

For the past 17 years, Mr. Almqvist has been Tucson Magnet's drama teacher. He has built a phenomenal theater program rarely seen on any high school level. His programs and plays have won numerous awards from universities, as well as regularly being named one of the best high school theaters in America by the American High School Theater Festival.

Mr. Almqvist is known for staging productions on topics such as AIDS, environmental activism, and immigration. He believes the theater offers each student an opportunity to learn new skills and enhance his skills.

As an educator, he has influenced thousands of students to pursue a career that both challenges them, but also brings them joy.

I give my most sincere thanks and congratulations to Mr. Art Almqvist for representing Tucson as a leader in the field of education. Mr. Almqvist exemplifies how a role model can effect change and educate the next generation.

THANKSGIVING AND SNAP

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, next week we celebrate Thanksgiving, a holiday in which we express our gratitude for all that life in this land has given us. We celebrate our good fortune with family, friends, and foods.

One of the most iconic portrayals of this day is Norman Rockwell's 1941 painting, "Freedom from Want," which shows a large family seated around a dinner table waiting to carve up a turkey. This painting was created to depict what Franklin Roosevelt called one of the "four essential human freedoms," the freedoms that millions of Americans would fight and die to protect in World War II.

Roosevelt reminded us as Americans that "we cannot be content . . . if some fraction of our people, whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth, is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure." Instead, "after this war is won, we must be prepared to move forward . . . to new goals of human happiness and well-being."

Mr. Speaker, we are moving in the wrong direction. Right now in America, 49 million Americans, one out of every seven households in our country, are struggling with hunger, including 16 million kids. At this time of great need, this body proposes to cut \$40 billion from food stamps, forcing 4 million low-income Americans to go hungry. It is immoral.

HOMES ACT

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, energy efficiency investments work. A recent

study by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory found that improving the airtightness in homes would achieve \$33 billion in annual energy savings.

Across the country, 113 million homes use 23 percent of U.S. source energy, and the largest potential is in the hottest and the coldest climates.

In Vermont, we are leading the country on energy efficiency, demonstrating the potential these home improvements can have for saving money and protecting the environment.

I have introduced bipartisan legislation with my good friend and Republican colleague, Representative MCKINLEY, that would provide homeowners with an incentive to install precisely these kinds of efficiency measures in their own homes.

Whatever your preferred source of energy, we can all agree that using less energy is good for the taxpayer and the environment. This is something we can and should work together on accomplishing.

I encourage everyone to read Lawrence Berkeley's article in the science digest Energy and Buildings. It can be found at www.elsevier.com/locate/enbuild.

HONORING NATIVE AMERICAN CODE TALKERS

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, November is Native American Heritage Month, and I rise today to honor the many contributions that Native Americans have made and continue to make to our Nation's proud history and culture.

Earlier today, we awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to 26 tribes whose members served as code talkers during World War II and World War I, including the Pueblo of Acoma, which is one of 22 Native tribes that call New Mexico home. At a later date, we will honor seven more code talker tribes, including another from New Mexico, the Pueblo of Laguna.

The code talkers proudly served our country with great honor and distinction. They transmitted vital information during some of the most dangerous battles, including every assault the marines conducted in the Pacific from 1942 to 1945. Without the code talkers, the world wars would have lasted longer and America would have suffered many more casualties.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the Pueblos of Acoma and Laguna and the other code talker tribes are officially getting the thanks and recognition they deserve from a very grateful Nation.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1900, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 420

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1900) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-25. 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.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from November 22, 2013, through November 29, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of

this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule 1.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), 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. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 420 provides for the consideration of a critical piece of legislation that was passed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce designed to address the costly and unnecessary delays which many businesses experience when trying to get a final determination to be made by the Federal Government in relation to a pending pipeline.

A member of the committee, Mr. POMPEO from Kansas, the bill's author, has drafted a meaningful piece of legislation, taking into account the various competing interests involved in the permitting process and has found a fair and just balance for ensuring that our critical infrastructure moves forward.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of general debate on the bill. Five of the six amendments submitted to the Rules Committee were made in order, all Democratic amendments. The sixth was neither germane nor did it meet the CutGo rules of the House. Finally, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit on the bill, allowing for yet another opportunity to amend the legislation.

H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, is the product of hours of work with stakeholders that Mr. POMPEO has put in to improve the legislation. The bill streamlines our Nation's pipeline permitting processes in an effort to allow for greater capacity and promote safe infrastructure. Specifically, the bill directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve or deny a permit application for a new natural gas pipeline within 12 months.

Natural gas is one of the clearest examples of how this country can move itself toward a more sustainable energy-independent future while at the same time allowing and encouraging our economy to grow. My own district in north Texas sits 8,000 feet above the Barnett shale, a natural gas formation that industry has been using to produce gas for decades. Indeed, due to the technological advances and strong market, the area that I represent felt few of the effects of the recession until

at least a year after the recession was initiated due to the booming economy that resulted from the development of the resources under our feet.

Obviously, with increased production and demand, as we have seen with the natural gas industry, comes an increased need for infrastructure. I welcome any legislation which would streamline the permitting process and allow companies to spend less time with Washington bureaucrats and more time creating jobs, producing products that consumers want and are eager to buy.

□ 1245

Indeed, with the increase in supply that hydraulic fracturing has created with natural gas, the pace at which the Federal Government has approved increased infrastructure, namely pipelines, to transport this commodity has not kept up.

Pipelines provide the safest, fastest, and cleanest mode of transportation for natural gas, as we in the Energy and Commerce Committee have heard from witnesses again and again. Making certain that our country has the number of pipelines necessary for transporting the gas we need to heat our homes and run our cars is a critical step toward energy independence.

Moreover, Members of this body who annually support more robust funding for programs like the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, commonly referred to as LIHEAP, should be joining with Republicans today in supporting an increase in pipeline infrastructure in our country, as the natural gas being produced in Western States could more efficiently be transported to the Northeastern States, reducing home heating costs and lessening the need for government assistance for many families.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an important bill. It will create opportunity to put thousands of workers to work, creating the infrastructure that this country has needed for some time due to the energy boom in natural gas. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that this Republican-controlled House of Representatives is incapable of doing anything that matters in people's lives. When the history is written on the 113th Congress, especially as it pertains to the House of Representatives, they have accomplished nothing. They have made a lot of noise. They shut the government down. They whine about the health care bill every chance they get, but they have accomplished absolutely nothing.

And it is frustrating because our country is facing great challenges. Our

economic growth is slower than it should be, thanks to the Republican shutdown of government, and their willingness to play politics with the debt ceiling has had a negative impact on our economy. Job growth is too slow, and we should be working together to invest in education and in job training and in infrastructure projects to help put people back to work. We ought to have a long-term highway bill. I think every Governor in the country, Republican and Democrat, would agree with me on that statement. Yet this House of Representatives just seems incapable of accomplishing anything to help rebuild our infrastructure.

The sequester that my Republican friends embraced has taken a terrible toll on our science and research programs. Talk to the people at NIH. Potentially lifesaving research into diseases like cancer and Parkinson's disease have been crippled, yet there is no urgency over on the side of my friends on the other side of the aisle to try to do anything about it. They just sit there and twiddle their thumbs and life goes on; meanwhile, we are losing our competitive edge in medical research and in science.

The Senate has passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill. The Republican leadership claims that we simply don't have the time to take it up. That is nonsense. We had time to take up this horrible bill that my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KING) authored that would allow for the mass deportation of young, undocumented immigrants, the so-called DREAMers who were brought here as children by their parents. They have time to demagogue these issues, but to actually fix our broken immigration system, they claim we don't have any time.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD today's Washington Post editorial, "John Boehner Must Act on Immigration Now."

And just so my colleagues understand this, when my friends on the other side of the aisle say they don't have time, the Republicans will take 4 out of 5 days off for the rest of the year. That is how hard they are working on behalf of the American people. Four out of 5 days remaining from now until the end of the year they are going to take off. That is not doing your job, Mr. Speaker. That is not doing your job.

Instead of dealing with these important issues, we have this bill before us now that has come to the floor, H.R. 1900. The bill before is rather curious. Rather than solving a problem that actually exists, it is a solution in search of a problem, and it is just another partisan messaging bill that is going nowhere in the Senate. The White House has already said they would veto it.

H.R. 1900 would require FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, to approve or deny an application for a natural gas pipeline within 12 months of its filing date. FERC already

decides 92 percent of permit applications within 12 months, and the GAO has concluded that its pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent and gets pipelines built. The small percentage of applications that have taken more than a year involve complex proposals that deserve a more thoughtful review.

Instead of speeding up the permitting process, this bill will lead to unnecessary permit denials and increased litigation that will ultimately slow the process down. If FERC cannot properly review permits within the rigid 12-month deadline, they may be forced to deny applications that would otherwise end up being approved.

For me, the most troubling part of H.R. 1900 is that it may result in truncated or inadequate environmental analysis, which threatens the health and safety of communities these potentially hazardous pipelines run through. Just last week, a Chevron pipeline exploded in Milford, Texas, forcing the entire town to evacuate. Mr. Speaker, it isn't too much to ask the oil and gas industry to go through a process to make sure that these pipelines are safe.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and on the underlying bill, and I urge my Republican colleagues to get back to work on solving real problems on behalf of the American people.

Enough of the press releases, enough of this polarizing rhetoric and these meaningless debates that we seem to be consumed with here in the House of Representatives. People want us to work on their behalf, to do things that will improve their lives, that will strengthen our country; and instead, my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be cheering for our country to fail all the time and bringing this kind of stuff to the floor, which is going nowhere and is meaningless.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

[The Washington Post, Nov. 19, 2013]

JOHN BOEHNER MUST ACT ON IMMIGRATION
Now

(By Editorial Board)

Poor John Boehner. The beleaguered House speaker can't even eat breakfast in peace. The other day, a pair of teenage girls, activists for immigration reform, accosted him at Pete's Diner, his early-morning hangout, to ask how he'd like to be deported.

"How would you feel if you had to tell your kids at the age of 10 that you were never coming home?" 13-year-old Carmen Lima, of California, asked Mr. Boehner. "That wouldn't be good," allowed the Speaker.

He got that right. The rest of his remarks on immigration that day, not so much. Mr. Boehner, who pledged to press ahead with immigration reform a year ago following Mitt Romney's dismal performance with Latino voters, now says the House will not negotiate with Democrats on the basis of the sweeping reform bill passed by the Senate in June with bipartisan support. Translation: Don't hold your breath for immigration reform this year, and don't get your hopes high for next year, either.

Mr. Boehner says he still wants to "deal with" immigration, but "in a commonsense, step-by-step way."

The trouble is, no one knows what those steps would be. The only immigration bill on which Mr. Boehner has permitted a vote by the full House would allow for the mass deportation of young, undocumented immigrants brought to this country illegally as children by their parents—the so-called Dreamers.

Deporting hundreds of thousands of youngsters who grew up and went to school in the United States does not seem an especially promising way to resolve the broader issue of the nation's broken immigration system. Neither does heaving billions of dollars more at border security without tackling the entire problem. Some partial reforms, such as opening the visa spigot for high-tech engineers, scientists and mathematicians, may make sense, but they don't get at the fundamental problem.

As it happens, border security and high-tech visas are addressed in the Senate bill, along with more fundamental reform; that's why it's 1,300 pages long, a fact that Mr. Boehner cited to dismiss its viability as the basis for negotiations. In the wake of Obamacare's rollout troubles, large-scale reforms are in poor repute, we understand. But there are 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States. The country needs to deal with them in some way. When it does so, it needs to set up a sensible system for future immigration so we don't wind up in the same fix 10 or 20 years from now. That requires legislation of some complexity, it's true, but members of Congress are elected to solve complex problems.

President Obama said Tuesday that he is open to dealing with immigration in a piecemeal fashion. But the House can't dictate that only border security and deportation are on the table. Mr. Boehner should let House Republicans vote on the parts of immigration reform they consider priorities and take that "sensible step-by-step" approach into negotiations with the Senate. It is unserious, and unconstructive, to tell the Senate what it can and cannot bring to the table in negotiations with the House.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I rise today in opposition to the rule and to H.R. 1900.

As many of my colleagues are aware, natural gas is extremely important to the State of Texas. It seems like every day more and more natural gas deposits are being found. More importantly, with the commercialization of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, we are now able to develop these resources effectively and economically, but that is only half the story. Once we have found these resources, we need a way to move them to market in a safe and environmentally responsible way.

In 1956, the United States decided it was in our best interest to build a network of highways. These highways, totaling approximately 47,000 miles, moved goods to market and dramatically expanded commerce. It may surprise some, but the interstate and intrastate pipeline system is approximately seven times larger than the highway system in the United States.

The natural gas pipeline system in this country is critical and extensive infrastructure. The permitting and review process that is required to site and construct pipelines in this country has ensured an environmental safety record that is second to none. That doesn't mean there aren't still going to be problems, when you consider the amount of miles we have.

Unfortunately, I can't support this particular bill. I support an expedited review process and expansion of the pipeline system. Our intrastate natural gas pipeline system is not broken. I cannot support a bill that would issue a license or permit or approval after merely an expired time line. In testimony in our committee, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the FERC, has an average of about a year turnaround.

I want to continue to support the construction of pipelines, and my ardent support is firmly backed by a safety record that is unmatched. I will continue to support an industry that has been an engine of our economic growth for the last decade.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the future on another approach that will benefit all stakeholders, our environment, and our economy.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and the bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I see four people in the gallery. I see three Members on the floor. The galleries are empty, the floor is empty because we are not doing anything, and it is not because we don't have a lot of things to do.

We have 6—7 if you count tomorrow where we will leave by 12:00—6 full days left in the session in 2013, and yet we fiddle here while the country sees itself burning on bills that are going nowhere, that have no priority and deal with a subject, energy, which, happily, is one of the most successful places we are at in America today, where we are fast becoming the energy-independent, low-cost energy situs of the world.

We have no budget conference coming to this floor scheduled in the 6 full days that we have left and the 2 other days that may be counted in which we come in at 6:30 and meet for probably a half an hour or 45 minutes and vote on suspension bills. Yet we have spent this entire week—and we left, of course, hardworking day yesterday, we left doing work at 2:30 in the afternoon. No budget conference, no fiscal policy, no solution to the crisis that confronted us when we shut down government.

I urged that we have a budget conference report by November 22—that is tomorrow—so that we didn't, as our practice has been in recent months and

years, confront real issues only when crisis gives us no other alternative.

No immigration reform has been brought to the floor, although it passed the Senate with 68 votes, comprehensive immigration reform, which will address a problem that every Member of this House says is an immigration system that is broken. The majority leader said that the other day, and I asked him about the four bills that our Republican friends, Mr. Speaker, have reported out of committee but they languish somewhere in the netherworld, not brought to the floor for consideration by this House.

And yet we have time to consider bills that will have no impact, which the President says he will veto, and are not bipartisan bills, were reported out of the committee in a partisan fashion, as so much of the legislation that we consider on this House floor is, partisan, confrontational, no-consensus pieces of legislation.

Yet a comprehensive immigration reform bill that had 68 votes, over two-thirds of the United States Senate, 14 Republicans voted for that bill, yet the Speaker says he is not for it and won't bring it to the floor. That is the same Speaker that says let the House work its will. The House cannot work its will if the legislation is not brought to the floor by the House, which can only be done by the Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, as you know. So they keep that bill from being considered, although CBO says it will help the economy, grow jobs, and fix a broken system.

□ 1300

There are 6 full days left to go on the schedule in 2013. And yet the farm bill, which was reported out of the committee 2 years ago in a bipartisan fashion in the last Congress but was never brought to this floor, while we twiddled our thumbs while Rome burned—the farm bill lies languishing in conference committee because a bipartisan bill, passed by the United States Senate, was not considered in this House.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. But a partisan bill with almost no Democratic votes, and the second piece of that farm bill, the nutritional part, receiving not a single Democratic vote, lies languishing in the conference committee because it was passed in an extraordinarily partisan fashion, where the gentleman from Oklahoma's (Mr. LUCAS) bill, reported out in a bipartisan fashion. The American public, Mr. Speaker, says, Let's act bipartisanship. We did. With Democratic and Republican votes, the farm bill came out of the Agriculture Committee and was turned into a partisan bill on this floor by my Republican colleagues. So it languishes with 6 days left, with the farm bill expiring on December 31, no action, no progress.

We need to pay our doctors a proper compensation for the services they give. I am sure the gentleman from the Rules Committee, who, himself, is a medical doctor, understands this necessity. We need to fix the sustainable growth, but it languishes somewhere out in the netherworld while we have 6 days left. Unfixed, unscheduled. I have asked the majority leader numerous times: Is that going to be brought to the floor? It has not been brought to the floor.

Discrimination in the workplace, passed by the Senate in a bipartisan fashion, ENDA, is not going to be brought to this floor. The Speaker says he is opposed to it, so the House will not be able to work its will again on a piece of legislation that, in my opinion, would have a majority of the votes on this floor. There is no doubt in my mind, and I am the whip. I count votes, Mr. Speaker, as you know. It would have the majority of votes on this floor, but the Speaker and the majority leader will not bring it to this floor.

Unemployment insurance for 1.2 million people ends on December 31, and we have 6 days of full work left and two partial days when we come in at 6:30. Yet unemployment insurance has not been brought to this floor to be extended for those 1.1 million people, with still 7.2 or 7.3 percent unemployment. Unemployment insurance is a critically important issue. It is somewhere out there, but it is not on this floor. This, while we have considered legislation this entire week that the majority knows will not pass the United States Senate and, even if it did pass, would not be signed by the President of the United States.

But they send a message, perhaps, to their base: politics. With the budget conference, immigration reform, the farm bill, the sustainable growth rate, doc reimbursement for Medicare patients, discrimination in the workplace, unemployment insurance, and, yes, I would add to that tax extenders—none of it on this floor.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. No one ought to ask themselves why the American people hold this institution in such low regard. None of us who have served in this institution for any period of time are proud of what we are doing in this Congress. We lament the unwillingness of the leadership of this House to have us do the work that the American public knows we must be doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the previous question. This is not just an ordinary previous question. What this previous question says is, We will not adjourn, American people. We will not adjourn on December 13, as is projected by the majority to be the date on which we adjourn. We will not adjourn until such time as we have

done the important work that the American people expect of us, the responsible work that the American people expect of us, the work that we ought to expect of ourselves until we consider this bill.

I would hope that we would defeat the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, then we will bring to this floor a resolution which will say, We shall not adjourn until we have done a budget conference that precludes fiscal crisis, shutting down government, a refusal to pay America's debts; that we pass an immigration reform bill that fixes what everybody knows is a broken system; until we bring a farm bill to the floor which will preclude farmers and consumers and those who need nutritional help from being put at risk.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter. This is not a letter from Democrats. This is a letter from 13 Republican leaders, chairs of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, who say to the budget conference committee: Bring a solution to the floor before the Thanksgiving break and no later than December 2. Yet, ladies and gentlemen of this House, Mr. Speaker—and yes, Mr. Speaker, all of us speak to the American people, who ought to be asking us, Why? Why? Why do we waste time when so much important work remains to be done?

Defeat the previous question. Allow us to offer a resolution which will say to the American people, We will continue to work until we get your work done.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, November 18, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Budget Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,
Ranking Member, Budget Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
Chairwoman, Budget Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. JEFF SESSIONS,
Ranking Member, Budget Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN, CHAIRWOMAN MURRAY, RANKING MEMBER SESSIONS, AND RANKING MEMBER VAN HOLLEN: We call on the Budget conference to reach an agreement on the FY 2014 and 2015 spending caps as soon as possible to allow the appropriations process to move forward to completion by the January 15 expiration of the current short-term Continuing Resolution. We urge you to redouble your efforts toward that end and report common, topline levels for both the House and Senate before the Thanksgiving recess, or by December 2 at the latest.

If a timely agreement is not reached, the likely alternatives could have extremely damaging repercussions. First, the failure to reach a budget deal to allow Appropriations to assemble funding for FY 2014 will reopen the specter of another government shutdown. Second, it will reopen the probability

of governance by continuing resolution, based on prior year outdated spending needs and priorities, dismissing in one fell swoop all of the work done by the Congress to enact appropriations bills for FY 2014 that reflect the will of Congress and the people we represent. Third, the current sequester and the upcoming "Second Sequester" in January would result in more indiscriminate across the board reductions that could have negative consequences on critically important federal programs, especially our national defense.

In addition, failure to agree on a common spending cap for FY 2015 will guarantee another year of confusion.

The American people deserve a detailed budget blueprint that makes rational and intelligent choices on funding by their elected representatives, not by a meat ax. We urge you to come together and decide on a common discretionary spending topline for both FY 2014 and FY 2015 as quickly as possible to empower our Committee, and the Congress as a whole, to make the responsible spending decisions that we have been elected to make.

Sincerely,

Harold Rogers, Chairman, Committee on Appropriations; Jack Kingston, Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies; Tom Latham, Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies; Kay Granger, Chairwoman, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies; John Abney Culberson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies; John R. Carter, Chairman, Subcommittee on Homeland Security; Tom Cole, Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch; Frank R. Wolf, Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice Science, and Related Agencies; Rodney Frelinghuysen, Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense; Robert B. Aderholt, Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies; Michael K. Simpson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies; Ander Crenshaw, Chairman, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government; Ken Calvert, Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished whip. It is frustrating to serve in the people's House and watch as this leadership purposely tries to avoid doing the people's business. It is frustrating when you go home and you talk to farmers, and they want to know where the farm bill is. It is frustrating when you talk to people about immigration, and they look at what happened in the United States Senate, where it passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support, and we can't even get anything scheduled here. We can't even get anything scheduled here.

It is frustrating when people are still reeling over the fact that the Republicans shut the government down, and they want to make sure we don't re-

peat it. Yet we have no budget resolution, no budget conference that has been put together to make sure that we are on a road where we don't have any more of these Ted Cruz-led shutdowns around here. So it is very frustrating.

I think the gentleman from Maryland said it very clearly—that the American people are frustrated. It is not just Democrats. It is Democrats and Republicans that are frustrated.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURGESS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURGESS. Is it in order to refer to Members of the other body by name?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not provide an advisory opinion.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So we don't want another Ted Cruz-led shutdown here in the House of Representatives. I think the American people are fed up with that.

Then, as the distinguished minority whip pointed out, I mean, we are not even in session more than 6 full days from now until the end of the year, which is absolutely unconscionable.

You say to yourself, Well, maybe the Republicans are planning to do something in the future; maybe they have an agenda for the future. Then we read in Politico that last Thursday, a group of House Republicans filed into Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR's Capitol office suite and received a blank piece of paper labeled, "Agenda 2014." This is their agenda for 2014. A Republican political aide put it more bluntly by saying, "What we have done so far this year clearly hasn't worked."

This is their agenda for next year. It might as well be the agenda for the rest of this year. It is nothing, nothing that is improving the quality of life for the people that we represent. Again, it fuels a cynicism all across the country that the majority party here doesn't seem to care about what happens to regular people, and that is very, very disconcerting.

I guess they could go back and say that their big accomplishment was that they complained about the Affordable Care Act. Over 40-something times, they brought bills to the floor to try to repeal it, never once offering an alternative to improve it, never once giving an alternative idea that would help address the fact that tens of millions of our citizens don't have health insurance. Millions do have health insurance, but it is really not health insurance because when they get sick, they realize they have been paying for a policy that provides them nothing. There is no alternative agenda to try to address those issues; it is just that they are against it. I guess it is easy to say "no," but the bottom line is, I think the American people are looking for us to say "yes" to some things.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up House Resolution 424, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER's resolution prohibiting an adjournment of the House until we adopt a budget conference report.

What that means is that we should not adjourn until we do our job. That shouldn't be a radical idea. I would like to think there is bipartisan consensus that we ought to do our job, and that is what this would require.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and on the underlying bills which, to be honest with you, are a waste of our time. They are going nowhere in the Senate, and the President has already issued a veto threat on them.

With one last urging of my Republican colleagues to stay here and do your work, Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

You know, Mr. Speaker, it was a little over a year ago that the American people went to the polls, and in their wisdom, they elected a divided government. They knew what divided government looked like. They had seen it for the 2 years prior.

The President came to town in 2009 and promised a lot of sweeping changes, and he delivered on those sweeping changes during the first 2 years of his administration. He had a health care bill passed. The health care bill passed without a single Republican vote. You talk about a partisan vote—the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was a partisan vote. Unfortunately, we are seeing now, as we have convulsed the country with these changes that are occurring within the insurance system, we are seeing the changes that are going to occur to our providers, our doctors, our hospitals, our nurses in the months ahead. This is a serious situation, and it requires serious action to be taken.

I won't apologize for any action that has been taken by the majority in this House to try to rein in the excesses of the administration and the previous Democrat-controlled Congress when they took over one-sixth of the Nation's economy in a partisan fashion without a single Republican vote.

The sequester was passed in August of 2011. It was passed at the request of the President. The gentleman has talked about shutdowns and defaults of the government. Do you remember that the sequester was a compromise

proposed by the President and the Office of Management and Budget at the White House in order to prevent defaulting on our debt? It was a very difficult vote for many of us in this House.

What has the sequester delivered? The sequester delivered what no one had been able to deliver in the 4 years previously, and that is a Federal budget deficit that is below \$1 trillion. It doesn't sound like a big ask that the American people had: We want you to stop spending so much money. The sequester delivered on that promise.

I find it strange now for the gentleman from Massachusetts to impugn the integrity of people who voted in favor of that sequester when the President and the minority leader of the House of Representatives now want to take credit for the fact that the deficit was cut in half over the last 4 years.

□ 1315

The only reason it was cut in half was because they raised it to unsustainable levels, and now the sequester has reined that back in. It is quite likely that the deficit at the end of fiscal year 2014 will in fact be lower if we don't do something to damage the trajectory that we are on.

I don't think the immigration bill passed by the Senate is here at the House. I think it has got an origination problem, and it is unconstitutional. If there is a bill at the desk, I will be happy to look at it, but I don't think that has occurred. The gentleman knows that.

This bill that we are considering today would lower the price of natural gas delivered to consumers in the State of Massachusetts. I have a table prepared by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The national average for natural gas is \$9.19 per thousand cubic feet. In Massachusetts, it is \$13.18.

So this is a bill today that could deliver product to the gentleman's constituents in Massachusetts at a much more reasonable price. This sounds to me like a bill that will help the economy. This sounds to me like a bill that may provide jobs for the American people.

The minority whip talked about the doc fix. Our committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, did pass, in a bipartisan fashion, the repeal of the sustainable growth rate formula. I think it is a good bill. I think it is a bill where we had participation from both sides of the dais and not a single dissenting vote when we voted on the bill in committee right before the August recess.

There is another body here in the Capitol Building. They are considering their own version of a similar bill in the appropriate Finance Committee over in the other body. I don't want to prejudice or preclude what they will or won't do. I am anxious for them to do something that would give us a negotiating point where we could consider moving forward with a final repeal of

this problem, but in fact, the legislative branch consists of two bodies—this body and the body on the other side. Until the Finance Committee acts, there is little more that the Energy and Commerce Committee can do to push that bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of a critical bill to ensure our energy infrastructure needs are being met. Mr. POMPEO has done a good job. I applaud him and our committee for the thoughtful legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

[From the Energy & Commerce Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Nov. 19, 2013]

H.R. 1900 NEEDED TO DELIVER AFFORDABLE AMERICAN ENERGY TO CONSUMERS

HOUSE TO VOTE THIS WEEK ON LEGISLATION TO SPEED UP NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS

This week the House of Representatives will consider H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. Authored by Energy and Commerce Committee member Rep. MIKE POMPEO (R-KS), the bill will help ensure consumers have access to affordable and reliable energy by modernizing the permitting process for interstate natural gas pipelines. It is a critical part of the committee's efforts to build the architecture of abundance, and will allow American families and businesses across the country to enjoy the benefits of the U.S. shale gas boom.

America is experiencing a surge in natural gas production but right now we simply don't have the infrastructure to accommodate this increased supply and deliver this low-cost energy to consumers and manufacturers. And as gas gains a greater market share of the nation's electricity portfolio, many regions of the country do not have the pipeline capacity to support this conversion, leaving consumers vulnerable to price spikes. We saw this play out last January as areas of the country, particularly along the East Coast, faced gas shortages and high prices. According to a recent blog post by the Energy Information Administration, "The increased use of natural gas for electricity generation has raised concerns about fuel diversity, as the Northeast is also reliant on natural gas for part of its heating needs and has limited pipeline capacity to bring gas to market. The winter of 2012-13 saw spikes in wholesale electricity prices in New England and New York as demand for natural gas from both electric generators and natural gas distribution companies taxed the capacity to bring natural gas into these markets."

The chart below highlights those states that suffered the most last winter from high natural gas prices and the lack of adequate infrastructure, with natural gas prices reaching up to 68% higher than the national average:

Residential Natural Gas Prices for January 2013: National Average: \$9.19*

Alabama	\$14.44/57%
Arizona	\$11.07/20%
Connecticut	\$13.07/42%
Delaware	\$12.32/34%
Florida	\$15.43/68%
Georgia	\$12.92/41%
Maine	\$15.33/67%
Maryland	\$10.73/17%
Massachusetts	\$13.18/43%
New Hampshire	\$11.99/30%
New Jersey	\$10.81/18%
New York	\$11.42/24%
North Carolina	\$11.07/20%
Pennsylvania	\$10.48/14%
Rhode Island	\$12.58/37%

Residential Natural Gas Prices for January 2013: National Average: \$9.19*—Continued

South Carolina	\$11.88/29%
Vermont	\$14.73/60%
Virginia	\$11.10/21%
Washington	\$10.47/14%

* Dollars per Thousand Cubic Feet
Source: U.S. EIA

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the rule governing debate on this bill, H.R. 1900, the "Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Act."

Mr. Speaker, as I stated yesterday when we debated the other energy bills, I am not anti-energy exploration. I am not pro—or anti-fracking. I am, however strongly "pro-jobs," "pro-economic growth," and "pro-sustainable environment."

As a Member of Congress from Houston I have always been mindful of the importance of, and have strongly advocated for, national energy policies that will make our nation energy independent, preserve and create jobs, and keep our nation's economy strong.

That is why I carefully consider each energy legislative proposal brought to the floor on its individual merits and support them when they are sound, balanced, fair, and promote the national interest.

Where they fall short, I believe in working across the aisle to improve them if possible by offering constructive amendments.

Although I believe the nation would benefit by increased pipeline capacity to transport our abundant supplies of natural gas, the legislation before contains several provisions that are of great concern to me.

Pursuant to Section 2, paragraph (4) of the bill, a permit or license for a natural gas pipeline project is "deemed" approved if the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission (FERC) or other federal agencies do not issue the permit or license within 90–120 days.

I have three concerns with this regulatory scheme.

First, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have a problem with "deeming" something done that has not been done in fact.

Thus, the provision is unwise.

Second, this provision is a remedy in search of a problem. There is no lengthy or intolerable backlog of neglected natural gas pipeline projects awaiting action by FERC.

The provision is unnecessary because FERC has, since fiscal year 2009, completed action on 92 percent (504 out of 548) of all pipeline applications that it has received within one year of receipt. And the remaining 8% of decisions that have taken longer than one year involve complex proposals that merit additional review and consideration.

Third, the provision is irresponsible because would require FERC to and other agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

Compounding the problem is that the fact that FERC like virtually every federal agency is operating under the onerous and draconian provisions of the disastrous sequestration which has caused so much misery and disruption across the nation and to our economy.

FERC, for example, with a budget of \$306 million faces a \$15 million reduction in spending authority this fiscal year, according to OMB. That sum amounts to 5% of FERC's budget.

So the likely impact of this bill if passed is to put FERC in the position of having to work faster to issue decisions with fewer experienced employees and a reduction in resources.

Given the inherent dangers involved in the construction and operation of a natural gas pipeline, does anyone doubt that this state of affairs is likely to lead to FERC to err on the side of caution and deny applications that may otherwise been approved if it had more time and more resources to carry out its responsibilities?

Mr. Speaker, we should not take that chance. That is why I offered an amendment, which the Rules Committee made in order, to suspend the effectiveness of this legislation so long as sequestration is in effect. I urge all Members to support the Jackson Lee Amendment when it comes to the floor later this week.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 420 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 424) prohibiting the consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment unless the House has adopted a conference report on the budget resolution by December 13, 2013, if called up by Representative Slaughter of New York or her designee. All points of order against the resolution and against its consideration are waived.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question

vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, 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 on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 195, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot

Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores

Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)

Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon

Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—195

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth

Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
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
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis

Lipinski
Loebuck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond

Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
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—12

Bachmann
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Ellmers

Gabbard
Herrera Beutler
Johnson, Sam
McCarthy (NY)

Meng
Radel
Rush
Westmoreland

□ 1345

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mses. WILSON of Florida and SLAUGHTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska and CARTER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 592, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to record my vote for rollcall No. 592. Had I been present I would have voted “nay” on ordering the previous question.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 194, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

AYES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy

Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culbertson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelighuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)

Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon

NOES—194

Andrews
Bachmann
Barber
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
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle

Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
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
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall

Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speler
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—11

Campbell
Diaz-Balart
Ellmers
Gohmert

Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Pittenger

Radel
Rush
Wenstrup

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1352

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 593, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 592 and 593, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MENG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 592 and 593, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

FEDERAL LANDS JOBS AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 419 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1965.

Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1354

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1965) to streamline and ensure onshore energy permitting, provide for onshore leasing certainty, and give certainty to oil shale development for American energy security, economic development, and job creation, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, November 19, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 113-271 by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFALZIO) had been postponed.