and they loved him, and they couldn't reconcile why the police, who they respect, would hurt Philando Castile, who they also respected and admired and loved.

Jamar Clark, another one from Minnesota, unarmed, shot, killed, tremendous outpouring of community frustration around this, brought an 18-day protest outside of the Fourth Precinct in Minneapolis, and you know, drew the attention of the entire community. And I can assure you that many people, particularly young people, were angry, upset, frustrated, feeling very vulnerable because they just felt that there was no accountability in that their lives just didn't matter very much in the eyes of the people who were sworn to protect and defend them.

We have a community problem, Mr. Speaker. We have to come together and deal with it, and it is simply not enough to say it is all the cops' fault or it is all the citizens' fault. This is a social problem that calls for a social solution.

Part of it will be changes in law. Part of it will be departmental changes. Part of it will be changes in the way we do business. But we have got to have these changes. And if people just say, "It is not my fault, you know, it was an accident, this person had it coming," we will never get to the bottom of these kind of things.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967, there were a state of civil disturbances, some people call riots, throughout our urban areas, and the government responded by issuing something called a Kerner Commission Report, K-E-R-N-E-R. And one of the findings of that is that po-

lice community relations were incredibly bad, that communication was poor, and that the police were essentially sent into areas that were economically and socially isolated and deprived in order to keep order, and what really should have been happening is that we should have been investing in jobs and opportunity and social inclusion, and we just asked the police to sort of just solve this problem without making the investments that our society should have made.

□ 1830

I am sad to say that we really don't seem to have advanced very far. The fact is that often civil disturbances, which are often referred to as riots, occur after these tragic shootings. Civil judgments are paid out. Citizens tend to distrust the police and are less willing to call them when they need them.

There are tremendous social costs to not addressing these officer-involved shootings involving unarmed civilians, and we have to be there to do something about it.

We have seen a number of tragic circumstances all across the country, whether it is Sandra Bland or whether it is Walter Scott in South Carolina, whether it is Eric Garner who died begging for a breath or whether it is all of the victims of Officer Holtzclaw who routinely and systematically sexually abused women in Oklahoma City. The fact is there is great discretionary latitude conferred on our law enforcement officers.

We need more oversight and accountability. We need people to be held accountable when they break the law, and I mean people who are police and people who are not. We need to say that there is one standard of justice and that everyone has to adhere to it.

We know about Michael Brown, 17 years old, shot in 2014, or we could say Tamir Rice. There are so many cases. They just go on and on and on. We are at a point where we have to address this crisis.

Now, Ms. Damond is one of more than 500 fatal shootings by police this year alone. I will say it again, Mr. Speaker. Ms. Damond is one of more than 500 people who have been fatally killed by the police this year. Some of them, the officer may have had legal justification, some not; but when you have got 500 people across this country being shot and killed, it is a crisis that we have to do something about.

This year, I could simply tell you, Mr. Speaker, that offering prayers simply isn't going to get it done. We have a systemic problem, and whether we have to talk about addressing body cameras more and insisting upon their use or whether we need implicit bias training for police to raise awareness of unconscious or implicit biases, whether we need to train officers on the deescalation of force and have training in that regard and, yes, prosecutions of people who just commit

crimes with a uniform on, we have got to take decisive action.

We need more diversity in police departments, and we need more diversity in jury selection. We need grand jury reform, and we need the Department of Justice to keep account of all the cases that involve officer-involved shootings.

One thing we absolutely do not need is for the Attorney General, Jefferson Beauregard Sessions, to abandon consent decrees, which have brought some level of understanding and communication between communities and the police departments. We need a partner in the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. What is at stake is too important.

We also need quality schools. We need investment in neighborhoods. We need quality jobs and affordable housing. We need healthcare for all, and we need to have clean air and water for everyone. We need those things as part of the ecosystem that human beings live in. But none of these things are a replacement for decent, respectful treatment people deserve from law enforcement.

I am not here to give up. I am here to engage police in a dialogue about how we reduce these shootings, how we increase the trust, how we make sure that no one feels that they can't go to the police because the trust has been so severely damaged.

I believe we have got to come together as a society and recognize that this problem is serious. It is not getting better; in fact, it is getting worse.

When you think about cases involving people like Mya Hall, or Alexa Christian, Meagan Hockaday, Sandra Bland, Natasha McKenna, all African-American women killed by or after encounters with the police, it is not just men; it is women, too. It is not just African Americans; it is whites, too. Justine Damond was a white female. It is Latinos. It is people of different economic stations. It is not just one community. If Ms. Damond's case proves anything, it is that officer-involved shootings of unarmed civilians don't only occur in certain neighborhoods of certain people.

The time is now for us to act. And I do put out a call for police and communities to engage in an intensive discussion about how we restore trust, how we increase accountability, and how we really make it true when we write on the side doors of our police vehicles all across this country, "to protect and serve."

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ELLISON very much for those very thoughtful and insightful comments.

I want to pick up the discussion about the police power and expand the discussion to include not just power over persons, but power over property in America.

Our Constitution's Framers were deeply informed by the social contract theorists of the 17th and 18th centuries, and those theorists believed that we enter into a social contract out of a state of nature, because we are all

made better off by virtue of being part of a society.

So the first incarnation of it came from Thomas Hobbes in his work on the "Leviathan." Hobbes argued that the state of nature was, in his famous words, "nasty, brutish, and short," because anybody could kill anybody. And so we enter into society together, and we give our power to the leviathan, the government.

Now, the problem with his view, of course, was that the leviathan, the government, had whatever powers it wanted, unlimited, infinite powers. And at that point, as the Framers of our Constitution would see, you have got a real problem, because you might be saved from criminals and bandits and thieves, but now you have got to deal with an all-powerful government and police who can trample your rights just as much as the thieves and the bandits could. So the Hobbesian theory was inadequate.

John Locke, in his famous work on the social contract, improved upon the proposition. The state of nature for him was not quite so frightful a place. There were certain virtues to a state of nature, so people were actually giving something up by going into it.

So in his view, entering the social contract meant that we would surrender some of our powers to government, and certainly our powers to commit violence and theft against other people, but in return, we would be guaranteed rights by the government and we would also have rights against the government, and that was the view that deeply informed the U.S. Constitution.

The whole point of the rule of law is that the people have rights against the government, against those who are just the agents of the sovereign. The sovereign is the people. The people are the sleeping sovereign who can come awake in times of constitution-making and also in order to make law.

Now, the whole social contract becomes unraveled Hobbesian style if we are attacked by the police. So my friend, Congressman POE from Texas, earlier spoke about the horrific spectacle of violence waged against U.S. citizens and others in the streets of Washington, D.C., by the thugs of Prime Minister Erdogan from Turkey, who were unleashed on protesters, and we saw, as Congressman POE said, a scene of really savage violence take place right here in Washington.

I am glad that we have a bipartisan consensus that that kind of police attack on freedom of expression, freedom of assembly is unacceptable in the United States of America, whether it is on citizens or whether it is on permanent residents or whether it is on non-citizens.

But there is something else that is going on in the country having to do with the police power. The police power in common law terms, in the American vernacular, is not just the power that police officers have to regulate public

safety and public order; the police power also has to do generally with the governmental power to regulate.

There are some very troubling things that are taking place in America today. One of them has to do with the eminent domain power. We are seeing rampant abuse of the eminent domain power across the country today, where private developers use their political power and influence in campaign contributions in order to get local governments or State governments to condemn private property of homeowners in order to oust them from their homes in order to build a private project.

Now, one of the chief perpetrators of this business model in the United States of America happens to be the President of the United States, Donald Trump, who has bragged about his use of the eminent domain power and has been involved in a lot of litigation relating to eminent domain power.

I will take you to Atlantic City and introduce you to a woman named Vera Coking, who lived in a three-story house off of the Boardwalk in Atlantic City right next door to the 22-story Trump Plaza that then-businessman Donald Trump had built. Trump had built the hotel; he built the casino; he built a parking garage. But it wasn't enough for him. He wanted a VIP parking garage.

He wanted a parking garage for limos and made an offer, which Ms. Coking refused, on her house so he could demolish her house and build his expanded garage. She said: No, thank you.

He came back with another offer. She said: No, thank you. It is not a question of money. My family has lived in this house for generations, and my kids went to school here, and we belong to the church here. It is not for sale.

Well, then at that point, President Trump, in order to build his gold-plated parking garage for the limos, went to a government agency that he knew well called the Atlantic City Casino Redevelopment Authority to help him take away Ms. Coking's property, and they entered into litigation. Fortunately, she found pro bono counsel in the Libertarian public interest group, the Institute for Justice, a Libertarian think tank and legal action center, and they were able to stop Donald Trump in court in a case called Atlantic City Community Redevelopment Authority v. Banin. Unfortunately, that took place before the famous Kelo v. New London decision in 2005.

Now, there was a very similar scenario in Kelo, in a hard-hit working-class town in Connecticut called New London, where the Pfizer Corporation and a local private land redevelopment authority, one of these shadowy, mixed public-private entities, decided that they wanted to displace a whole neighborhood in New London so they could destroy the blight, as they called it, and put in their brand-new development.

Ms. Kelo, a very soft-spoken single woman, working-class woman, decided

to fight, and she also found the Institute for Justice, and they organized the community to say, no, they were not blight, that they had ties to this community and they were not going to be forced out by these big corporations.

They won all the way up to the Supreme Court, and then a five-Justice majority in the Supreme Court, in the Kelo decision in 2005, determined that it is perfectly constitutional and consistent with the Takings Clause in the Fifth Amendment of our Constitution for a public municipal corporation to condemn a person's private home or a private small business in order to turn it over to another private business if it is consistent with someone's economic redevelopment plan. And this was a decision that President Trump said he "agrees with 100 percent."

Because, remember, that was his business model, that everything is for sale, and if you refuse to sell to Donald Trump and his companies, they are just going to get public authority to come in to get you out of the way so they can condemn your land and take it over.

Now, it turns out that in the Kelo decision, after the Supreme Court's erroneous judgment in it, the land was condemned, Susette Kelo was forced out of her house, and—guess what—they never even built it. Today it is an urban wilderness taken over by wild cats.

□ 1845

Well, let's look at another example of abuse of police power in America today.

I understand that earlier this morning, the Justice Department announced a new Federal policy to help State and local police officers take cash and property from anybody suspected of a crime even without arresting them, even without charging them with a crime, and even without an arrest warrant, reversing an Obama administration rule that was put in place because of rampant abuse of people's rights across the country.

This is the United States of America. The police should not be able to stop people on the street, in their cars, or at their homes and say: I think that the money you have doesn't really belong to you. I think the condo you have doesn't belong to you. I think the car you have doesn't belong to you. I think your property looks suspect. We are going to seize it. And then we are going to hold it, and you have the burden of coming to sue us to prove that your property is innocent—without charging them with a crime, without arresting them, or without using a search warrant. This is what Attorney General Sessions wants to do with the Orwellian new order that he handed down today. He wants to get the Federal Government back into the business of working with State and local governments to simply declare people's property and their money presumptively guilty. And then they have to go out,

hire a lawyer, and go to court to prove that their property or money is clean within the eyes of the government.

But whatever happened to due process? Under our Constitution, we are presumed to be innocent of crimes, and our property should be presumed to be innocent of crimes if there is no legal process at all to condemn our property or to cast a shadow of criminal suspicion over it.

If you look at the history of this, Attorney General Holder barred State and local police from using the Federal legal regime to seize cash and other property without criminal charges or without criminal warrants, which is the right way to do it. That is the constitutional way to think about it.

In a democratic society, the people are presumed to be innocent until they are proven guilty. It is not as if we are walking around with the stigma of being presumed guilty of doing something in the eyes of the State.

Since 2008, thousands of police agencies have made more than 55,000 seizures of cash and property worth \$3 billion under a Justice Department civil asset forfeiture program, which allowed the police to make seizures and then share the proceeds with Federal agencies. It allowed the Federal agencies to cooperate with State and local law enforcement.

Then the Department of Justice said they were disengaging from that because there was a series in The Washington Post about all of the extraordinary abuses taking place.

There was one gentleman, a small business man, a Chinese-American citizen of the United States who was traveling with a lot of money because he was going to purchase a building for his new Chinese restaurant that he was going to open up, and so he had, I think it was around \$25,000 or \$30,000 with him. He got stopped by the police and he was exceedingly nervous about the whole thing. They said he was acting nervous and they took his money from him, his life savings that he was hanging on to in order to go and purchase a building for a Chinese restaurant. Luckily, he found some lawyers, but it took several years for him to get the money back. He lost the deal.

He is in the minority because most people this happens to never go to court to try to get their money back, they are so terrified and demoralized by the experience of having their property taken by government agents without any due process at all.

I urge everyone to go and find that Washington Post series on the abuses that led up to the change in policy that was put into place by Attorney General Eric Holder.

Now, Attorney General Sessions does a U-turn. The administration, which President Trump started by saying he wanted to give power back to the States and back to the people of the United States, instead says the Federal Government is going to be incentivizing more violation of people's

due process rights by allowing seizure of people's property and money.

It goes back to what Congressman ELLISON was talking about: What is this going to do for police-civilian relations in the United States, when people are terrified that their property can be taken away by agents of the State without an arrest, without a criminal warrant, or without any charges at all? That is not right in our country. That is not right in a country that does not allow for a taking of private property without a public purpose. It is not right in a country that is based on due process of law, that is based on probable cause and search warrants for people being searched.

That is where this administration is taking us with the policy that was announced earlier today. It is going to make our communities only more suspicious and only more dangerous.

We have to step back from this Orwellian leviathan vision of government, an all-powerful State that can seize your home or your small business because a big business man like Donald Trump wants your property to build his casino garage for his VIP guests; or because some fancy company decides it wants to redevelop your land; or because the police decide you don't look the right way and we are just going to take your money out of your pocket, we are going to seize what is in your wallet, we are going to take your car, we are going to take your boat, or we are going to take your condo or apartment without any criminal charges at all, and you go and deal with the problem.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America, we are a land of laws. The great Tom Paine said that, in the monarchies, the king is law, but in the democracies, the law is king.

We have to abide by the rule of law here. And I am not talking about Democrat, Republican, left, or right. We all have to be constitutional patriots in America, to stand up for our Constitution.

I would invite the President of the United States to come join us here to talk about the problem of eminent domain abuse and to talk about the problem of law enforcement taking people's property and their money without due process of law, because it is a serious threat to everything that we believe in and why we created our social contract. All of us have got to be constitutional patriots and stand up for the basic principles of the country.

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

AMERICA'S DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

COSTLY AND BURDENSOME REGULATIONS

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding to me. I promise to be brief.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about something that Hoosiers back home are talking to me about every single day, and that is to rise to express my support for those struggling against burdensome and costly regulations, those costly regulations that are hurting Hoosier businesses from being able to get their products to market, from ultimately being able to grow their enterprises, and from ultimately being able to hire more Hoosiers.

When Democrats passed the Dodd-Frank Act, they promised a success for Main Street. Instead, Dodd-Frank has become a nightmare for businesses on Main Street.

Specifically, while I was back home just a few weeks ago, I met with two businesses working hard to do right by their customers and employees but confounded by section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Section 1502 requires businesses to disclose due diligence on the source and chain of custody of "conflict minerals," as well as hire a third party to honor their due diligence and subsequently submit a report to the SEC on those measures. According to its Democratic authors, this provision would only affect the biggest of companies, but those companies have to bring in all of their suppliers, all of their vendors in order to comply, which affects many small businesses across Indiana's Ninth District.

One of those firms is Best Home Furnishings in Paoli. They manufacture quality furniture across Indiana, and I was astounded to learn the lengths they must go through in order to comply with this regulation. They travel far abroad to verify the wood is conflict-free. And even after all that time-consuming and very costly travel, they are left wondering, despite all of their best efforts, if they are making any impact on those areas that are far from their plants, far from their customers, and far from their employees.

Another such example is Key Electronics, a manufacturer that is working on electronics in Indiana to get through opioid withdrawals for many Hoosiers who are afflicted by this scourge on our communities. It is a laudable goal, but they are hamstrung by the thousands and thousands of dollars they pay to ensure the customers that they work with ultimately get this third-party audit on them and all of their vendors. This challenging business with very thin margins is being limited in what they can invest in innovative, desperately needed therapy for those addicted to opioids.

For every dollar and every moment that a businessowner has to spend complying with this outrageous and unnecessary regulation, those are minutes and dollars that are not directed towards job creation, not directed towards investing in America's future,

and not directed towards fulfilling their and, ultimately, their employees' dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues in this Congress to bring an end to the excessive job-killing regulations that stand between Hoosiers and their entrepreneurial dreams.

GIVE AMERICANS BACK THEIR HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about how regulations and restrictions in healthcare space are preventing new innovations from being able to deliver better care to Hoosiers back home.

I recently met with a local business just outside of my district, Mainstreet Health Investments, who is working hard to develop new rapid recovery centers that are truly better in matching patients' needs with services provided.

For example, when a patient has knee surgery, they only need a hospital for a very limited window during their period of acute care. They need that hospital for such immediate recovery, but, hours after that, they can be transferred to a different recovery center, one that better matches their needs as a patient, enabling them to recover much more quickly and enabling us all to save significant dollars by matching that care with the needs that they have.

Frankly, I have been amazed at the quality of these rapid recovery centers, where the patient is truly focused on, in a holistic manner, such that they can develop and have physical therapy right there in that location. It is innovations just like these rapid recovery centers that they are building that will help deliver better cures to more Americans.

This is how we make a healthcare system that is not only more affordable, not only more accessible, but also better for patients in the long run. I want it to be just as effective, in addition to affordable and accessible.

What stands in the way? What is standing in their way is certainly government bureaucracy, a government that is retarding a level of innovation, retarding their ability to grow and build more of these facilities across the country despite the demonstrated need and the demonstrated benefit to those patients.

So I wanted to talk about those regulations and how they stand in the way of Americans and Hoosiers who are trying to get ahead, trying to get their companies get ahead, trying to help their fellow employees get ahead, and, ultimately, that will, together, help America get ahead.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for taking this time—and it was only about 3 weeks ago we actually took the leadership hour and we did a series of presentations on what was happening in debt and the excessive spending in the Federal Government, what was driving it and what

was happening with mandatory spending. Then the very next morning, CBO issued an update.

Have you ever had one of those moments in your life where you just spent almost an hour on the floor walking through the numbers, and you get a document and you start digging into it, and you find out a number of the things you presented just 14 hours earlier were wrong? But, sadly, they were wrong in the wrong direction, if there is such a way to phrase it.

Think of this: From January's Congressional Budget Office number until June's number, the U.S. debt deficit this year, the U.S. deficit this year, grew by \$134 billion as our projection for the end of the year. So, functionally, the deficit for 2017, the fiscal year we are in, we will come very close to \$700 billion this year.

□ 1900

It is going to be 693 is the projection. And if anyone saw—I think it was yesterday or the day before—Mick Mulvaney over at OMB, was projecting, from the White House's calculations, that the deficit this year was going to be about \$704 billion.

So we put together this slide next to me just to make it clear how much that is, to just sort of understand what is going on and trying to put this in perspective.

Okay. So we are going to use the CBO number because, you know, it is the Congressional Budget Office. So \$693 billion is going to be borrowed for 2017, the year we are in right now.

Well, think about that. That is \$1.89 billion every single day. That is \$79 million every hour; \$1.3 million every minute. And, what, \$1,900 every second? And that is what we are borrowing. So if I take up an hour here, you all get to make a decision if my hour here was worth \$79 million of borrowing.

Why is this sort of devastating in the numbers when you really start to dig into this CBO report?

Well, first let me give you one of the things that bothered me the most. This is a big deal when, from January to June, our excessive spending and borrowing number actually increases by 25 percent and it got almost zero press.

We are living in a society right now where, if there is a shiny object, a tweet, another story, the press, even a lot of the Members of this body, run talk about that. And I will make you the argument that the greatest systemic threat to this society are these numbers because the fact we are going to borrow \$134 billion more than we were already projecting, it is worse than that.

If you were to step back 1 year ago, 1 year ago we thought this year's deficit was going to be about \$450 billion. I mean, it is still outrageous. In a year's time that number now is kissing up to \$700 billion this year.

To understand the scale of that, we are going to actually do some of our slides. And the first one we are going

to put up is the slide from 3 weeks ago, and the punch line on it is the numbers are worse than this. I just wasn't going to use up a whole bunch of ink and print a new one. But this is important to understand.

So this is where we think we are going. This is what is in the CBO report. But do you see actually the blue areas? That is sort of spending that is on autopilot. When we say autopilot, it is by formula. You reach a certain age, you get certain benefits. You fall below a certain income, you get certain benefits. We borrow money, we pay back the interest. You have served honorably in the military, you qualify for certain benefits.

But this is 2026, so this is functionally 9 budget years from now. Understand where we will be. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, other things that are formula driven, you fall below a certain income, you get interest on the debt.

And you start to realize only 22 percent of all spending in 9 years will be things that functionally get voted on here. Everything else will be by formula. Your government is very quickly becoming a health insurer with an army, an insurance company with an army.

What is fascinating is—think about this—this year we are going to kiss up close to \$700 billion in borrowing. That is more than all discretionary spending on nonmilitary discretionary spending. So think about that. If you came to me and said, "David, I want you to only spend exactly what you are taking in right now," you get to help me make a decision. If I am not allowed to touch mandatory spending, the entitlements, do you remove the entire military, or do you remove everything else you think of as government, the Park Service, the FDA, the FBI?

Everything else is government because all of that is living on borrowed money. And somehow we desperately must find a way for the American public to understand the scale and how quickly these numbers are moving away from us.

In 5 years, so those folks who are 60 years old today, they are at the peak of what we call the "Baby Boom." So in 5 years from now, we actually hit the peak of our brothers and sisters who will receive their retirement benefits, if they take them at 65. And you start to look at the numbers. And we are going to—let's switch to the next slide. And you will actually start to see that curve steepening.

We are going to show a slide in a couple of boards from here that starts to show you at what point we are running these trillion-dollar deficits.

The next point I also wanted to make that was here in the CBO report is, when we borrow an additional \$134 billion on top of what we already projected—so close to \$700 billion this year—that is now part of the rolling debt. That is part of—now we are going to be paying interest on that for generations because our inflection point to

pay down the debt is moving farther away from us every day because—you saw the previous slide—every day we are borrowing pretty close to \$1.9 billion every single day.

So why this slide is important is—just understand—in 9 budget years, if you said, “David, I want you to deal with the debt. I don’t want you to do it today because I don’t want to lose any benefits. I don’t want to talk about the complications of what happens if we had to deal with the reality of trying to make the combination of making the economy grow and having to deal with entitlement reform,” but in 9 years, only 11 percent of the budget would be nondefense, non-entitlement.

And the amazing thing is, that number will stay almost identical for the next 10 years. So almost all the growth, a trillion-plus dollars of growth in those 9 years is coming almost solely from Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans’ benefits, but mostly Medicare.

It is really difficult to talk about, but if you actually look in the CBO numbers, you understand, we have a couple of our key trust funds that start to run out of money within the 10-year window. So let’s actually switch slides and try to—and a couple of these are going to be repetitive for a point, so it starts to become more absorbable of what is actually really going on in these underlying numbers.

So we put this one together just to sort of have a sense of what has happened. What happened from when we were estimating in 2016, the Congressional Budget Office gave us a number, so this is a year ago. We were building our budgets. We were building our projections. We were building our cost analysis on how much interest financing, these things. This is a year ago. We thought we were going to borrow \$544 billion, still an outrageous amount of money.

Here we are a year later and we are going to come close to \$700 billion. Then in January, from a year ago—so this last January—it moved up to, hey, we are going to borrow \$559 billion. Not a lot of movement. And then 6 months later, it blows off the charts. And now all of a sudden, we know from the CBO number, it is \$693 billion of borrowing this year.

The OMB number, I know the chart over here I think is saying 702. I could swear I saw 704, but let’s just call it \$700 billion.

This is an intense frustration because, if you actually listen to many of us as we get behind these mikes, we will argue and fight and fuss often on things that, when you actually add them up, are pretty small, sometimes bordering on petty, that don’t really have a multiplier effect into the future.

Yet, how much discussion have you heard behind these microphones in the last 3 weeks, since the CBO report came out, the update came out that,

hey, from January to June, somehow the number just grew by 25 percent; we just added another \$134 billion of borrowing this year?

This isn’t way off into the future. It is this year. And guess what. We are going to be financing that for as long as anyone who is probably watching this or listening to this in this room is alive.

Can we go to the next slide. We are heading toward a time where the growth of this debt, the growth in mandatory spending is moving to crushing everything else we care about. So if you happen to be someone who is a Member of this body and you care passionately about education, you must understand that the mandatory spending is going to crush it.

If you care about the environment and other programs, the finding resources to pay for those things is gone.

If you care desperately about defense, defense is going to be competing for scarcer and scarcer dollars because those dollars are promised in our mandatory spending, our entitlements.

So the only reason I threw this one up was just getting a sense that just the movement from January to June—the chart may not look like a big deal, but we are dealing with hundreds of billions of dollars here.

You see that little separation between the red line and the blue line?

That separation is 6 months. This isn’t a game. It shouldn’t be partisan. The numbers are the numbers, and Congress cannot continue to exist in a math-free zone.

So—and I am sorry. This is actually—I have toned down my charts because I was getting made fun of by making too many of them, and, actually, I was. I think I killed one of the big printers here on Capitol Hill, but that is another discussion.

So let’s actually sort of look at this one. This is functionally 2017 to 2027. So the 10-year window, which we use constantly around here. Just understand what this constant growth of the debt does in the mix of our priorities that we are able to pay for.

Where is the money? Where does it ultimately come from? Where does it go?

So if we are here right now, the first bar is spending. The second bar is revenues or pay-fors or mechanics. You know, some of it is borrowing, some of it is payroll taxes, and other things. Then the same thing for 2027.

So let’s first take a look at where we are at right now, and this is by gross domestic product. So they tell me this is a much more elegant way to sort of understand how much of our society’s economy is going into finance government—is going into finance government’s debt. And none of these numbers have State and local. This is just us at the Federal Government level.

So take a look. This year, hey, about 1.4 percent of our GDP, of the economic muscle of our society is going into financing our excessive spending, our

debt. In 10 years, it is 2.9 percent. So it is the entire economy, close to 3 percent of it is going to be grabbed just to pay for debt.

But when you also start to look at—you see that black portion on the top? In 2017, the excessive spending here, without revenue—so it is borrowing—is 3.6 percent of our entire GDP went to borrowing. In 10 years, it is 5.2, and it keeps growing, and it really starts to take off.

Remember we had the comment “in 5 years, we hit the peak of the Baby Boom moving into retirement.” And if you see the curve, it steepens and, over the next couple of decades, it blows off the charts.

So you actually start to look at the mix of: What are our resources? What do we have?

Well, let’s just go to the 2027. So that is this. So, functionally, 6 percent of our entire economy will be going to Social Security; 6.9 percent of our GDP will be going to healthcare programs. Another 2.5 percent of our society’s GDP will be going to other mandatory programs.

Only 5.4 will be going to everything we call discretionary, and part of that is also defense. So about half of that will be defense and half of that will be other discretionary programs.

□ 1915

This is where we are moving prioritywise. The growth of these programs consume everything in their path.

One of the things we actually talked about 3 weeks ago when we were behind this microphone—look, there are demographic changes, but when I was a kid, \$4 were spent for young people for every dollar that was spent for our, what we will call, seniors. Today, that is reversed. Today, we will spend \$4 for seniors for every dollar spent for young people, and that curve continues to move away from us. So just understand, that is the decision this body, this society, has made as our priorities.

Now, why this slide is so incredibly important to understand, if you see the blue there—and, look, I am blessed to be on the Social Security Committee in Ways and Means. We just had the actuary report, and Social Security has problems, but it is not a crisis. It is fixable. As a matter of fact, any well meaning people, a handful of them could get in a room and in a day fix the unfunded liabilities, which I think is 22, \$24 trillion over the 75-year window for Social Security.

What should terrify you are the numbers I am about to point out that are actually within Medicare. Let’s actually just sort of reach over here, and forgive me for leaning over. Let’s say you are 50 years old today. We are going to use 65 as the benchmark for retirement. You are going to be retiring in 2030. You see the gray here? Over your career, over your work life, the average person who will be retiring in 2030 will have put in \$179,000 into Medicare.

But do you see this side? They are going to receive \$621,000 in benefits. The person who is 60 years old today, in the average, and these are means, the person who is 60 today, retiring in 5 years, will have paid \$179,000 in part of their FICA tax going to Medicare. Over their years of retirement, because of longevity, because of healthcare costs, because of a series of different things, they are going to take out \$621,000.

Now, I need you to start to multiply those types of differentials where we put in this, we are taking this out, and multiply it times 76 million of our brothers and sisters who we define as baby boomers.

Do you see the math problem?

This slide isn't from some conservative group. I believe it is from the Urban Institute. This is just reality.

Let's say you happen to be my most liberal constituent, and you care desperately about the preservation of these entitlements and of Medicare. You should be the first one lining up with me and others around here from both sides of the aisle saying: We must do two key things. We must adopt policies that maximize economic growth, because whether it be tax reform, whether it be regulatory reform, whether it be immigration reform, all these things, but primarily tax reform, we must do those policies that drive economic growth, because a growing economy solves a lot of problems, but it doesn't come close to dealing with these types of shortfalls.

So the second thing that must be done, and it is going to take fair-minded people on both sides of the aisle, we are going to have to do entitlement reform. It is just the math.

When someone gets behind one of these microphones or is running for office and they say, "Well, if we just get rid of waste and fraud, or if we just get rid of foreign aid, or if we just get rid of this," I am sorry, they need to go out and invest in a calculator. That is not what the underlying numbers say.

And to try to double down on a couple of these points, to understand how fast these numbers are moving away from us, in 2022—it sounds like a long time from now, but, look, we are working on the 2018 budget right now. So, what, four budget years from now? Every year, we are going to be running a \$1 trillion deficit, and it grows and grows. That \$1 trillion of borrowing in 2022 has to be financed.

We are working on this chart. It is a little more complicated, so you are not going to see it for another month or so. As you are borrowing more money and interest rates go up, you do understand it is not just the money we are borrowing this year. When we move up the interest rates because we are out there in the markets sucking up the capital, pulling the capital in, when we raise interest rates, there are about \$2.5 trillion of our \$14-plus trillion of publicly held debt that is refinanced every year. So it is not just the interest we pay on new borrowing. Like, right now, almost

\$1.9 billion had to be borrowed today. It is not just the interest we are going to pay on that, but it is the effect on everything that is refinanced every year, every day, every month, every quarter, because as those interest rates move up, we have to change the financing.

Just understand, when you look at this chart just how fast—and this is just the borrowing number—how it explodes away from us. So in 2027, 10 years from now, annual deficit, \$1.463 trillion of just borrowing. That is 9 budget years from now.

You realize, if you add that up, I believe that is more than all military and all other discretionary spending we are spending today. Please understand how fast these numbers are moving away from us and start demanding that we, as Members of Congress, toughen up and do those things that are really difficult, really hard, and the willingness to tell the truth of what is driving these debts and deficits.

My primary reason for putting up this chart is that I am a huge fan that we have to do sort of this holistic approach, that it is now incumbent upon us as policymakers to do everything and do everything at once. You can't just have us say we need to do healthcare reform because almost no one in the country who is outside that world is paying attention to what it is doing to the debt and deficit, blowing them off the charts.

Then we have those of us who are focused right now on doing tax reform. We talk about our book of specialty, and people who care about immigration, care about this, care about that. The reality is we have to do it all. We have to do it all at the same time to maximize economic growth.

The GDP indicator today from the Atlanta Fed, we call it GDPNow—it is a wonderful website. It is a great app—I think has us at 2.5 percent GDP. Okay. That is better than we have been.

The new CBO baseline built into this next 10-year projection is saying 1.9 percent GDP growth. That is unacceptable because these numbers continue to remain incredibly ugly if we grow at that speed. But if we were to be at 3, 3.5, the numbers get much easier to deal with. But this chart is really important and a little tough to absorb, but it basically demonstrates, even with additional growth, we are still going to have to do entitlement reform, and it is going to have to be on a fairly large scale.

Growth makes it just a lot easier and makes it so we can do a much longer onramp for our brothers and sisters who are right now planning for retirement or other benefit programs that are out there.

So in this next slide, I wanted to show it because I wanted to actually use it to talk about—I know right now there is a lot of consternation of what is happening over in the Senate in regards to healthcare, and I think constantly there is a lot of misinformation

about the healthcare bill we did here in the House, what I have read of what has been worked on in the Senate.

So let's first get a couple things very clear. If you hear a commentator, if you are someone behind one of these mics, talk about, "Well, it is one-sixth of the economy and that is what is in this bill," they didn't read the bill.

The ACA replacement is almost exclusively about the small portion of our society that is in the individual market. They don't get their healthcare from an employer. They don't get their healthcare from Medicare. They don't get their healthcare from the VA. They don't get their healthcare from Indian Health Service or TRICARE or all these other ways. They are the plumber. They are my wife and I when we were running our own business.

In my congressional district, it is only 2 percent of my population. In my State, it is only 4 percent of my population. That was the population that was having great difficulties if they held a preexisting condition. Well, this society now, we have all come to terms, we are a guaranteed-issue society. That was in our bill when it passed. But that is still a tiny portion of the society that is in that individual market. In a State like mine, Arizona, you have a single choice, huge price hikes, and none of that was what was promised.

When you start to look at the math on the deductibles and then the price, so many of our brothers and sisters out there who should be in that individual market are basically saying: I would rather pay the fine; let them try to catch me. Because we have already talked about them. We did a whole presentation, I think, about 6 weeks ago, 2 months ago, that were in this ratcheting problem. Half of our population who should be in that individual market, let's just call them the healthy, 50 percent of that population who only use about 3 percent of the healthcare dollars, they basically said: It is too expensive; I am not buying.

But every time someone who is a part of that healthy portion of the curve says "Yeah, you have mandatory purchase, but I am still not going to buy" and doesn't purchase, you end up in this ratcheting effect. And the ratcheting effect, it gets more expensive, so more drop out; gets more expensive, more drop out. And that has been the crisis that is the ACA. Most people know it as ObamaCare, but to be respectful, let's call it the ACA.

It has an actuarial, structural death spiral. So our attempt was: Could you do a series of things that would lower the premiums enough for that 50 percent of the population who only uses 3 percent of the healthcare dollars to get them to actually buy? Mandatory. Hasn't worked. Maybe really well-priced coverage would work, because when they participate, the curve flattens out. Because right now, it looks like a hockey stick, and we know there

is functionally a tiny percent of our population, I think it is like 5 percent of the population, equals almost 50 percent of all the spending.

So the reason this chart is up here, we were trying to find an elegant way to try to say those of us who, like myself, I have fairly severe asthma, but folks with chronic conditions, diabetes, particularly if it is not managed, other things, that is actually 84 percent of all healthcare costs.

When we did the risk-sharing amendment for the ACA replacement bill, we were trying to fixate on that continuity of care. How do you finance that continuity of care for our brothers and sisters, particularly those who have those chronic conditions, to make sure that is continuity of care between themselves, their doctors, their healthcare institution, the insurer? I thought we did a fairly elegant job of drafting that and then putting real resources behind it.

But this is important to understand, the outlier of our brothers and sisters out there, those of us who have pre-existing conditions or who have chronic conditions, end up being the cost drivers in our healthcare.

So our ability to be creative, our ability to say: If you have one of those in your pocket, can this actually be part of your healthcare management? Are we going to accept the reality that someone with a chronic condition should be allowed to pick up their phone and use FaceTime to talk to their doctor?

□ 1930

Should a poor person be allowed to use their phone to consult their doctor? Should they be allowed to wear sensors and other things? There are some incredibly creative things rolling onto the market there to help our brothers and sisters with chronic illness. This body needs to be prepared to adopt them, because here is the punch line: whether it had been the ACA, whether it had been a replacement, had almost nothing actually to do with healthcare. It had to do with who pays. This was about the money: who pays, who gets the money.

Because remember, it was in 1986—31 years ago—a piece of legislation was passed basically saying you cannot deny someone medical services. You show up to the emergency room, you show up in the hospital, you are getting your medical services, and you can actually see this in the data. For the last 30 years, the number of procedures, particularly the stuff it costs, has been laid much the same.

So when you have people saying, “Oh, you are not going to be able to get healthcare,” we have been a society for 30-plus years that has sort of a guarantee of delivery of health services. The great battle is who pays.

Do you remember a few years ago when we had the great consternation of dispro share, uncompensated care. I worked on those issues. And now all of

these years later, we are basically trying to make an argument of who pays, how do we pay, how do we get more healthy—that is 20-, 30-, 40-year-olds who are healthy, how do we get more of them, particularly in the individual markets, to participate?

Then the second half is Medicaid. This is a strange city because it is one of those cities, when you actually look at the dollars, even though the dollars are going to continue to grow and grow, so many people define that as a cut. But remember, we were looking at the exploding deficit debt numbers. We have to deal with the reality. We are in real trouble, and we are going to have to step up and start being honest with each other about what is happening in the underlying math here.

So I know this is a little diversion from what was in the CBO report, but once again, you saw on the charts that the healthcare and healthcare entitlement numbers were substantially driving the deficits. Now you actually sort of see what is in the underlying part of that population.

We will go back to the beginning again. Hopefully, I haven't spoken for a whole hour, for your sake and mine. But one more time: this year, according to CBO, 3 weeks ago—and you have heard lots of talk about it, right? That was me being sarcastic—\$193 billion of borrowing this year. We are going to borrow almost \$1.9 billion every day, \$79 million every hour. I have been here an hour. Has this been worth \$79 million to you?

But think about it—and I know I misspoke earlier, so that is one of the reasons I wanted to put this board up. It is \$21,900, \$21,900 every second of borrowing.

I have a 21-month-old. It is the greatest gift the good Lord has ever given my wife and me.

I pray for the birth mother every night, saying, “Thank you.”

But if you look at the charts, when she hits her peak earning years, her tax rates are going to be double, maybe even more, of what I would pay today.

The economic growth is probably crushed by the amount of debt; and a lot of the calculations, if we step out 30 years, the computers can't even model them anymore. Because, understand, there are some amazing numbers in here that functionally, in 9 budget years, we are at 91 percent debt to GDP on publicly held debt. That is not the money we borrowed from the trust funds.

So the question I ask—I love my little girl. How many of you love your kids? How many of you love your grandkids? How many of you love this country? How many of you want this country to have an amazing future, because it can. This is all fixable. Just every single day we wait, we make it so much more difficult.

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

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague, Congressman SCHWEIKERT from Arizona.

I hadn't intended to, but I will begin my remarks by addressing his remarks, and I will do something that I rarely do, and that is to quote a French historian, political scientist, and diplomat, Alexis de Tocqueville, who stated: “The American Republic will endure until the day that Congress discovers that it can bribe the public with the public's own money.”

The previous administration was led by an individual who, on the campaign trail, said that \$7 trillion in debt was unpatriotic. Now we sit at the precipice of \$20 trillion after two terms, and I would submit that perhaps that is unpatriotic multiplied by three, or nearly that, and echo the sentiments of Mr. SCHWEIKERT that it is absolutely, positively unsustainable.

Now, there are ways that we could certainly deal with runaway debt. One way would be to completely devalue the currency. If you really want to step away from the hyperbolic barbs that are thrown by my colleagues across the aisle as relate to the motives for the legislation that we carry and find out who would be really harming seniors and children, it would be those who would continue to spend until the only way to cover the tab was to deflate the value of the very moneys set aside to care for those least able to care for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCHWEIKERT not only for his wise remarks, but also for reminding me just how much I miss being a member of the statehouse in the Commonwealth of Virginia where there is actual back-and-forth debate on the merits of issues, wherein that small percentage of individuals who choose to inform themselves might shape their opinions based on a discourse rather than people standing at this microphone unchecked.

That leads me to my next point, which is also not on the subject that I originally intended to address, and that is the statement of my distinguished colleague from Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, who spoke on this floor about 45 minutes ago on a subject that is important not just to him and not just to me, but to America, and that is on the subject of asset forfeiture.

His comments were indicative of the tone that this body has devolved into. One of the many Democrats whom I admire, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, whom Vanity Fair described as a fervent Democrat who saw the value in working with Republicans—where is he today?—he once said: You are entitled to your own opinions, but you are not entitled to your own facts.

Mr. RASKIN said that the Trump administration was burdening Americans

by virtue of an asset forfeiture policy, and he cited the case of a Chinese restaurant, an entrepreneur who he said had amassed \$25,000 so that he could buy a building. But he was going over the speed limit so he was pulled over by police. So without cause, they took his money, and it took him 7 years, according to my colleague, to recoup his money and the opportunity was lost, and that is what is wrong with Mr. Trump's policy.

Wow. And he implored listeners to please look up this case, so I did.

In fact, there was a man who had saved money to purchase a Chinese restaurant who was going 10 miles an hour over the speed limit. He was pulled over by law enforcement, and he had not \$25,000, but \$75,000 forfeited. It took him not 7 years, but 10 months to get it back, and it happened in 2014. I am not terribly sure who was President then, but I don't think it was Donald Trump.

So I will join my colleague in suggesting that we need asset forfeiture review and reform in this country. But, please, you are entitled to your own opinions; you are not entitled to your own facts.

Now, why am I here tonight? Golly, Ned, why am I here at all? Who are we as a nation?

I tell my children, if you want to know what is the right thing to do in life when you are confronted with tough challenges, when you have a dilemma, ask yourself, "Who do I want to be?" Not "Who am I?" "Who do I want to be?"

Because I hope I never reach my aspirational goals, but I keep trying as long as I am here. I don't think if you reach all of your goals for who you want to be that you have aimed high enough. If you ask yourself, "Who do I want to be when I face that ethical or moral dilemma?" you will always then come up with the right answer when you answer what the person you want to be would do.

I grew up with a father who actually had a name for the belt that he wore around his waist. It was "The Enforcer." I had a mother who thought I could do anything I wanted to do and a father who would kick my tail if I didn't give it my best effort.

I spent nearly 10 years as a prosecutor, and I can't tell you how many times I looked down the dais at the criminal defendant and thought, "I wonder, but there for the grace of God go I"—but for the fact that I was blessed with amazing parents who encouraged me and loved me and disciplined me and told me the things I could do, unlike so many in political office today who garner votes and support by telling people what they can't do, what they need done for them.

By gosh, this country was built on a government dependent upon people, not a people dependent upon government. And that is who we are. Now, who are we going to be? Where are we going?

A wiser person than I once said, if you want to know where you are going, you should look where you have been. It is a relatively humbling thing to do representing the Fifth District of Virginia, because the Fifth District of Virginia was first represented in this institution by James Madison.

I tell people those are some very small, big shoes to fill—very small, big shoes to fill. James Madison won the congressional seat when he ran in an election against a pillar of American foreign policy named Monroe. They were so collegial during their campaign that they often traveled together.

When Madison was elected to Congress prior to the 17th Amendment, he went to the Virginia General Assembly—the longest serving democratically elected legislative body on the planet Earth—and suggested that James Monroe should be the Senator; and, indeed, he was made the Senator. So we have Madison. We have Monroe.

The drafter of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, lived in Virginia's Fifth District. The power of the Article III branch of government, the Supreme Court, John Marshall retired in Virginia's Fifth District. Patrick Henry retired in Virginia's Fifth District. Lee and Grant sat at a table at Appomattox Court House and ended the American Civil War in the Fifth District of Virginia, and a young woman named Barbara Johns stood up in the face of possible injury or death to start the Virginia civil rights movement in the Fifth District. So it is pretty humbling, but it gives me a good lesson in who we are.

So many on my side of the aisle criticized President Obama when he said: If you have a business, you didn't do that. Somebody else did that for you.

I will defend him. I will defend him. You did it with blood and sweat and tears and hard work and persistence and the willingness to stand up time and again after failing. You did it, but you did it because you stood on the shoulders of giants who gave you the opportunity to do it, those imperfect people: Thomas Jefferson, a slave owner, who gave us near-perfect documents; James Madison, documents that have been revised, oh, I don't know, 27 times in hundreds of years, that we constantly should strive to be a more perfect Union, that we will never achieve that status of a perfect Union so long as institutions on Earth are governed by mere mortal men, but that we have a duty in this Nation to try to continue to.

So that is why I am here. I am not here to perpetuate my own power. I understand that the most indispensable person is the person who recognizes that they are not indispensable.

Folks, drive past the graveyard and look at the headstones, because I can promise you, there are piles of folks buried there who thought the world just couldn't go on without them. And the band played on.

The Fifth District of Virginia was here before I got here. It will be here

after I leave. I am not here to perpetuate my own name or my own legacy or any sort of power. I am here to make sure that everything I do is pointed towards giving the posterity that will follow us—to my children, SCHWEIKERT's children, and your children—every bit as good, if not better, opportunities than those which we had.

I believe there are two fundamental entitlements to birth of Americanism.

□ 1945

First, you are entitled to an opportunity. We should always strive to make that opportunity more of an equal opportunity. But in a world where if your last name is Clinton, Trump, Obama, or Bush, you probably have a better chance of getting into Harvard. We are not there yet. But everyone is entitled to an opportunity. Everyone within the Jeffersonian construct of liberty that is "my freedom extends to the point where yours starts so long as you don't harm another," should be free to make decisions for yourself and has an entitlement to define success for themselves.

If you want to be the world's best beekeeper, go be the world's best beekeeper. If you want to be a great stay-at-home dad, by golly, be a great stay-at-home dad. If you would like to work to cure cancer, please do. If you want to be a Member of this body and try to perpetuate opportunity for our posterity, please do. If you want to be a Member of this body and try to perpetuate your own power or your own legacy, please don't.

So this brings me to the point where I stand here today. I have been here 6 months—not terribly long. Thank God I have been unable to shake my citizen world view in favor of a legislator world view. So as I walk into this Chamber and as I stand next to these women and men on both sides of the aisle, I am a little humbled. When I walk down the staircase on the edge of the original House Chamber that has been worn through time by the footfalls of the likes of Kennedy, Madison, Monroe, Eisenhower, and Lincoln, I am humbled.

But I would revert back to the words that Alexis de Tocqueville observed over 150 years ago, and that is we will thrive until we begin to attempt to bribe the taxpayers with their own money. At some point things become unsustainable. At some point we need to recognize that we are about freedom of individuals to venture and fail and venture and gain, that we are a nation whose government should depend upon people, not whose people should depend upon government.

An hour and a half ago I stood on this very floor, and I dropped at the Clerk's desk H. Res. 458. H. Res. 458 is a vehicle that would move to discharge past the normal process of procedures. H.R. 1436 is a bill that was voted for by every Republican Member of this body in 2015, which would provide for a repeal of the broken promises that are the Affordable Care Act.

Just yesterday, in conference, they showed us polling, and it showed that the American people trust the Republicans more on national defense, border security, jobs, and the economy, but we were kind of sketchy on healthcare. I can read a poll, but I came here to do what I think is right. I came here to do what I said I would do.

This plan that I think could reasonably be called the Managed Healthcare Bailout Program or the Health Insurance Industry Profit Enhancement Act has failed working Americans, and the paradigm under which we have debated it has failed to be an honest one. So if I am here not to enhance myself or my legacy, if I am here to do what I think is right or what I said I would do when I ran for office, then I need to stand up and do what I said I was going to do when I ran for office, and that was to ensure that the decisions of Americans were left to Americans, that we minimize the interference in individuals' lives by the government, and that we recognize—and I will paraphrase—that Mr. Jefferson was correct when he said that the fruits of the working class are safest when the legislature is not in session.

I believe it was Will Rogers who said: They say the only certain things in life are death and taxes, only death doesn't get worse every time Congress meets.

We hear about a CBO score that says X million people will lose coverage. The last time I looked, this thing was called the Affordable Care Act, not the Affordable Coverage Act. Even if it were called the Affordable Coverage Act, it would be a misnomer because it is not affordable.

A story published about 3 months ago indicated that two-thirds of Americans couldn't find \$1,000 in case of a financial crisis. But deductibles have gone from \$1,000 to 2,000, to 3,000, to 4,000, to \$5,000 for the average family of four.

I ask you: If your deductible is \$5,000 and you can't find \$1,000 in times of crisis, do you have healthcare?

You have coverage. You have coverage, but you don't have healthcare. You are still indigent, and it is a broken promise. But don't worry, there were lots more: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. It turns out that wasn't true. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. It turns out that wasn't true. We should see an average decrease of about \$2,500 a year per policy. It turns out that wasn't true.

Don't worry, these insurers who supported the plan—remember the insurance industry endorsed the Affordable Care Act—they are doing this out of benevolence, folks.

I have an article from the New York Post that says there is a cost spiral associated with ObamaCare and with the insurance industry, but the cost spiral is upward. If you had bought \$100 worth of UnitedHealthcare the day the ACA passed and sold it, the last time I looked, you would have \$580. That is a heck of an investment. The only people

making out on this are the big insurers. Meanwhile, rank and file Americans are perpetually lied to by folks who say: Those guys don't care.

Actually, we do. We are just not trying to perpetuate our own power by taking from one group and giving to another while bankrupting our Nation and robbing our children blind.

So I have only been here for 6 months. I went to some people very early on and I said: How about discharging this bill? I am frustrated.

They said: Well, it is not time for that.

I said: Okay. I want to be a team player.

I am frustrated, and we get to this point. The President is frustrated. The Senate is frustrated. I don't give a hootin' heck about the President or the Senate or this body. I care about the American people whom I serve. They are frustrated. And nobody on the other side of the aisle will talk about a plan that the namesake of the plan, President Barack Obama, said has serious problems, that Minnesota Democratic Governor Mark Dayton said is bankrupting his State and is unsustainable, and that President Bill Clinton said is the craziest thing.

We have zero suggestions for help because, by gosh, we can score political points. Shame on both sides of the aisle if you are doing this to score political points.

We ought to be doing this to make sure that the fundamental birthright of Americanism, opportunity, is perpetuated for perpetuity and that it doesn't die in the hands of a group of the political class who say: Well, this will get me points at home. People told me not to do this. It might not help you. Your district is not that safe.

I don't rightly care. I am going to do the right thing. I have never had a job in my life that I wasn't willing to lose if it meant doing the right thing.

So what are the goals of this?

This is rather brash. They are humble. I want the leadership of this Chamber to understand that the rank and file Members support them, that we got their backs, that we thank them for their best efforts, and we don't want to quit this fight. We thank you for what you do. Let's keep going and keep that darn promise.

I got a feeling that if you keep your promise, if you are worried about elections, then your reward will come when people realize there is somebody in this town who has some integrity. So I want to support leadership. I want to send a message to the other Chamber that we are willing to act if they are willing to act, and maybe embolden them. I want to let the President know that we haven't quit on him. But, most importantly, I want to send a message to the American people that some people in D.C. mean what they say.

There have been dozens of votes for repeal by Members who knew that the repeal would never happen because it had to cross the desk of the person for

whom the bill was named. It was a theoretical abstract: Sure, I support it.

We are playing with live ammunition, folks. Let's see who meant what they said. Come to this desk—and if you are watching at home, contact your Member and tell him to come to this desk—and sign onto the discharge petition, H. Res. 458. Or maybe you didn't mean it or you did. Who knows? But let us know. Shoot straight with folks. Dozens of votes for repeal.

Let me be clear about this, too. I am not sitting here trying to pull the rug out from under people. The bill that would be discharged by this resolution would not immediately end ObamaCare. Instead, it would give us a 2-year window. And I will bet you that if we repealed and had a 2-year window to debate a replacement, that we might get some input from people on both sides of the aisle. I know to a metaphysical certainty that no side has the monopoly on good ideas. I would love to have some input. There will certainly be Members who say: I don't believe the Federal Government should have a large role. There will be other Members who say: We should have single payer.

Right now, we are stuck in a broken system because of political gamesmanship. It burned me when I was on the outside, and it burns me on the inside.

What are the facts? What are the real facts?

The average individual premium, according to eHealth, May 3, 2017, has gone up 39 percent in the last 2 years. The average family plan has gone up 49 percent. That means if you were an individual and your premium was \$1,000 a month, it is now \$1,330 roughly a month. I am doing math on the fly in my head. If you are a family and you were paying \$500 a month, then it is \$740-ish a month. That is in 2 years. The average individual plan is up 147 percent from 2008. The average family plan is up 177 percent.

Folks, Americans' income hasn't increased at that rate.

The average is up 25 percent in the last year, and that is according to the Department of Health and Human Services' report of October of 2016. That means if you were paying \$2,000 a year ago, you are paying \$2,500 now—25 percent in 1 year.

Candidly, all the disingenuous arguments on the other side about how many will die if we move to a system that allows individuals choices are not only hollow, disingenuous, and beneath the dignity of this body by virtue of their disingenuousness, but they are also false.

Folks, for the first time in nearly a generation, the mortality rate rose in 2015. U.S. life expectancy dropped from 2014 to 2015 for the first time since the 1990s. Ironically, it dropped more in States that expanded Medicaid. So I am not only disgusted with and sick of such harsh rhetoric, but I think it has now been proven demonstrably false.

We talk about who will be kicked off their plan. According to the CBO, 10

million people lost their employer plans. Those are the plans that, if they liked, they could keep. Roughly 15 million of the people who are now insured are insured by virtue of an individual mandate. That means that we have forcefully compelled American citizens to purchase a good or service at the risk of forfeiture of their money or their freedom.

We live in a country where you can choose in many places to buy marijuana. You can choose to bungee jump. You can choose to skydive. Heck, in some places, you can choose to visit a prostitute. But you can't choose a healthcare plan that doesn't carry coverage for mental health or for maternity. You can't do that. That is against the law.

This is about choice. I served in the United States Army as a fire support officer, and when I left the Army, I made the egregious error of attending law school—just kidding. When I did that, I chose not to have healthcare because as I looked at what I was able to do on the limited amount of money that my family had and did a cost-benefit analysis and the fact I was in relatively good shape and young, I determined that our family's best interests were served by not spending that money. It was a crazy, brazen risk that I think paid off, but it certainly should be within the purview of decisions that Americans are allowed to make, and right now it is not.

I am frustrated, but I am fighting. A lot of people are frustrated, but they are fighting. I want to see our leadership succeed. I want to see this Nation continue to be unequivocally the greatest experiment in freedom that the Earth has ever known. But if we continue to try to parlay largesse in failed programs into political power, we won't. We won't.

The time to measure things based not on intentions, but results is nigh. In Oregon, they spent hundreds of millions of dollars to create a website for the ObamaCare exchange that failed to enroll a single individual, and nobody was fired and nobody went to prison. I was a prosecutor for a long time, and I will tell you, if you waste or defraud people of 100, 200, \$300 million, you usually either lose your job or go to prison. But if you are in politics in Oregon, you are rewarded because, by gosh, you had great intentions.

Let's judge these things not by their intentions, but by their outcomes. Let's not argue about who has coverage, but about who has access to affordable care. Let's support revision that drives down premiums and deductibles, and let's trumpet our victories based on whom we actually help, not whom we intended to help.

□ 2000

I stand united with the bulk of my colleagues. I know there are some who might have said one thing and now do another. This is an avenue by which we might find out who they are.

I don't, for a moment, question the individual motives of Members. I think they have an opportunity to distinguish themselves by virtue of signing onto this resolution.

I ask you again, if you are watching at home, to contact your Member if you agree with what I said and ask them if they will come to this bar when we are in session and sign their name to H. Res. 458 and demonstrate that they are willing to do the exact same thing now, when it counts, that they did dozens and dozens of times under the previous administration when they knew that their actions would be met with a veto pen.

I don't do this to score political points, I don't do this to make my name bigger, and I don't do this because it feels good. I do this because we owe it to the giants whose shoulders we stand upon—Patrick Henry; Thomas Jefferson; Martin Luther King, Jr.; Abraham Lincoln; Barbara Johns; John F. Kennedy; and Ronald Reagan—the people who gave us the opportunity to be as successful and great as we are. Don't piddle it away. Be responsible. Be willing to say no when no is the appropriate answer, and do what is right.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. 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 topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 20, 2017, at 9 a.m.

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 Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3294. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the definitions relating to HUBZones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 3295. A bill to require the President, the Vice President, and certain high-level of-

ficials to file a report with the Office of Government Ethics, when selling real property, disclosing each natural person who is a beneficial owner of the real property upon completion of the sale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business credit for gain from the sale of real property for use as a manufactured home community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 3297. A bill to streamline the application process for H-2A employers and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PALMER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YODER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIRES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3298. A bill to authorize the Capitol Police Board to make payments from the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund to employees of the United States Capitol Police who have sustained serious line-of-duty injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 3299. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes, the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Federal Credit Union Act, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the rate of

interest on certain loans remain unchanged after transfer of the loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3300. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to require States to submit pre-election reports on the extent to which absentee ballots for elections for Federal office are or will be available for transmission to absent uniformed services voters and overseas voters by not later than 45 days before the election, to repeal the authority of States to waive the requirement of such Act that States transmit absentee ballots for such elections to such voters by not later than 45 days before the election, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 3301. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide Federal protection to the digital audio transmission of a sound recording fixed before February 15, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3302. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and to provide for Social Security benefit protection; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, 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. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 3303. A bill to permit disabled law enforcement officers, customs and border protection officers, firefighters, air traffic controllers, nuclear materials couriers, members of the Capitol Police, members of the Supreme Court Police, employees of the Central Intelligence Agency performing intelligence activities abroad or having specialized security requirements, and diplomatic security special agents of the Department of State to receive retirement benefits in the same manner as if they had not been disabled; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Foreign Affairs, 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 Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 3304. A bill to require the Attorney General to designate Human Trafficking Coordinators for Federal judicial districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 3305. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, with respect to bikeshare projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 3306. A bill to authorize a national grant program for on-the-job training; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3307. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 3308. A bill to require an audit and review of the caregiver programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3309. A bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to make publicly available on-line tools to allow individuals eligible for disability benefits to assess the impact of earnings on the individual's eligibility for, and amount of, benefits received through Federal and State benefit programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3310. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide certain individuals with information on employment support services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 3311. A bill to establish an Individual Market Reinsurance fund to provide funding for State individual market stabilization reinsurance programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HILL, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. BUDD, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 3312. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3313. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to consider the availability of affordable housing in allocating amounts made available for fiscal year 2017 for the Veterans Affairs-Supported Housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POLLIS (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 3314. A bill to transition away from fossil fuel sources of energy to 100 percent clean and renewable energy by 2050, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Natural Resources,

Appropriations, Agriculture, Small Business, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 3315. A bill to amend section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to exclude limited scope vision insurance coverage from health insurance coverage subject to the health insurance provider annual fee; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BEYER, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CRIST, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 3316. A bill to direct the National Science Foundation to award grants to encourage young girls to participate in computer science and other STEM activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. TROTT (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3317. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty for female genital mutilation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3318. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. COOK, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3319. A bill to extend the duration of Military OneSource Program services for members of the Armed Forces upon their separation or retirement from the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ENGL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 3320. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.J. Res. 109. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for balanced budgets for the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.J. Res. 110. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms.

SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H. Res. 456. A resolution objecting to the conduct of the President of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs, 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 Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H. Res. 457. A resolution honoring the 169th anniversary of the first women's rights convention held in the United States in Seneca Falls, New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. AMASH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H. Res. 458. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1436) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CORREA:

H. Res. 459. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should support the development of programs that better prepare students for careers in cybersecurity by actively promoting ethical hacking skills; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H. Res. 460. A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to recognize the rich history of the logging industry and the importance of lumberjack sports by adding the Lumberjack Bowl to the National Register of Historic Places; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SABLON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CORREA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr.

VELA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H. Res. 461. A resolution urging Tom Flores be inducted to the Pro Football Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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 Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 and Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 3297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 3298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 3299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence . . . of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 8, "to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Rights to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as interpreted by Steward Machine Company v. Davis and by Helvering v. Davis ("general welfare" and general taxation).

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 3303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Officer thereof."

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause VII

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 3306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . ."

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 3308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 3311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests lies in Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

Additionally, the Constitution grants to Congress the explicit power to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 3314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution. Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 3315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.”

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; 1.

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 3316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Title 10, United States Code

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 3320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section II Clause 18

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.J. Res. 109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.J. Res. 110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 19: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 25: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 233: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 242: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 392: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 411: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 459: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 664: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 719: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 721: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 770: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 790: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 844: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 849: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 850: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 873: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 909: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 911: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 918: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 963: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 964: Mr. SIREs, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 986: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1002: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1046: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1116: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1148: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1155: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1164: Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 1264: Mr. BARTON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1267: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1436: Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 1494: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1584: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1606: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1612: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1659: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1660: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1676: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1685: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1698: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1731: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1757: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1795: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1810: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1828: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1847: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1865: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1876: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1889: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 1949: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1955: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1974: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2023: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 2049: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2063: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2119: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2173: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2276: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 2279: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2315: Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2359: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2404: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2414: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2417: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2472: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2488: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 2550: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2612: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2622: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2651: Mr. REED, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2723: Mr. FLORES and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2733: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2740: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COOK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2747: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2770: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2797: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2801: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2805: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2820: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. REED.

H.R. 2823: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 2832: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 2862: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2871: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2899: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2903: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2908: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2913: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2933: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2957: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2989: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2996: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 3020: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3031: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 3048: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3054: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3067: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 3089: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3091: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 3100: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3187: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 3191: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 3197: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JONES, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 3218: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. HECK, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3222: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3223: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3228: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3236: Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 3239: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3254: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 3255: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3273: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3285: Mr. CRIST.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. KNIGHT, and Ms. CHENEY.

H.J. Res. 107: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. LAMALFA.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| H. Con. Res. 59: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. ESHOO. | WEBER of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mrs. NOEM. | H. Res. 446: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SHERMAN. |
| H. Res. 15: Mr. MEEKS. | H. Res. 271: Mr. BILIRAKIS. | |
| H. Res. 88: Mr. PALAZZO. | H. Res. 307: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. | H. Res. 449: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. MCGOVERN. |
| H. Res. 128: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. ENGEL. | H. Res. 313: Mr. DONOVAN. | |
| H. Res. 129: Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. | H. Res. 353: Mr. CICILLINE. | |
| | H. Res. 445: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LEE, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. | |