

lives and the families whose loved ones have been laid to rest for our great Nation.

HONORING WOMEN IN MILITARY SERVICE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, again let me offer my deepest concern and sympathy for our fellow Americans in Oklahoma—what an enormous tragedy and devastation—and also our friends in north Texas. America is embracing them, as we should.

But I rise today to acknowledge, as we look toward this coming weekend, and honor those who have fallen in battle, and to be able to celebrate the experience that Members of Congress, women Members of Congress had this morning in commemorating the war memorial for women, and to salute Brigadier General Wilma Vaught, who was the founder and originator, along with Members of Congress, of this historic memorial.

Today, we ascended to Arlington National Cemetery where we placed a wreath in honor of those women. 154 women have fallen in Afghanistan and Iraq. We had the privilege of honoring five women from the five military branches and to, again, pay tribute to those who are willing to sacrifice.

Men and women sacrifice. They are parents. Mothers leave behind their children and families. Families depend upon women in many different ways, and it is greatly an honor to be able to honor those women and to say as well that we will never, ever forget those men and women who have fallen in battle. And we will be there on Memorial Day, as I will be in my Heights location doing a flag ceremony and at the Veterans Cemetery, because this is what America does. We never forget those who fell in battle for us.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, 1,700 days and counting: that's how long it's been since the application to build the Keystone XL pipeline was submitted to the State Department. And with each passing day, every new delay, job creation has been stalled and American energy independence has been pushed to the back burner.

That is why I am pleased to join my colleagues in saying no more roadblocks to American-made energy. No more roadblocks to the 40,000 jobs that will be created during the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, not to mention the jobs to run and operate it in the future.

The time for the Keystone XL pipeline is now. The time for our energy independence is now. Let's pass this bi-

partisan legislation and get to work for the American people.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to be able to begin with a quote:

We are tired of waiting, and we believe the time has come to make the final decision on one of the most important projects to unlock the energy future for this country, the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, this quote is not from an energy titan. It comes from Sean McGarvey of the AFL-CIO.

The time has come for America and North America to be able to seek and achieve energy self-sufficiency. This is part of the solution. Americans are tired of not planning for the future. We need to unleash that potential to be able to put our people back to work. The time has come. The time is now. Let's get America back to work. Let's create energy security right here on this continent.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 3 of the Protect Our Kids Act of 2012 (Pub. L. 112-275), I am pleased to appoint Mr. Robert E. "Bud" Cramer of Huntsville, Alabama, to the Commission to Eliminate Child Abuse and Neglect Fatalities.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 22, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 22, 2013 at 11:08 a.m.:

Appointments:
Military Compensation and Retirement
Modernization Commission.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3, NORTHERN ROUTE APPROVAL ACT

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 228 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 228

Resolved, That at any time after the 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. 3) to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, 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 90 minutes equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources 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 113-11. 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 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.

□ 1240

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill.

House Resolution 228 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3, the Northern Route Approval Act. The rule makes 10 of the 25 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee in order, nine of which were sponsored by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and it provides for a robust debate in the House of Representatives.

The underlying bill was marked up by three committees of jurisdiction, and each committee reported the bill favorably with a bipartisan vote.

Additionally, the U.S. Senate, on March 22, 2013, voted to approve the pipeline by a vote of 62-37.

Mr. Speaker, there are four simple reasons this bill has garnered bipartisan support: it creates American jobs; it increases our energy independence; it strengthens our national security; and it will contribute to lower gas prices.

This bill leads where the President has wavered, and finally approves the northern route of the Keystone XL pipeline, which has been studied for over 1,700 days by 10 Federal agencies and several State environmental agencies.

The U.S. Department of State has issued four environmental impact statements, at a total length of 15,500 pages. These studies prove that the vast majority of the project will not result in a significant environmental impact, and mitigation efforts will be undertaken to reduce any environmental impact.

Additionally, the project includes 57 project-specific special conditions to ensure the maximum level of safety. Due to these conditions, the U.S. State Department's Environmental Impact Statement found that the pipeline will have "a degree of safety over any other typically constructed domestic oil pipeline system."

For 4 long years, multiple studies and well over 15,000 pages of environmental analysis, the administration claims that the XL pipeline still cannot be approved. We all hear the echo of the President chiding Congress with his slogan, "We can't wait."

I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, if not now, when?

This bill answers that question, and the answer is today. It is clear that this pipeline will create jobs, increase national security, and contribute to lower gas prices. For this reason, H.R.

3 breaks the Presidential logjam and approves this worthwhile project.

On December 23, 2011, both the U.S. House and the Senate unanimously approved, and the President signed into law, a bill that required the President to approve the pipeline unless the President determined that the project did not serve national interests.

On January 18, 2012, the President said "no" to the pipeline, claiming that it did not serve national interests.

By preventing this project from moving forward, he said "no" to 42,100 construction and manufacturing jobs at a time when Americans need work. He said "no" to cheaper gas prices for goods and services which could result in reduced energy cost.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, lower energy costs lead to lower manufacturing and shipping costs which, in turn, contribute to less grocery, gas and utility bills for the average American family.

He said "no" to increased diversification of America's oil supply. He said "no" to reduced dependence on foreign oil. All these benefits this generation could pass on to future generations.

By this inaction, the President said "yes" to more oil from barges from the Middle East. When the pipeline is finalized, it will transfer 830,000 barrels of oil each day, which totals nearly half of our current daily imports from the Middle East.

The President said "yes" to our ally, Canada, taking its business elsewhere, to China, rather than the United States. The oil from the tar sands of Canada will go on the market somewhere, whether we approve the XL pipeline or not. This is our chance to ensure Americans will have the opportunity to benefit from the energy supply, not China.

The State Department acknowledged that the United States would be more secure if we relied more heavily on a non-OPEC source, such as Canada, for our energy needs.

According to the State Department, and I quote:

Non-OPEC Canadian crude oil supplies advance the energy security of the United States, given Canada's close proximity, our free trade agreements, and our close bilateral relationship with a stable democracy.

Canada is a more reliable and cost-efficient source of energy than the foreign oil that we depend on from the Middle East, Africa, and other regions of the world.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The relevant committees of jurisdiction have provided us with a bipartisan bill that will create American jobs, ensure energy independence, increase our national security, and contribute to the lower gas prices.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 min-

utes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, the Northern Route Approval Act.

In the words of Yogi Berra, it's *deja vu* all over again here in the House of Representatives.

Last week, the House of Representatives repealed the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time. This week, for the eighth time in 2½ years, we're voting yet again on another Keystone pipeline measure that will never become law.

The very decision to sign this law would lie with the same President upon whose desk this decision is currently awaiting approval; and, therefore, this is yet another waste of taxpayer time, taxpayer money, when we have pressing national issues we should be discussing—how to address our budget deficit, how to get our economy moving, how to renew affordable college and low-interest rates for students.

There are so many issues that my constituents are crying out for. Yet another symbolic issue that has nothing to do with whether the Keystone pipeline is approved or not is the last thing we should be spending our time here on the floor of the people's House debating.

Rather than creating a bill that's more viable, instead this bill, by far, is the worst iteration of the bill that we've seen, worst of the eight.

Even my colleagues who support construction of the 875-mile pipeline are having trouble supporting this bill because of its thinly veiled messaging that guts important laws and waives judicial review.

In short, this Northern Route Approval Act is a regulatory earmark, a specific earmark which this House of Representatives has purported to eliminate. Not only is it an earmark; it's an earmark that has a far greater dollar value than any of the earmarks that have been much maligned by Members of both parties and are no longer part of this deliberative body.

At a time where we should be advancing on renewable energy policy, on an all-of-the-above energy policy, this bill would bypass the very system that this Congress has set up under the law for consideration of a project.

□ 1250

This project has nothing to do with gas prices. In the analysis from the Department of State, there is absolutely no indication this would have anything to do with gas prices. This is for the global market. Let's debate it for what it is. Is it a favor to Canada if we do it? Absolutely. Does it have an environmental and health impact on Americans? Absolutely. Weigh the two. Let's look at a cost benefit.

This has nothing to do with lower gas prices. If we want to talk about lower gas prices, let's do it. Let's increase fuel efficiency standards to lower gas prices. Let's look at what we're doing nationally. Let's look at our processing

capacity. Let's look at alternative and public transportation. There's a lot of things we could be doing that actually would reduce gas prices. There is no analysis in the Department of State's thorough vetting of this that this would have any impact on price at the pump. This is 5 to 10 years from now, exporting a majority for the global market.

Instead of voting on this act, there's a number of other great bipartisan bills we could be talking about which would reduce gas prices. Let me give an example.

The Public Lands Renewable Energy Act that I helped coauthor with Representatives Gosar, Thompson, and Heck of Nevada would expand renewable energy development and create jobs while protecting our Nation's public health and environmental resources. And yes, because we expand our renewable energy development portfolio, it would apply downward pressure on gas prices.

This bill is talking about a review process that's already well underway for the Keystone XL pipeline. Congress, itself, set up the process whereby each administration—and the country has the opportunity every 4 years to elect a President. Congress set up the process where each administration has the criteria for approving projects like Keystone. If we don't like the criteria, let's talk about changing those criteria in statute. That's the proper way to do it, not just shortcut the very process that Congress set up.

Until then, we need to keep this process in place. No matter what the administration does, some Members of Congress aren't going to like the outcome; but we establish the ground rules, and the executive branch is administering the law that we created. Rather than interrupting the State Department's review process with this bill, we should allow the Department to take the necessary time to address the impacts, the concerns, the costs, and the benefits of this controversial pipeline.

Although there's many issues that need to be better understood as part of the Keystone XL process, it's critical that we address pipeline safety issues to make sure that tar sands don't spill into our communities. It's not a Republican or Democratic issue. Everybody wants to make sure that America is safe, even if we do a major favor for Canada. There are indications that this pipeline could be more susceptible to oil spills because of the higher pressure that this type of pipeline uses compared to conventional crude. In fact, in the public comment period, many Americans expressed their concern that a spill could impact their property value, their health, their safety, access to clean drinking water, and quality of life. These are the types of things the administration is rightfully weighing in determining the outcome.

While others argue the pipelines are the safest way to transport tar sands

crude oil, the 150,000-gallon oil spill in Mayflower, Arkansas, 2 months ago shows an example about the inadequacy of some of our current pipeline safety regulations. I've heard arguments that the pipeline could create economic benefit. Well, communities like Mayflower certainly won't see the benefits of Keystone when their yards, homes, and businesses are buried in the thick black layer of tar sands crude oil, threatening agriculture and local economic development.

I think that we should make sure that tar sands developers adhere to pipeline safety standards that protect the health of Americans and protect our economy and protect jobs to ensure that any project that goes forward doesn't destroy jobs rather than create them.

To address pipeline safety issues, Mr. TONKO of New York has offered a commonsense amendment. He'll be here to speak about that. It would require the Secretary of Transportation to determine whether current pipeline regulations are sufficient to address the special safety concerns that are particular to transporting tar sands crude oil. Unfortunately, however, this rule, which I strongly oppose, as well as the underlying bill, does not allow for the discussion or even the debate about Mr. TONKO's amendment, which I think is a commonsense requirement.

Since this bill doesn't require the pipeline regulations which were requested by Mr. TONKO, I'm pleased that at least an amendment that I offer with Ms. CHU of California and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia was made in order. This amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to evaluate the true cost of a potential spill from the Keystone XL pipeline in our communities. The GAO study would look at the impact of tar sands spills on public health, the environment, and the quantity and quality of water available for agriculture to farmers and to municipalities for drinking.

It's inevitable that the Keystone pipeline will have spills and leaks. That much we know. These spills and leaks are not only costly to clean up—and we need to know and understand those costs—but they also take a toll on our communities. Accidents happen. Understanding the cost of spills is also important because the Keystone pipeline is slated to cross over the Ogallala Aquifer. The Ogallala Aquifer lies beneath 8 States, including my home State of Colorado, and supplies drinking water to about 2 million Americans and supplies 30 percent of the irrigation water for our Nation's farmers.

TransCanada stated that it will provide alternative water supplies to affected communities if an oil spill impacts surface or groundwater. But TransCanada's promise to provide alternative water supplies in case of an oil spill is not enough insurance for millions of Americans who rely on the Ogallala Aquifer for drinking water

and for farming. We simply need more information about the potential impact and the range of impact that an oil spill would have on the Ogallala Aquifer.

Mr. Speaker, even if my colleagues support the President if he chooses to move forward with the Keystone XL pipeline, there are many reasons not to vote for H.R. 3. Rather than ensuring that we have the proper protections in place for our environment and our citizens, the Northern Route Approval Act mandates approval of the pipeline while waiving nearly all other Federal permitting requirements.

It doesn't even allow a discussion of amendments like Mr. TONKO's that were brought forward in good faith that at least deserve 10 minutes on the floor of the House when, by the way, we're debating a bill that's never going to become law, won't be brought up in the Senate, and goes to the very same President for signature who's considering this project. So the least we can do is spend 10 minutes debating Mr. TONKO's meaningful amendment if we're spending time debating everything else that isn't going to become law.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this rule, support a more open and transparent process here on the floor of the House, and then move forward with legislation that deals with critical national priorities that all of our constituents are calling upon this Congress to act upon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank my friend from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill. It's very interesting that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that more oil production doesn't affect the price of oil or gasoline. Well, that's the same thing as saying that gravity doesn't exist and the Earth is still flat. Neither one of those are true.

We all know that it's a marketplace, it's a commodity, and the more you produce, the lower the price. How well do I know that? In my own district in Louisiana, we produce more natural gas than we can use, and the price now is so low that we can hardly produce it because of the low reimbursement for the cost. But that will come up over time.

Two cents a gallon in 1 day is how much gasoline prices have recently increased. It has increased 7 cents a gallon just in the last week. It may not sound like much, but the price of gas is going up once again. One headline says, "Gas Prices Spike Ahead of Memorial Day." That's hitting just about every American in the wallet, and yet the President continues to play games with a project that will carry an estimated 830 barrels of oil per day from Canada to the gulf coast for processing.

So what are we waiting for? More studies? This project has been studied

to death. Every State that it would go through has already sent its approval. It's been 1,700 days since TransCanada first applied to the State Department for permission to build the Keystone XL pipeline. TransCanada says pipeline construction will create about 20,000 jobs. And our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, Why aren't we talking about jobs? Twenty-thousand good-paying jobs, plus lower prices to the consumer.

□ 1300

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman.

But the Obama administration's State Department has politicized this project and stalled it in order to kowtow to the far-left environmental fringe.

We need the jobs and we need the energy benefits. We need the lower costs for consumers and for manufacturing.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, of course quantity affects price—Economics 101. The disconnect here and the failure in the argument from the other side is this quantity is a rounding error in the global supply and the global demand. This has no impact on price. We're not talking about anything that actually moves the bar of reducing gas prices for consumers.

With that, it's my honor to yield 1 minute to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. I rise to urge my colleagues to reject this rule and reject H.R. 3.

We've already seen the impact of tar sands oil in my district. Piles of petroleum coke three stories tall and a city block wide are sitting on the banks of the Detroit River. Pet coke, a byproduct of refining tar sands oil, is much dirtier than coal and is often sold to China. In Detroit, it sits uncovered and uncontained, waiting to blow into the air and water. These piles of petroleum coke are a blight on our communities and could pose a threat to the environment and public health.

I offered an amendment to require a study on the environmental impacts of petroleum coke and other byproducts. This amendment was rejected by the Rules Committee despite the study's potential benefits to communities who may become host to their own piles of Pet coke.

The bill—and the rule—is taking us in the wrong direction. Instead of selling dirty energy to China, we should be developing clean energy technology here at home.

For these reasons, I cannot support the rule. And urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 3.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. I rise in support of the rule because I think that this illu-

sion of energy independence has, in any case, been postponed by the very actions that work against this rule would represent because we're talking here about 5 years of postponement. And I think to have real energy solutions here in the United States means, first off, using the energy solutions that are represented in this continent.

I think it is by no means a fix, it's by no means a cure—in deference to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—but it is an important step in the right direction. I think as well it represents a step toward energy independence, which is also about national security.

I think it's a step toward jobs, which are vital in this country and needed at this time—more than 20,000. And I think ultimately it's a pocketbook issue. Where, as you think about driving time coming this summer and the number of people who will be filling up their tanks, this is a step in the right direction toward energy independence, energy security, and ultimately jobs. For that reason, I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), whose amendment under this rule was also shut out from even a debate here on the floor of the House.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I oppose the rule and the underlying legislation.

I submitted two amendments to the committee; I regret that neither was made in order. One—rejected by the Republican majority—would have protected private property owners along the pipeline route from being bullied by TransCanada into giving up their land. The other amendment would have required the Secretary of Transportation to provide assurance that current pipeline safety regulations are sufficient to prevent spills of diluted bitumen. I have represented communities that have been impacted by pipeline explosions. I know the price they pay.

Much of this pipeline is going to cross private lands, not public lands. Protection of private property rights is something we hear a lot about whenever government makes a decision to protect unique and valuable public resources. But apparently, if a foreign company wants to build a pipeline to transport oil for export, private property rights can be sacrificed.

What is the rush? There is existing pipeline capacity to deliver this oil. The tar sands are not going to disappear. Our citizens should receive a fair chance to defend their property in State courts. This legislation deprives them of that opportunity.

Ms. Julia Trigg Crawford testified last month before the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice in favor of limiting the power of eminent domain and in strong opposition to granting an exemption to TransCanada. I

will include her testimony with my statement. She is only one of a number of landowners who were bullied by TransCanada, and she is now seeking a remedy in State court.

Ms. Crawford and all other property owners who have gone to the courts should have the opportunity to make their cases. If TransCanada wants access to our land, they should follow our laws—laws put in place to safeguard our resources and our rights.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and this ill-conceived and unnecessary legislation.

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION AND CIVIL JUSTICE HEARING ON THE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT

APRIL 18, 2013.

My name is Julia Trigg Crawford. I am the third-generation manager of the farm my grandfather bought in 1948. As a landowner along TransCanada's conveniently uncoupled Keystone Gulf Coast Project, I absolutely support measures to limit eminent domain. But I strongly oppose an exemption for TransCanada, its Keystone XL, and any other foreign or domestic for-profit entity that cannot provide proof that their projects are for public benefit.

I believe, as do countless others following my family's legal case, that TransCanada has abused the power of eminent domain in taking our land. When another pipeline asked to come across our place, we said we did not want them here and asked they would find a different route through a willing neighbor. That pipeline company did just that—and eminent domain was never mentioned.

When they came knocking in 2008 we told TransCanada the same thing: we don't want a pipeline here, and asked them to find another route. They said no, then exploited a flawed permitting process in Texas, and used eminent domain to take the easement they wanted across our land.

There are a host of reasons why we don't want a pipeline across our property. First, we don't believe a foreign corporation should have more of a right to our land than we do. Secondly, we need to protect its Caddo Indian heritage, specifically the 145 artifacts TransCanada's archeologists recently found within the proposed pipeline easement. How curious that TransCanada and the Texas Historical Commission concur that my entire 30-acre pasture qualifies for National Registry of Historic Places recognition, EXCEPT for the one sliver of land TransCanada must have on our place to connect the two sections of pipeline they've already build adjacent to our land.

We don't want them horizontally drilling under the Bois d'Arc Creek where we have State-given water rights. We irrigate 400 acres of cropland from this creek, and the pipeline would be just a couple hundred yards upstream from our pumps. Any leak from that pipeline would contaminate our equipment, and then our crops in minutes.

Furthermore, the neighbor directly to the west of us owns thousands of acres, and had granted TransCanada an easement anyway. When we politely asked them to seek a way around us, TransCanada could have slightly altered their route and traversed that neighboring land differently, avoiding our property altogether. But instead they just pulled out the club of eminent domain, telling a reporter later it was just too late to make any changes.

As some of you may know, in 2011 the Texas Supreme Court ruled in Denbury

Green that private property rights are far too precious to be taken by simply checking a box on a form. Furthermore, the Supreme Court said that when challenged by a landowner, the burden falls on the pipeline to present reasonable proof it meets the requirements of a common carrier. So we did just that, we asked for the proof.

In challenging TransCanada, we asked them to provide proof they met the qualifications as a common carrier and had the right of eminent domain. And once again they hid behind the skirts of the Texas Railroad Commission, saying in essence, The Railroad Commission believes us, you should too. The embattled Railroad Commission has proven to be nothing more than a rubber stamp, they have never denied anyone common carrier status. So, when we asked for another element of proof, their tariff schedule, TransCanada said in court they would not have that tariff schedule until about the time product started flowing. In other words, they could not produce this particular proof they were entitled to take my land until after my land was condemned, handed over to them, construction was completed and tarsands, the product for which Keystone is being built, was flowing. This is wrong, and is precisely why the Keystone XL should not be granted an exemption from this bill's much needed eminent domain restrictions.

If I read it correctly, this bill's exemptions for pipelines already under construction allow current eminent domain abuses to go unpunished. The bill addresses the problems, and outlines important solutions, yet allows those who exploited the process up until a certain date on a calendar to get off "scot-free". And as someone who has lost part of her family farm to this abuse, that's leaves me, and lots of people like me out in the cold. And add insult to injury: our land was taken through abusive means, and the abusers could get off without even a hand-slap.

Two years ago when our family first began our stand against eminent domain abuse, TransCanada was flying below the radar screen. No one seemed to know much about the Keystone XL Pipeline. But now the light is blindingly bright on TransCanada, the tarsands, and the threat to everyone's land and water. People around the world see that TransCanada represents eminent domain gone unchecked and horribly wrong. Why else would there be so much pushback, by so many people, from so many backgrounds, in so many ways, to the Keystone XL project?

If we allow an exception for TransCanada and the Keystone XL, we will be setting a dangerous precedent, leaving the door open for even further misuse of our legal system and more abuse of landowners unwilling to risk their property for foreign profits. The same system that enabled the judge in our case to issue a 15-word ruling from his iPhone would enable TransCanada and other pipeline companies to use the incredible legal and psychological leverage of eminent domain to continue stealing property from American citizens.

We have appealed that iPhone ruling, and look forward to our day in court with an experienced panel of judges in the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals in Texarkana, Texas. And if our legal defense fund holds out, we may take it to the Texas Supreme Court.

Eminent domain abuse at the hands of one greedy corporation is unforgivable, but it is part of something even bigger. While all land is invaluable to its owners, farmland holds a particularly unique position. Rural property rights, like mine, are the "fundamental building blocks for our Nation's agricultural industry." "The use of eminent domain to take farmland and other rural property for economic development threatens liberty, rural economies, and the economy of the

United States." And TransCanada is at the heart of these issues right now. Their advertisements in my local newspaper say "We want to be more than just a pipeline company: we want to be a trusted neighbor". They've given me no reason to trust them.

I do not believe there has been even one shred of documentation that proves that one single drop of the products transported through TransCanada's pipeline will be refined for use in the U.S. Yet we are supposed to relinquish our family's tradition and the cultural heritage of the families who lived on our land before us, just because TransCanada says, without proof, that their pipeline is for the public good. How can this pipeline be for the public good when so much information about it is not even in the public record? Diluted bitumen, tarsands, whatever you want to call it, is a product we should fully understand before we start pumping it through major waterways, sometimes through 70-year-old pipelines built before tarsands extraction was economically viable. TransCanada has called this product proprietary, refusing to provide specifics. How can we ensure the safety of a substance when we don't even know its ingredients?

Pipeline companies do not deserve a free ride, especially when they can't clean up their own messes, and especially when we taxpayers are subsidizing the cleanup attempts. Look at Enbridge in Michigan. Look at Exxon in Arkansas. This is a spill I went to see for myself. Standing at a culvert, I saw the 5 foot high imprint of the oil rush to the local wetlands. The thought of seeing the equivalent on my creek bank is disheartening. America already subsidizes the oil industry at a monumental disproportion to other industries. Are we to further subsidize pipelines with our safety, our security, and our human dignity?

Corporations may be considered to be people, but dollars do not yet count as votes. TransCanada's money never sleeps, but neither do landowners like me, faced with the threat of losing our property, or seeing our land and identities torn apart.

This bill brings much needed reform to a sometimes flawed system, and a platform where wrong can be made right. But with this exception that includes TransCanada, it is turning a blind eye to the most flagrant abuser of eminent domain today. I urge you to remove that exclusion, and let those who have abused be exposed, and suffer the consequences. TransCanada stole land that has been in my family for 6 decades, and all for a project that will line their pockets. To allow them to walk away from past abuses without penalty is egregious. I will continue to fight these injustices because life, as we know it, depends on it. And I am not alone.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIA TRIGG CRAWFORD.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation.

Let's be honest: this permit is 5 years old. The average time for authorizing permits in these types of projects is 18 to 24 months. Enough paralysis by analysis.

Now, some may say during this discussion that we're being impatient and we're rushing this through—1,700 days? This delay has taken longer than it took the Greatest Generation to win World War II on both fronts. It's longer than it took Lewis and Clark to do their exploration of the Louisiana Purchase to Oregon and back.

The Keystone XL is a private infrastructure project with no government funds that will create nongovernment jobs—by the way, a \$7 billion infrastructure project, 20,000 direct jobs along this route over a 2-year period.

I want to make a very important point. Those who oppose this legislation argue that it's unprecedented. This is not the first time Congress has had to intervene to build a pipeline. Like-minded legislation to this one was necessary 40 years ago to achieve construction of the game-changing trans-Alaska pipeline. That legislation that was passed and signed into law deemed that the environmental studies—NEPA—were sufficient, as this one does; that rights of way across Federal lands—not State, but Federal lands—were processed; and judicial review was also included.

Then again, in 2004, Congress had to act to pass legislation to build the Alaska natural gas pipeline. That legislation was passed and signed into law with a 60-day judicial review. The pipeline was deemed to be in the national interest and, unlike today, it expedited the NEPA. Here, the NEPA process has been finished—complete. The only way you can get more studies is to have amendments requiring more studies because all of the legal requirements have been filled.

Today, we just heard about mistreatment. And there was some misinformation from the last speaker regarding what this bill does. It gives a streamlined judicial process in regard to the Federal permits issued. It has nothing to do with States' eminent domain. But let's hear some facts.

Today, TransCanada has agreements with 60,000 landowners over 32,000 miles of pipeline. Under the original Keystone pipeline that goes through Nebraska, there were over 300 landowners involved in negotiations, four of whom objected. Three of those settled, one went to court; 300 versus four that were upset. And they got their day in court in the State of Nebraska, just like this bill preserves. If there are verifiable crop deficiencies, it's TransCanada's policy to make them whole.

Now, what will compel the State Department to complete this process? They've had it for 5 years. The studies have been completed—the original NEPA, a supplemental, a Nebraska supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most studied pipeline in the history of mankind.

□ 1310

History is our greatest educator.

In 1973, Congress passed and President Nixon signed the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Act to "ensure that because of the extensive governmental studies already made of this project and the national interest in early delivery of North Slope oil to domestic markets, the trans-Alaska pipeline be constructed promptly without further administrative or judicial delay or impediment."

That was 40 years ago we had the same problems; 2004 we have the same problems. And it took Congress to act to resolve them.

This will be the newest, most highly engineered pipeline in our history to resolve some of the questions from the gentleman from Colorado. Again, three separate environmental studies.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. TERRY. The point of those is to study the impacts, if there is a spill, to not only the soil, the ecosystem, but the Ogallala Aquifer as well. Three different studies have dealt with that. All have scientifically concluded that there is negligible impact on the ecosystem, or in the artistic term "not significant."

The most celebrated geologist in the State of Nebraska has said that it is impossible for the oil to get to the Ogallala Aquifer; but if it did, the water is still and won't move out of that and can be easily remedied.

Now, I'm not being impatient; the Republicans aren't being impatient. Our Nation of builders needs this pipeline, and I urge approval of both the rule and the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman cited studies that apparently addressed his concerns about environmental impact. I would draw his attention to the fact that there were three draft studies—one that was actually finalized. All of them were on the old routing. The project itself has been revised. There have been zero studies, environmental studies for health and water, with regard to the new routing of the pipeline.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Whether or not you support the pipeline, you should oppose this legislation. H.R. 3 is a reckless attempt to sideline environmental review and limit public input.

The majority claims that Keystone XL is the most studied pipeline in the history of pipelines. Shouldn't a pipeline that is going to run the length of our country be exhaustively studied? We need to know the environmental impacts and truly weigh all the consequences, intended or not, of H.R. 3; and H.R. 3 would deny the American people and this Congress that opportunity.

Over 1 million Americans commented on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. The President and his administration need time to analyze these comments and evaluate the impacts of this massive project. H.R. 3 shuts that process down and says it's ready to go.

This can't be about making the President look bad or the bottom line of a Canadian corporation. This is about doing what's right for this country.

This is no ordinary pipeline. It will transport dirty tar sands oil from Canada to Port Arthur, Texas. Tar sands oil produces 40 percent more carbon pollution than conventional oils.

Pretending that this pipeline has to be done and has to be done immediately is to hide from the reality of the consequences of this pipeline. We really don't need the oil. It is oil that will be primarily exported out of this country.

A recent study by Cornell University found that Keystone XL will divert more green jobs and contribute to more climate change than any other project. The claims of employment are hugely exaggerated.

We are having the wrong conversation. We should be talking about the future of real energy independence and alternative and renewable energy.

While I don't support H.R. 3 or Keystone XL, I think the decision lies with the President. That's why I am circulating a letter to the President to reject this lack of a Presidential permit.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, let me make it abundantly clear here: the pipeline is going to be built. The question is whether it's going to be built west to Vancouver, and then we're going to see the product shipped to our economic competitors; or will the pipeline be built south to our refineries in the United States.

There's a second point. We've got the cleanest burning refineries in the world. That is not true in terms of our economic competitors.

So from an environmental standpoint and from the standpoint of energy needs in the U.S., it makes no sense to advance the interests of our economic competitors.

Now, the U.S. energy costs have been declining. China's energy costs have been rising. Our country is becoming a more attractive place to manufacture goods. We are also becoming more competitive, both with Europe and with Asia.

U.S. gasoline prices right now are 30 percent lower than China's, and U.S. electricity prices are 50 percent lower than Europe's. For those of us that have been involved in manufacturing in the past, we understand how important that is. We want energy prices lower here in the United States than they are overseas, not the other way around.

A reliable and efficient energy supply is, frankly, vital to our economic competitiveness; and unless we reverse course, we could squander the advantage we have right now. The Keystone pipeline will have a major positive impact on the economy at a time when millions of hard-pressed Americans are searching for work. Keystone will create an estimated 20,000 new direct jobs and we know hundreds of thousands of indirect jobs, not only in the States where the pipelines will be built and

operated, but throughout the entire country.

Keystone is going to enhance our national security. Think about this for a minute. And, frankly, our Foreign Affairs Committee members, 24 of our Republican Members, wrote to the President in February saying that by providing secure access to petroleum from Canada, we would reduce our reliance on energy imports from countries in the OPEC cartel. The U.S. would be less vulnerable to political and security-related disruptions of our energy supply.

Well, that's the point. That's the objective here. And in the same vein, energy from Canada will enable us to reduce our dependence on unstable and unfriendly oil exporters. For example, while the Venezuelan regime remains openly hostile to the U.S., the country is our fourth largest source of oil. By contrast, Canada has long been one of our closest allies.

Our economies are joined together with Canada and our energy sectors are already integrated. We want to spend the money in Canada and have it circulated back over that border. Ninety percent of what Canada buys is made in the United States. We could have no better partner in our effort to ensure our energy security.

By obstructing the approval process, the administration not only prevents the benefits of the pipeline from materializing; it also chills the development for new projects. Think about this. At the present time, Canada and Mexico are major sources of American energy and offer enormous potential for the development of new oil and gas fields and greatly expanded cross-border energy trade.

Yet if our existing Federal bureaucracy is willing to impose excessive costs and continued delays on a project as sound as Keystone, what reasonable business will want to assume similar risks going forward? I tell you what will happen: that pipeline will be built instead to Vancouver, British Columbia, and instead of the imports coming into the United States.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROYCE. The role of the State Department in the approval process is to determine whether the project serves the national interest. No one familiar with the facts would deny that it does, but the delays continue based on unfounded claims.

The State Department's own draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Keystone concluded that, in effect, there was no environmental reason not to approve the pipeline; yet still no action has been taken.

But it appears that not everyone in the administration got the message to slow this project down. This month, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concluded that the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would have no negative impact

on a wide range of threatened species—from the gray wolf, to the whooping crane, to the prairie fringed orchid. While it found that the project was likely to affect the American burying beetle, ABB, it concluded that Keystone XL's conservation measures "would likely result in a net increase in protected ABB habitat." So the one animal affected will actually be better off after the Keystone pipeline.

It is time to stop this charade. All reasonable objections to the pipeline have been fully addressed. Please pass the legislation.

□ 1320

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to one of our leaders on energy policy, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE). (Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership, and I hope that we will continue this debate with my good friends on the other side of the aisle on this issue.

It is just very challenging to have a structure of legislation that deems approval and does not do what I think all of us want it to do, which is to get moving to provide these jobs and to do what America is uniquely noted for—that we cross the T's and dot the I's, that we make sure that the environmental concerns are answered. I rise on this rule to make several points.

Mr. RUSH and I offered an amendment to strike section 4. In this bill, it does not allow for judicial review. It allows for people in Kentucky or in Arizona or in Texas to come to the District of Columbia to file their cases in the Court of Appeals. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I raised concerns about that. My bill struck the provision that eliminated judicial review so that some burdened individual citizen couldn't just go into his Federal district court.

I had another amendment that is very near and dear to me that wants to give new life to the jobs and businesses in the energy industry, which is to create a report to ensure that women, small businesses, minority-owned businesses get their fair shake and that we have an overall commitment to hiring the new young graduates who are coming out, many of them from the diverse community, which we see the energy industry is still seeking to outreach because there is a great need for increased diversity in many of these fields. Amendment No. 2 would have added a nonseverability clause so that, if anything were found to be unconstitutional, we would go back to the drawing board for this entire bill.

Again, to have a major initiative be deemed approved, the Secretary of State authority deemed approved, the Presidential authority deemed approved, this is something that, my colleagues, we should work together on.

I would finally suggest that I hope my colleagues will support my amendment on extending to 1 year the period for filing. Let's work together and make sure we've got something that will create jobs.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I just want to say that I know there is a desire to have more T's crossed and I's dotted. There are over 450,000 T's and I's in those 15,000 pages. We've done enough. It's time to build this pipeline. Keystone XL will help lower gas prices and will help protect against supply disruptions by putting downward pressure on oil prices by increasing supply to domestic markets.

In a memo from the Department of Energy regarding Keystone XL, it asserted that gasoline prices in all markets served by refiners on the east coast and gulf would decrease, including in the Midwest. Yes, it does do that. There are four things we said. One of them is the major one, which is that it creates jobs immediately; 42,100 were estimated by the Department of State in one of their four studies on this particular bill. I mean, we could go study after study after study with 10 different agencies looking over and over and over. There are no more studies to be done. It's time to make the decision. When should it be made? Now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. I lament that fact because I'm one of those who supports the Keystone pipeline for the many reasons that have been stated here.

I know people have concerns about oil sands, tar sands or oil production processes, but that's a Canadian decision. The fact is that these oils are going to be moved by tens of thousands of railroad cars or trucks through the States or through a pipeline to the west. Pipelines are a proven environmentally safe and sound way to move oil around North America and the country.

I am in opposition to the bill because, in committee, it became apparent that the bill relieves a foreign corporation from all of the same obligations that domestic corporations are expected to honor. They are exempted from having to comply with the EPA, with the Army Corps permits for construction and maintenance. They are relieved of the responsibility to pay taxes on the oil flowing through those pipelines. They are relieved of responsibility for cleanup in the event of accidents. That is a prescription for nothing but trouble and disaster.

Mr. Speaker, those are the reasons that I speak in opposition to this rule and to this bill.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 9½ minutes

remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time in order to close.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. No.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inform the gentleman that I have possibly one who, if he comes, I would like to yield to. Other than that, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Look, it has been talked about as to the impact on gas prices in the Midwest. There is no TAPS on this pipeline in the Midwest. It goes from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico to China and everywhere else. There can't even be TAPS on it in the Midwest because we're talking about unprocessed tar sands crude, which needs to be processed. It's a drop in the bucket in the global supply and has no impact on gas prices.

There are dozens of meaningful policies that we can talk about to reduce gas prices. Let's get to it rather than taking this important decision out of the context of the administration and out of the context of the process that Congress, itself, set up to co-op that very process for purely political purposes.

The Northern Route Approval Act exempts TransCanada from multiple loss, including treaty acts that we've passed, the Clean Water Act, and many others that my colleague Mr. NOLAN pointed out that American companies are subjected to. Yes, it's giving foreign companies preferential treatment over American companies.

Even though we don't know the cost of potential Keystone tar sands spills, we do know that American taxpayers will likely be stuck paying the bill for cleaning up and for the economic costs of these spills. Tar sands developers are exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. Let me repeat that. Tar sands developers are exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. That's a fund that normally collects an 8-cent per barrel excise tax on domestically produced crude oil to pay for spill prevention and mitigation efforts.

So they are exempt. They're not paying in. Like any oil that's pulled out of the ground in Texas or across our country, they're paying in because we know that oil spills happen; we know they have real economic and health costs; we know they affect agriculture and water—but oh, no, this project is exempt. Since tar sands are not considered conventional oil, TransCanada is not required to pay into the trust fund for the oil it transports, while the data indicates that the tar sands crude can actually have a worse economic and environmental impact when spilled than conventional oil. We can't subject more communities like Mayflower to oil spills and then burden the U.S. taxpayers at a time of record deficits with paying for the cleanup.

Approving the Keystone XL pipeline through this bill would simply benefit foreign oil companies at the expense of the health and safety of the American people. There is a process in place to protect the health and safety of the American people, the economic welfare of the American people, jobs. This bill circumvents that process that Congress set up. If we want to change the process, let's have a debate about the process for approval and the statutory framework and work with the administration to come up with a better way to do it. Let's not go around our own process just because we may or may not like what we may or may not think is the outcome.

I urge the majority to stop wasting the American people's time with bills that are going nowhere and to turn towards addressing so many challenges we can agree on—reducing the deficit, improving the economy, improving the efficiency of the delivery of health care. Let's talk about reducing gas prices, the bipartisan bill that I've introduced with Mr. GOSAR and Mr. HECK and others.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I'll offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 2070, Representative TIM BISHOP's bill to protect consumers from price gouging at the pump.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

This rule doesn't even allow for 10 minutes of debate or 5 minutes of debate or 1 minute of debate on the very commonsense amendments that have been brought forward by my colleagues like Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. TONKO of New York.

Don't we have 1 minute to debate these important amendments? What are we doing that's so important? We didn't even go into session until noon today. Why didn't we go into session at 11:59 a.m. and have 1 minute for debate on these amendments? What are we doing here, Mr. Speaker? We have the time to get it right. Let's do it.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, the amendments that were talked about are amendments that would add to a process that we have said is very sacred. We don't want to change the process. We don't want to circumvent it.

We're not circumventing any process. Because this crosses a national boundary, there's only one thing left to do: we need the President to okay it. Every study that could be done—this started in 2008 and continued in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, and now here we are in 2013. It's out of opportunities to be studied. It's time.

This rule provides for ample and open debate and makes in order proposals from both sides of the aisle.

As I stated before, this bill represents so much more than the approval of an 875-mile long pipeline. It represents 42,100 jobs, greater energy independence, and will benefit our Nation for generations to come.

The Keystone XL pipeline will allow 830,000 barrels of oil to flow each day to domestic refineries that employ hard-working Americans. This number represents half of our current daily crude oil imports from the Middle East. This will not only diversify our energy sources, but it will reduce our dependence on foreign oil from countries that in many ways do not share or respect our freedom and democracy.

As we speak, the southern gulf coast segment of the Keystone XL pipeline is being constructed. It didn't require Presidential approval for one reason: it didn't cross a national border. It was studied by the requisite State and Federal environmental agencies, it was approved, and now it's approximately 50 percent complete.

Four years and 15,000 pages represent more than enough time and paper to study this pipeline. Any more paper and we'll need an environmental impact statement to study the effects of the environmental impact statement.

Our Nation is crying out for job creation, energy independence, and lower gas prices. Today, we have the opportunity to answer that call and to remove the few remaining barriers that stand between Americans and the relief they desperately need.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this rule and passage of the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank Chairman SESSIONS and the Members of the Rules Committee for making in order my amendment that extends the time period for filing a claim arising under the Act from 60 days to 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, the Keystone XL Pipeline project raises several issues important to every Member of this House:

Energy production and independence.

Environmental protection and preservation.

Job creation.

Separation of powers and checks and balances.

Given the importance of these issues, I believe the House would have benefitted from a rule that provided for even more extensive and wide-ranging debate and that made more amendments in order.

For example, an amendment I offered jointly with Congressman RUSH, Jackson Lee Amendment #4, would have struck Section 4 of the bill and restored the right to full judicial review to aggrieved parties.

Another amendment I offered, Jackson Lee Amendment #3, would have required the Secretary of Transportation to submit within 90 days of enactment a report to Congress identifying the procedures and policies adopted to ensure that women and minority business enterprises are afforded the opportunity to participate on an equitable basis in the construction and operation of the Keystone Pipeline. Had this amendment been made in order and adopted Congress would have been provided with helpful information needed to conduct appropriate oversight.

Another amendment I offered, Jackson Lee Amendment #2 Amendment, would have added a non-severability clause to the bill, which states that: "if any provision or application of the legislation is held to be invalid, the entire act shall be rendered void."

This non-severability clause simply would have made explicit that the component parts of this bill all fit together, in *pari materia*, so to speak, such that removing any one part would defeat the intended purpose of the bill.

My amendment would make very clear the Congressional intent that this bill is so delicately crafted, that it is "all or nothing."

Each of these provisions would be rendered meaningless if any of the remaining parts is invalidated.

This has been a long standing principle of statutory construction, going back at least to 1936, when the Supreme Court stated in *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 238, 312 (1936):

"[T]he presumption is that the Legislature intends an act to be effective as an entirety—that is to say, the rule is against the mutilation of a statute; and if any provision be unconstitutional, the presumption is that the remaining provisions fall with it.

This presumption becomes conclusive when Congress makes its intention clear, see *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. at 312, by including a non-severability clause in the statute.

My amendment would have done just that.

For these reasons, I am opposed to the rule and cannot support it.

We can do better to create jobs, build the pipeline, and protect the environment. I will consider how to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk. It is Jackson Lee Amendment No. 1.

I thank the Members of the Rules Committee for making the amendment in order.

My amendment is simple and straightforward. It extends the time period for filing a claim arising under the Act from 60 days to 1 year after the date of the decision or action giving rise to the claim.

This amendment is especially needed because H.R. 3, the underlying bill, vests exclusive jurisdiction over any and all claims arising under the Act in a single court—the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Think about that. The Keystone Pipeline is proposed to run from Alberta, Canada through the great States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and my State of Texas all the way to the Gulf of Mexico.

And the only court in the country authorized to hear the claims of any resident of any of these States who seeks justice for a legally cognizable injury is located more than 1,000 miles away from their homes.

This will impose undue hardship and financial burdens on ordinary Americans seeking justice. Instead, the bill requires them to find and retain a high-priced D.C. lawyer that they don't know and may have never met to represent their interests in a court in a far away land.

Another reason for extending the time period in which to file a claim from 60 days to 1 year is because by lodging jurisdiction in the D.C. Court of Appeals, the burden of proof and persuasion is shifted from the governmental and corporate actors involved to the homeowners, small businesses, and individuals bringing the legal action.

This is because the burden that must be shouldered by a plaintiff is very steep. To challenge factual and evidentiary determinations made in an Environmental Impact Statement, for example, a plaintiff must demonstrate that they are "not supported by substantial evidence in the record considered as a whole."

To meet that standard, plaintiffs will have to retain experts, locate and prepare witnesses, and gather and review documentary materials.

That takes time. And that is why my amendment is necessary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 228 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

Sec. 2. 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. 2070) to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, 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. 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 recommend 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2070.

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), de-

scribes 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.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum

time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 194, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—194

Andrews	Braley (IA)	Castro (TX)
Barber	Brown (FL)	Chu
Barrow (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Bass	Bustos	Clarke
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Becerra	Capps	Cleaver
Bera (CA)	Capuano	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Connolly
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Conyers
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Bonamici	Cartwright	Costa
Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)	Courtney

Crowley	Kilmer	Pocan
Cuellar	Kind	Polis
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Quigley
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Rahall
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Delaney	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Levin	Ruiz
DelBene	Lewis	Ruppersberger
Deutch	Lipinski	Rush
Dingell	Loeb	Ryan (OH)
Doggett	Loftgren	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Lowenthal	T.
Duckworth	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Schakowsky
Ellison	(NM)	Schiff
Engel	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schneider
Enyart	(NM)	Schrader
Eshoo	Lynch	Schwartz
Esty	Maffei	Scott (VA)
Farr	Maloney,	Scott, David
Fattah	Carolyn	Serrano
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Fudge	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Gabbard	McCollum	Sinema
Gallo	McDermott	Sires
Garamendi	McGovern	Slaughter
Grayson	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Green, Al	McNerney	Speier
Green, Gene	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Grijalva	Meng	Takano
Gutierrez	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Hahn	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Hanabusa	Moore	Tierney
Heck (WA)	Moran	Tonko
Higgins	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas
Himes	Nadler	Van Hollen
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Vargas
Holt	Neal	Veasey
Honda	Negrete McLeod	Vela
Horsford	Nolan	Velázquez
Hoyer	O'Rourke	Visclosky
Huffman	Owens	Walz
Israel	Pallone	Wasserman
Jackson Lee	Pascarella	Schultz
Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)	Waters
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Watt
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Waxman
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Welch
Keating	Peters (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)	Yarmuth
Kennedy	Peterson	
Kildee	Pingree (ME)	

NOT VOTING—16

Clyburn	Markey	Titus
Cole	Miller, Gary	Woodall
Diaz-Balart	Nugent	Young (AK)
Garcia	Nunnelee	Young (FL)
Hastings (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	
Herrera Beutler	Sarbanes	

□ 1400

Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF
VICTIMS OF RECENT TORNADOS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, as you're all well aware, it's been a tough week in the Southwest. In particular, it's been a tough few days in the Fourth District of Oklahoma.

Today, I rise to first thank you for your prayers and your thoughts and your good will, but I note also the tornado that rolled through Congressman TOM COLE's district in Oklahoma, from Newcastle through Moore and across the southern part of Oklahoma City. Congressman COLE is not with us today because he is still in Oklahoma, addressing the needs of and working with his fellow citizens and community members as they try to put themselves

back together after this strike by an F-5 tornado.

Moore is particularly important to our colleague, Congressman COLE, because not only does he represent the community, but he was raised there, two generations of his family buried in the cemetery there. So it's a community that's important to him in many, many ways.

That said, the good folks in Moore and the other communities will, over the coming days, pull themselves back together. They'll finish sifting through every pile of rubble; they'll have made a determination that there's no one left to be saved, as they work frantically to try to do that; and they'll begin the process of laying to rest those who were lost and put their entire community back together.

While many folks are well aware of the importance of FEMA and the Federal response, Moore is a classic example—and this could be any community in the United States—of where, in the greatest tragedy, the most tragic loss of life, city government, county government, and State government come together to work seamlessly to help those in need and to recover those beyond help.

We in the Oklahoma delegation and our friends in the Texas delegation appreciate everything that you have and you will help do in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield to the gentleman who represents part of that area and just to the north, Oklahoma City, the great Fifth District of Oklahoma, Congressman LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. In the past week, Texas and Oklahoma have experienced a storm. We lost 6 in Lake Granbury, Texas; 2 in Shawnee, Oklahoma, on Sunday; and 24 in Moore, Oklahoma, including 10 children and 14 adults. We have been overwhelmed with the number of people that have come to us to say, “We're praying for you.”

I would like to make a request that this body take a moment to pause and pray and experience a moment of silence in honor of those that have been lost and the recovery efforts ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Members will rise and the House will observe a moment of silence.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas was allowed to speak out of order.)

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR THE VICTIMS OF
THE RECENT TORNADOS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. As the Democratic side of the Texas delegation, I want to join the other Republicans that came up with the Oklahoma delegation and simply say that this is not a partisan issue. We stand ready to be of assistance to those people in Oklahoma.

I represent Dallas. That is closer to Oklahoma City than it is to Houston. No matter where tragedies may occur, we stand ready as American people to stand by those people who have been affected, notwithstanding party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 185, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—228

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

Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—185

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Galego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke

Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Clyburn
Cole
Díaz-Balart
Farr
Garcia
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler

Issa
Jones
Kirkpatrick
Lummis
Markey
Miller, Gary
Nugent

Poe (TX)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Sarbanes
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1413

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.

NORTHERN ROUTE APPROVAL ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 228 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. 3.

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

□ 1416

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. 3) to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

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

I thank the chairman for the time to express my views on H.R. 3, which will generate numerous benefits to the Nation and its economic growth. This pipeline will create American jobs, enhance our energy independence, and strengthen our national security.

I am proud to say that I'm a cosponsor of this legislation because it represents a significant opportunity to create jobs and spur economic growth in our country. Furthermore, this bill will help the Nation become more energy independent.

According to the Department of Energy, the pipeline will transport 830,000 barrels per day of oil from Canada to the gulf coast, totaling nearly half of our current daily imports from the Middle East. This bill makes these numerous project benefits a reality. What this boils down to is breaking through bureaucratic hurdles and making this project a priority.

The southern leg of the Keystone XL pipeline has already been approved, and this bill finishes the job, allowing con-

struction of the northern route of the pipeline to move forward.

This bill also ensures that the environment and its historic resources are protected, through the 5 years of studies that have already been completed on this project. Indeed, this has been the most studied project in our country's history.

It also ensures that the project's routing through Nebraska, the primary objection with the permit when it was denied in 2012, is the route chosen by the people of that State. Simply put, as President Obama said regarding the southern route, this bill "cuts through the red tape."

The project is the most extensively studied and vetted pipeline project in the history of this country. Given the nearly 5 years of study and review of the Keystone XL project—with four State Department environmental impact statements and over 15,000 pages of publicly released documents—we know the ins and outs and all about this pipeline.

I believe in an all-of-the-above energy strategy, and this legislation is one piece of that puzzle to break America's dependency on overseas foreign oil.

□ 1420

Finally, it is important to remember that this project will be built with private dollars and create thousands of private sector jobs. This project has passed through all three committees with bipartisan support, and I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, DC, May 17, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, I am writing concerning H.R. 3, the "Northern Route Approval Act."

As you know, H.R. 3 contains a section on judicial review, which is within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 3, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

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

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.