

In the suburban Chicago district I represent, the Round Lake Area American Legion Post 1170 was showing its age. It was neither fitting nor proper for the veterans who filled its halls. Renovation was needed, but money was tight in a community hard hit by our economy.

One day, Edgar and Erik Garcia decided to restore Post 1170. With guidance from troop leader Paul Socha and Commander Steven Hall and help from fellow scouts, Erik and Edgar's idea neared reality. All they needed were supplies.

That is where Home Depot came in. Home Depot donated supplies and gift cards. They single-handedly covered 90 percent of the renovations, but they contributed far more than simply dollars and cents. Thirty Home Depot employees helped with the labor.

I am awed and inspired by Erik and Edgar's vision and determination. I am grateful for Home Depot's remarkable generosity, and I am overwhelmed by the communities' outpouring of support.

Our communities in Illinois' 10th District are close and strong and great because we care about one another. As we approach Thanksgiving, if you ever doubt our greatness, you need only visit American Legion Post 1170.

□ 0915

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANKLIN BARKER WEST

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by part of our Rules Committee family, members of the Rules Committee who would like to welcome back to our Nation's Capital a very dear friend, Celeste West. Celeste is part of our Rules Committee family who retired last July after 25 years of service. On Friday, September 6, Celeste tragically and unexpectedly lost her only son, Barker, in a car accident. Today would have been Barker's 19th birthday.

We all in the Rules Committee watched Franklin Barker West as he grew up. Barker brought a smile to everybody he met. He was a gregarious young man who had an unlimited amount of energy and zeal with an unlimited future. He was an outstanding young man who believed in himself and others.

Barker was also a fraternity brother of mine in the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity. Barker's fraternity brothers have called him a "legend." As we know, lives live on despite us being in other places. His spirit is with us today.

In the wake of this tragedy, we are here today with Celeste and her family, Barker's father, Frank, and his stepmother, Suellen. We are here to celebrate Barker's short but remarkable life, a life that was part of our United States Capitol family.

As a father myself, I cannot even fathom the difficulties that the family is going through. But we want you to know, all of us here today, that the life that has been lived of Franklin Barker West was important, and is important to us.

#### NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 420 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. 1900.

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

□ 0918

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. 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, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, we have had a number of hearings over the last year, and we are all quite excited about the additional production of natural gas and oil in America. As many people know, we now are the number one producer of natural gas in the world and the number one producer of oil in the world. This has come about because of the entrepreneurial spirit of the private sector and development of these properties on private lands, primarily in Pennsylvania, North Dakota, and Texas.

So we are all excited about the opportunity for energy independence in America and certainly hopeful to reach

a point where we are less dependent on oil and other products coming from the Middle East.

I want to thank MIKE POMPEO, a member from Kansas, for authoring this important legislation. Although we have become the number one producer and we have an abundance of natural gas today, we still have one key problem. To put it simply, we don't have the necessary pipeline infrastructure to move natural gas from where it is produced to where it is needed most.

I would like to just illustrate how some States are being harmed. According to the Energy Information Administration, in January this year we saw several States with residential natural gas prices way above the national average. For example, New Hampshire was 30 percent above the national average; Massachusetts was 43 percent; Maine, 67 percent; and Florida, 68 percent. Unfortunately, those living in these and many other States can expect to see higher prices once again this winter, and this is precisely why we are bringing to the floor H.R. 1900.

H.R. 1900 simply would bring certainty in agency accountability to the natural gas pipeline permitting process. It would allow natural gas pipelines to be built in a safe, responsible, and timely manner. It would also make existing natural gas pipelines safer.

During the legislative hearing on H.R. 1900, we heard testimony from industry of a corrosive natural gas pipeline that could not be replaced in a timely manner because an agency missed the deadline to issue a permit by nearly a year. The American people demand better than this.

So as we hear discussion and consider amendments to H.R. 1900, I want to thank once again the members of the subcommittee, the staff, and Representative POMPEO for all the work on this important legislation.

I respectfully reserve the balance of my time.

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

We are told that the Pompeo bill seeks to speed up the approval of interstate natural gas pipelines. In fact, it would have the opposite effect, delaying and disrupting a pipeline approval process that is working. The non-partisan Government Accountability Office has concluded that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission pipeline permitting is predictable and consistent and gets pipelines built. The pipeline companies testified that the process is "generally very good" and that the "sector enjoys a favorable legal and regulatory framework for the approval of new infrastructure." In short, this is a government program that works well.

H.R. 1900 would disrupt this functioning permitting process by arbitrarily limiting the time that FERC and other agencies have to review pipeline applications. When faced with these time limits, one of two things

will happen. Agencies can conduct inadequate environmental reviews and rush to approve permits that do not comply with our Nation's health, safety, and environmental laws. This would be a terrible outcome because the public won't be protected and pipeline permits will be legally vulnerable. Alternatively, the agencies can deny the permits when the time limits prevent them from completing legally mandated pipeline reviews, and this would be a bad result as well because needed pipeline capacity would not get constructed.

The career director at the Office of Energy Projects at FERC testified that he didn't believe that this bill would result in faster permitting. He explained that the bill would actually result in slower permitting if agencies had no choice but to deny applications because of the arbitrary deadlines established by this bill.

With this bill, we will get rushed decisions and more project denials. No one benefits from that, not even, or especially not, the pipeline companies.

But the problem with this bill doesn't end there. The Pompeo bill automatically grants environmental permits for a pipeline project if an agency does not make a decision on a permit within 90 days of the issuance of FERC's environmental analysis. This provision would sacrifice public health and environmental protections in favor of an arbitrary deadline. And no one can explain how this provision can actually be implemented.

These permits are detailed documents that include emission limits, technology or operating requirements, and conditions to ensure the environment is protected. Agencies need to figure out all of these details and then actually draft the permits. Complex permits might not even be written, but somehow they would be required to magically take effect.

In an effort to cobble together a solution to the mystery of how incomplete permits could be automatically issued, the bill transforms FERC into a "superpermitting" agency. If an agency misses the 90-day deadline, the bill apparently requires FERC to write and issue the permit itself.

Under this approach, FERC will be issuing BLM rights-of-way through Federal lands. FERC will be figuring out water discharge limits. FERC will be determining which technologies should be employed to reduce air pollution emissions. FERC will be issuing permits to protect wetlands and even bald eagles. These are jobs that FERC doesn't have the expertise or resources to carry out. They are ordinarily conducted by other agencies. But in this bill, because of the deadline, FERC will be required to take on those responsibilities.

There are going to be real environmental and safety impacts if permits automatically go into effect without the responsible agencies completing the necessary analysis. The Army

Corps of Engineers and EPA raised concerns that automatic permitting could lead to permits that are inconsistent with the requirements of the Clean Water Act and Clean Air Act, and this could result in harmful water or air pollution.

This unworkable bill won't speed up pipeline permitting, but it will have adverse health, safety, and environmental impacts, and it will undermine the public's acceptance of interstate natural gas pipelines going through their communities. That is why it is opposed by the Pipeline Safety Trust and the public interest environmental groups, and that is why the administration has announced that it would veto this bill if it ever made it to the President's desk.

This is a bad bill. The consequences have not been thought through, and I urge all Members to oppose the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), the author of this bill.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WHITFIELD and Chairman UPTON for helping me work this bill through our committee. It is great to have it on the floor today. We now have a bipartisan piece of legislation aimed at making simple, commonsense reforms to the natural gas pipeline permitting process.

Rather than eliminating environmental regulations and permits, H.R. 1900 takes a very reasonable approach by requiring agencies involved in the permitting of natural gas pipelines, simply requesting that they finish their work in a timely manner.

□ 0930

The legislation builds off reforms made in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which placed the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the lead agency for interstate natural gas pipelines.

As we have heard this morning, natural gas is becoming a dominant force in the electricity generation and manufacturing sectors. It is critical that pipeline construction can take place through a modernized permitting process, and that is what this bill aims to do.

The current interstate natural gas pipeline permitting process, established in 2005, is already in need of updating because of the enormous shale gas boom. H.R. 1900 makes changes to the interstate natural gas pipeline permitting process by simply putting in place statutory deadlines for each of the permitting agencies to complete their work. This is pretty reasonable. We are simply asking agencies to do what the law requires them to do. They can say "yes" to a permit, they can deny the permit, but they can't sit on it. They have to do their homework. They have to get the job done.

FERC is already the lead agency for coordinating environmental review of interstate natural gas pipelines, and as

FERC testified in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee earlier this year, the deadlines imposed by H.R. 1900 are reasonable. In fact, FERC asked for a couple of changes in the legislation, and in each case we made those changes at their request.

If, after H.R. 1900 were to become law, an agency doesn't complete its work, the permit would automatically be approved by statute. I have heard others say this is unprecedented, but that is simply not the case. There are numbers of examples all throughout the Federal code where statutory approvals of environmental permits are deemed approved in the absence of the agency saying to the contrary.

I can't imagine anyone saying that this legislation is radical or unprecedented. More importantly, I can't see that they could claim that it is unnecessary. To my left you can see the impact of the absence of natural gas infrastructure all across the country. Frankly, in Kansas, we are in pretty good shape, but on the east coast, here in the Northeast where I am standing today, and on the west coast, you see enormously high natural gas costs: 24 percent above the national average in New York; 20 percent above the national average in Arizona; 67 percent above the national average in Maine; and 68 percent above the national average for the cost of natural gas in the State of Florida. We are seeing these prices rise because we don't have infrastructure development adequate to meet the needs of manufacturers and consumers in these places.

The New York Times, that bastion of conservatism, wrote the following, saying that FERC was "concerned about increasing reliance on natural gas-fuel generators at times when there is an increasingly tight availability of pipeline capacity to deliver natural gas from the south and the west to New England."

The Boston Globe, writing about pipeline projects in New England, said that the projects come "as New England struggles to address growing demand for natural gas and supply constraints created by tight pipeline capacity. Those constraints have led to shortages and price spikes during the peak demand periods, such as extended winter cold snaps, helping to drive the region's already high energy costs even higher."

The New York Times and the Boston Globe recognize the need for H.R. 1900.

This is not a manufactured crisis or bill in search of a problem. This is a real issue with real consequences for jobs in America and for average working families all across our country. The bill will give certainty to natural gas pipeline developers that invest in projects which could transport affordable energy to consumers all across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1900 and address a very real issue impacting consumers and manufacturers all across the country.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I do that in order to respond to the concerns that have been raised about natural gas prices in the Northeast. This is a real issue. New England is using more natural gas to generate electricity and more natural gas for heating homes than in the past. On the coldest winter days, when natural gas is needed for both heating and electricity, there is more demand than can be met by the existing pipeline capacity, and that, of course, can result in price spikes.

This bill does nothing to solve that problem. The problem in New England isn't caused by pipeline applications taking too long to get approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The problem is that the pipeline companies aren't even submitting the applications because they haven't figured out who will pay for these new pipelines. The pipeline companies haven't been satisfied that there is a sufficient year-round demand to justify and finance these pipelines.

That is an issue that FERC is actively looking at and has been holding stakeholder conferences about. But this has nothing to do with Mr. POMPEO's bill. Cutting corners on the permitting process isn't going to help get additional pipeline capacity built for the Northeast. I don't think we ought to be blaming government for every problem. The reality is that FERC and the government didn't create this problem. It is a problem of the economics of it all, and the faster we understand that, the faster we can try to find real solutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1900, a commonsense, bipartisan bill that is going to help build the architecture of abundance that we need to fully realize the benefits of our American energy boom.

Until a few years ago, our Nation was facing a very critical shortage of natural gas, and I will remind us that policymakers in the seventies, eighties, and nineties never envisioned shale gas. Today, technological innovations like horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing have made the U.S. the number one gas-producing nation in the world.

Our overall energy landscape has changed dramatically in just a short period of time. It is not only rewriting the economic outlook that we have as a Nation but also beginning to change the geopolitical nature of global energy, as we have heard from nations around the world seeking access to United States supplies to help wean them off of regions like Russia and the Middle East.

Today, we face a new challenge: how to overcome government-imposed roadblocks to building the infrastructure

and unleashing the innovation necessary to harness our new energy abundance. As energy production grows across the U.S., building the infrastructure to move these supplies to consumers is emerging as the real challenge of this century. With all of our abundance in natural gas, it is simply unacceptable that there are still regions in the country where lower prices are being constrained by a lack of pipelines because of regulatory delays. America's rich natural gas resources should continue fueling both job creation and economic growth, but we cannot fulfill that potential unless we ensure businesses and manufacturers have access to this affordable and reliable clean energy.

I commend Representative POMPEO for introducing H.R. 1900 as a remedy for this problem.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. UPTON. Setting enforceable deadlines to improve natural gas pipeline projects will build upon the bipartisan reforms that we made with our Energy Policy Act of 2005 while preserving critical environmental review. If other nations, including Canada, Australia, and many other EU member nations, can hold their agencies to real, accountable deadlines, it is not unreasonable to ask ours to do the same.

Congress should be doing everything possible to reduce red tape and delays in building safe and efficient natural gas pipelines to bring our infrastructure up to modern times to reflect that energy abundance. This bill is a very important step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, legislation that will help bring America closer to energy independence and security.

The United States is blessed with God-given natural gas resources that many experts believe exceed the reserves in places like Saudi Arabia.

In eastern and southeastern Ohio, we are blessed with the Marcellus Shale and Utica Shale deposits that are beginning to produce never before seen volumes of natural gas and natural gas liquids.

This part of rural Ohio, a region of the country that is often forgotten by elected officials in the capital cities of Columbus and Washington, D.C., a region that sorely needs economic growth, is seeing billions of dollars of private sector investment in domestic energy production, and even more is in the planning stages.

But we have a major challenge to overcome. You see, we can't always get

the natural gas from the drilling site to the end-users because there is a lack of pipeline networks. Pipeline companies are working 24/7 to remedy this problem, but they often face procedural roadblocks from Federal agencies that slow down progress and hamper job creation. H.R. 1900 would give production companies the confidence and certainty that if they invest the millions of dollars to drill wells, they will have a way to get the natural gas to market.

This legislation could decide whether or not my constituents have a job, but I was disappointed that the administration is opposed to it. From the President on down, the administration has acknowledged that hydraulic fracturing is environmentally safe. Just yesterday, Secretary of State John Kerry mentioned the importance of natural gas to America. But with their opposition to this legislation, I guess they aren't really serious about America's energy independence and energy future. It seems they would rather leave Ohio's natural gas in the ground than let all hardworking Americans benefit from its production.

I urge my colleagues to support this important job-creating legislation, and I urge the Senate to take it up immediately.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I understand that proponents of this bill want a one-size-fits-all Washington, D.C., solution to the timeframes required for pipeline reviews. The problem is that there isn't some magic number of days that works for all pipelines in all circumstances.

There are 10-mile pipelines far from population centers that cross no rivers, and there are pipelines hundreds of miles long that cross multiple rivers and run through backyards. These are very different projects. It should come as no surprise that they take different amounts of time to review.

When reviewing a project, FERC doesn't just have to do an environmental review. It also has to conduct an engineering review. FERC must evaluate, approve, and in many cases alter a pipeline's route to address environmental, engineering, and community concerns. FERC must determine a pipeline's tariffs and rates. These are steps that take time.

For longer and more complex pipelines, these steps take longer, and they should. FERC decides 92 percent of all pipeline applications within 12 months. Let me repeat that: 92 percent of all the applications are approved within 12 months.

The fact that 8 percent of the projects take longer isn't a problem. It reflects the reality that a small number of projects are more complex and impact more people. If you have constituents in the paths of these proposed pipelines, you should want the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and other agencies to protect your constituents by completing the necessary

reviews. Your constituents don't want a one-size-fits-all Washington solution for all problems that are not the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I applaud my colleague and fellow subcommittee chairman on Energy and Commerce for helping bringing H.R. 1900 to the floor. This legislation will help ensure that the key elements of our critical infrastructure will be improved and constructed on a timely and predictable basis. This is a goal we all can and should support.

On a closely related subject, I too wanted to associate myself with Chairman WHITFIELD's recent statement regarding the growing tendency among certain States to engage in obstructionist tactics aimed at key infrastructure projects. In some cases, States have even used federally delegated authority to block federally approved projects. Let me say again that States have used federally delegated authority to block federally approved projects.

□ 0945

The most prominent example is the use of the Clean Water Act to deny otherwise routine permits and approvals. As my colleague suggested, we have legislated on that issue previously, but our clear intent in doing so was frustrated in the court system. It may well be that we may need to address this issue further, and I stand ready to work with my colleague to do so.

In other instances, States have tried to use their authority under the Coastal Zone Management Act to impose consistency requirements on federally approved projects, even when those projects have already been found to be consistent with the States' Coastal Management Plan. This is clearly taking a second bite at the apple.

The law is abundantly clear that a State has no authority to review an existing project a second time if it underwent a previous consistency review. Only in the event that there is an applicable program change or a significant alteration in the nature of the facility would a State ever be entitled to render a second consistency determination.

For this reason, I see no need to legislate on that subject at this time, but I am well aware that even the clearest of statutory provisions can sometimes be distorted by determined States, so I will join with my colleague, Chairman WHITFIELD, to keep a watchful eye on this situation.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I support passage of H.R. 1900.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at this time to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a very important member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WAXMAN for yielding the time.

Colleagues, we are dealing with a bill here, H.R. 1900, that relates to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

FERC is an independent agency that reviews electric transmission lines that go across States, interstate electric transmission lines. They also review interstate oil pipelines, and they also review the interstate natural gas pipelines. This is a very important subject.

Now, this bill relates only to the natural gas pipeline authority of FERC. The country right now is in a natural gas revolution. It has been remarkable. The United States is now a net exporter of petroleum. This has happened very quickly, and FERC has responded very well over time on the expansion of the natural gas market. That is why it is so confounding as to why we need this new bill that is going to short-circuit FERC's review power.

Right now, FERC grants over 90 percent of the interstate natural gas pipelines across the country. This bill really is an unnecessary piece of legislation in search of a problem. In committee, the bill was panned by the FERC professional staff. The administration strongly opposes it.

Instead of expediting expansion of natural gas pipelines across the country, it would disrupt FERC's natural gas permitting process which, right now, is already getting thousands of miles of pipelines permitted in a timely manner, like I said, over 90 percent of the applications.

Instead, the bill establishes arbitrary and inflexible deadlines for FERC and other agencies to issue permits; and there are several major problems with the bill, particularly short-circuiting the permitting process for the most complex projects.

The bill says we have a 12-month deadline, no matter what kind of project is proposed. FERC currently decides 90 percent of the permit applications within that 12-month period; and in July, the Pipeline Trade Association testified that FERC's existing permitting process is generally very good.

Second, in addition to this arbitrary 12-month deadline for all applications, it would rush environmental reviews for complex projects. The bill's rigid deadline applies to every pipeline project, regardless of complexity.

It doesn't make sense to apply the same 12-month deadline to, say, a 30-mile interstate pipeline that doesn't cross any rivers, doesn't have environmental concerns, doesn't go through population areas, and then apply the same 12-month deadline to the most complex, multi-state, interstate pipeline initiative that goes across environmentally-sensitive areas, maybe across rivers, through highly populated areas.

Third, the bill also will lead to unnecessary permit denial. What we heard from FERC is that, instead of speeding up the permitting process for natural gas pipelines, it is very likely

that this bill will slow down permitting. If FERC can't finish its analysis by the required deadline, they may have no choice but to deny an application that otherwise could have been granted.

Now, before I came to Congress, I practiced environmental law, and what I learned during that time is for those complex projects there is a lot of give and take that needs to happen. You have to discuss mitigation. You have to discuss are there any alternatives.

Oftentimes, these business owners, it is in their interest to have a little more time to figure out the right path for a pipeline or a transmission line or something like that. You get input from local governments, local communities, neighborhood associations, environmental groups; and you wind up with a better project.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Another serious problem with the bill is that it transforms FERC into a super-permitting agency. Now that sounds pretty scary, but that is what it does.

It says that the bill provides for permits to automatically go into effect if an agency does not approve or deny them by the bill's arbitrary 90-day deadline. So FERC would be issuing Clean Air Act permits, Clean Water Act permits, even BLM right-of-way through Federal land permits.

These are functions that FERC does not have the expertise or resources to carry out. This is an unworkable provision that could result in permits being issued that are inconsistent with the Nation's environmental laws.

Finally, I know many people on both sides of the aisle are very concerned about eminent domain and when we give power to government to condemn lands. Well, here is a reminder for everyone. We should all remember that when FERC issues a certificate of public convenience and necessity, it gives a pipeline company the power of eminent domain. The power to take someone's property should not be conferred without FERC taking the time it needs for a thorough analysis and thoughtful decisionmaking.

So for all of those reasons, I urge opposition to the bill.

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

I might just make one comment. As the gentlelady from Florida indicated, the Obama administration has indicated their opposition to this bill. But I will tell you, we have large groups, the National Rural Electric Co-Ops, supporting this bill; the Public Power Association is supporting this bill.

And the New England Ratepayers Association wrote a letter to us saying, currently, New England ratepayers suffer from the highest electricity rates of

any region in the country. A significant reason for this is the limited capacity of natural gas pipeline which the electricity generators throughout New England rely on.

So we are trying to respond to the needs of people, and we recognize that the economy has been weak, and there are not a lot of pipelines being built right now, although there is one in my home State of Kentucky.

But we want to set the framework so that when the time comes, these pipeline companies are able to move and move quickly with adequate protections.

At this time, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our distinguished whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1900 and in support of the work this Chamber has accomplished this week.

This was an important week in the House. We will have passed three bills that further the energy revolution that has propelled the U.S. to the forefront of the world's energy producers.

So to hear a few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle disparage this work, even so much as refer to it as egregious, is disappointing.

First, we passed legislation that reduced bureaucratic delays on energy products on Federal lands that are providing resources to power our economy. As America, we will soon become the largest energy producer in the world. It is astonishing that this occurred while energy production on Federal lands has actually decreased.

We guaranteed that energy production from hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands is overseen by the regulator with the best track record, the States.

And today we are ensuring that, once harnessed, the energy resources will reach end-users in the safest, most efficient and reliable manner.

In its lifecycle, the quality of all Americans improves; and there is no better example than, at the start of this month, November 1, the first pipeline to enter New York City in 40 years opened. That was 40 years that it took.

What happened once it entered New York City? The price dropped. The price fell by 17 percent. Do you realize if you buy gas in New York City, it is cheaper than in Louisiana? But 40 years that it took. To me, that was egregious.

The savings extend far beyond New York City. In 2012, affordable energy added \$1,200 of disposal income to the average U.S. household. That will go to \$2,700 by 2020 and \$3,500 by 2025. That is real savings.

Today we have an opportunity. We have an opportunity to streamline, to protect, and to lower the costs for all Americans, to actually be able to produce and create more jobs in America. That is why you see a very diverse

group of support for this legislation, from unions, to associations, to Americans that want to keep more of what they earn, create more American jobs, and then, again, stop any egregious falsity that it takes 40 years to build a pipeline.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I know of no union supporting this bill, nor do I think the Northeast ratepayers said in their letter where they expressed their concern about the supplies where there is a very cold spell, that they want this bill either.

I am pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a distinguished subcommittee ranking member on one of the energy subcommittees.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we are addressing before the House simply does not address the problems with pipeline approvals because the committee has not identified any problems with them.

The natural gas pipeline approval process works well. The Government Accountability Office's recent review found that FERC's consideration of the vast majority of these projects is completed within a year of receiving a complete application.

The network of over 2 million miles of gas pipeline spread across this country ensures that natural gas can be delivered where it is needed. We do have some areas where additional infrastructure is required, but the failure to fill those needs is not due to the permit approval process at FERC. It is due to economic decisions being made by those in the private sector.

We do have some problems with pipelines. Accidents resulting in explosions have severely damaged property and, in some cases, claimed lives. We should be doing more to prevent these accidents.

The 10 percent of project approvals that are not completed within a 1-year period are those that are more complex. They extend for many miles, traverse densely populated areas, and cross sensitive or valuable resources such as farm lands or water bodies.

A project with these characteristics may need more than 1 year to ensure that the pipeline that is ultimately constructed is not going to place people, their communities, other businesses or valuable resources at risk.

Whenever a regulatory agency is poised to act under the law to defend the health and safety of our citizens, there is a hue and cry about the necessity of doing extensive analyses of all aspects of the proposed regulation to determine its potential impact on businesses and the economy.

Many of these analyses take years and delay commonsense protections that will, indeed, save thousands of our citizens from illnesses or death.

Apparently, protecting public health or the environment can wait, but the oil and gas companies cannot.

We need energy, but we need other things also. FERC's process weighs all these considerations before approving pipelines, and that is how it should be.

Pipeline projects should be evaluated in a timely fashion; but the imposition of a hard, 12-month deadline for all projects, regardless of their length or complexity, is bad policy. We should devote our time to solving problems, not creating them.

H.R. 1900 should be rejected. It will do nothing to improve the pipeline approval process.

□ 1000

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time remains for both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, a couple of points are worth noting to make sure that everybody understands exactly what we are up against.

There has been some suggestion that this is unnecessary, and maybe in the eyes of some in Washington, some political officials, it is unnecessary; but the people who this matters to—consumers, manufacturers all across the country—know that this is a necessary piece of legislation. The National Association of Manufacturers has said that this is something that would be important to creating manufacturing jobs for families all across the country. The Chamber of Commerce has similarly made this comment.

It was earlier stated that some folks were unaware of union support for this legislation. I want to make sure that everyone is fully aware that the Laborers' International Union of North America, the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, and the operating engineers have all been supportive of H.R. 1900 and the importance of energy infrastructure expanding all across our country.

Finally, there has been this idea that FERC approves 90 percent of the permits. It has been repeated time and time again. It is just factually incomplete. It is like, if you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it. Technically perhaps true in the most narrow sense, but in reality, it is not the case that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approves 90 percent of all permits or that they are all approved. FERC is but one of many, many agencies that has the authority to approve and deny permits. So this 90 percent number that continues to be thrown around is just false. We don't have 90 percent of all folks seeking to build pipelines being able to build those pipelines in a timely fashion. They are being delayed.

There is real demand for this. There is demand from the New England Ratepayers Association. There is demand in States like Florida, where the natural gas rates are 60 percent higher than the national average. This is a real need. This is a real challenge.

And if we do this, if we get H.R. 1900 passed, all we are simply saying is do your job. Finish the process. If you decide that the permit shouldn't be built, any of these agencies can deny that permit being built. That seems fine. We are not denying any agency the capacity to deny a permit. But do the work. Tell these folks that, No, you are not going to get it, and then allow the process to move forward.

These unions, these associations, these real hardworking families need natural gas at an affordable price to be delivered to them, and H.R. 1900 will help achieve that objective.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, we are not arguing whether we should have an infrastructure of pipelines to take natural gas from one place to another. That is not the issue. And that is a false premise that, for some reason, that may be an area of disagreement. It is not.

The area of disagreement is whether, in letting a pipeline be built, we are going to shortchange the ability of the agencies to review the pipeline. And if we do that, there may not be time to look at BLM issues or safe water issues or clean air issues because FERC will be told, if you don't do your job within a certain period of time, this permit is going to be approved, and these other agencies aren't going to have time to do any review.

Well, FERC doesn't have the ability to do other agencies' jobs; and those other agencies ought to be able to do their job, and FERC should do its job in a timely manner. But "a timely manner" doesn't mean a certain amount of time and no more—not another month, not another 2 months, not another 3 months.

I want to close by sharing some of the comments made by others. The White House said they will veto this bill. The President and his administration are against it. They say the bill provides for the automatic approval of natural gas pipeline permits if applications are not decided within "rigid, unworkable time frames." The administration also notes that the bill could cause confusion and increase litigation risk, and further, the bill "may actually delay projects or lead to more project denials, undermining the intent of the legislation."

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's say they needed a couple more months but that 12-month period is right there. Well, they will either have to approve it without those extra few months of review or deny it, which could mean longer periods of time before the pipeline is approved. It is counter to what the proponents say that they expect.

The Pipeline Safety Trust and other public interest organizations said about this bill: "H.R. 1900 will need-

lessly put at risk the well-being of the people and environment where natural gas pipelines are built while making it easier for pipeline companies to use Federal eminent domain authority to take private land without a thorough review."

This is going to allow eminent domain authority by a private company to take away people's land. Is that something that Members of Congress want to vote for, your constituents' land could be seized by a private company when there had not been a thorough review that would allow this kind of power over private property? That shouldn't be the result of a rushed, incomplete process. We wouldn't want a rushed, incomplete process of taking away liberty. We shouldn't allow a rushed, incomplete process to take away private property.

The Pipeline Safety Trust also explains that "rushed or incomplete reviews resulting in automatic approvals pose a threat to public safety and the environment," and they characterize the bill's transformation of FERC into a "superpermitting" agency that issues other agencies' permits as "bizarre." And they are right that it "effectively places control over key environment and public health statutes in the hands of an agency primarily tasked with regulating the economics of natural gas and electricity." They don't have the expertise, they don't have the personnel, they don't have the budget, and now we are giving them that kind of a job.

And the last quote I have is from the natural gas pipeline industry. Now, I realize the industry would always like the permitting to go faster, but the industry told us over and over that the existing process works well. In May, the CEO of Dominion Energy testified on behalf of the pipeline companies. He told the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, "The interstate natural gas pipeline sector enjoys a favorable legal and regulatory framework for the approval of new infrastructure," and his conclusion was that "the natural gas model works."

Conservatives used to say, if it works, don't fix it, and yet they want to fix it with a lot of uncertain results, perhaps unintended consequences. Mr. Chairman, this bill would cause a lot of problems without speeding up the permitting process, which is currently getting thousands of miles of new pipeline built in a timely manner. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. In my concluding remarks, I would simply say that this act is commonsense reform aimed at providing greater certainty for interstate natural gas pipeline projects at a time when we see great revitalization in the production of natural gas. We have an opportunity to export some natural gas, we have the opportunity to help lower electricity rates, and I would urge all the Members to support H.R. 1900.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. In my state of Pennsylvania, the Marcellus Shale boom has reinvigorated our economy and created thousands of jobs. American energy production is booming, and we need the infrastructure to keep up with demand and transport the gas from well to market.

I have seen in my own state the frustration and delays in getting gas from well to market due to unnecessarily long permitting processes. These delays keep gas from flowing, hold up royalty payments to my constituents, and prevent tax revenue from making it into the state and local coffers.

While we must ensure that pipelines are constructed safely, many times these delays have nothing to do with safety and everything to do with politics. We've seen President Obama and the EPA do everything they can to delay natural gas production and destroy the energy industry in this country in order to appease the radical environmentalist left.

We must not allow this to happen. Congress must take action to ensure that our domestic energy production thrives and the United States can be energy independent. The Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act will expedite the federal review process for applications for natural gas pipeline certificates, allowing us to build this much needed infrastructure efficiently and safely.

I support passage of H.R. 1900 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1900, the "Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Act."

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated this week as this House has 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, 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.

Mr. Chairman, the process may not be perfect or as quick as we would like but it is working well and administered by hardworking individuals who carefully and meticulously consider permits and license applications for natural gas pipelines on a case-by-case basis—as they should.

The approval process for a pipeline is not like deciding to grow a garden in the backyard of your home—given the inherently dangerous nature of the activity, the review and approval process takes time and requires careful attention—as it should be.

In short, the bill before us 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.

Third, the provision is irresponsible because it would require FERC 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.

Thus, because of sequestration the legislation would achieve the opposite effect intended by proponents.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

Mr. Chairman, given the inherent dangers involved in the construction and operation of a natural gas pipeline, does anyone doubt that were this bill to become law FERC will be more likely to err on the side of caution and deny applications that may otherwise have been approved if it had more time and more resources to carry out its responsibilities?

Mr. Chairman, we should not take that chance. An amendment I offered, and which was made in order by the Rules Committee, avoids this outcome by conditioning the effective date of this bill upon the termination of sequestration.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in recognizing how detrimental sequestration has been to our fiscal policy and to the economy.

Earlier this week, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, joined by the 12 Subcommittee chairs, wrote a letter to the Budget Conferees in which they call upon the Budget conference to reach an agreement as soon as possible because among other things: "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".

The Appropriators go on to state that: "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."

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with Chairman ROGERS and the Subcommittee chairs.

Sequestration is bad fiscal policy. It results in unwanted and unintended legislative consequences. It is bad for the economy. It is unfair to the American people and they know it.

According to an analysis conducted by Regional Economic Models, Inc. and Third Way, the damage to the economy caused by sequestration is substantial.

Sequestration has cost the United States \$179.4 billion in lost economic activity and more than 1.88 million jobs, which means the economy grew by -1.04% less than it would have otherwise.

The corresponding figures for my home state of Texas are \$15.2 billion in lost economic activity and 153,541 jobs.

The human toll of the sequestration is even greater.

Texas, for example, will lose approximately \$67.8 million for primary and secondary education, putting around 930 teacher and aide jobs at risk.

In addition about 172,000 fewer students would be served and approximately 280 fewer schools would receive funding.

Texas will lose approximately \$51 million for about 620 teachers, aides, and staff who help children with disabilities.

Head Start and Early Head Start services would be eliminated for approximately 4,800 children in Texas, reducing access to critical early education.

Approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees in Texas may be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around \$274.8 million in total.

Texas will lose about \$1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

More than 83,000 fewer Texans will get the help and skills they need to find employment because Texas will lose about \$2,263,000 for job search assistance, referral, and placement, meaning.

Up to 2300 disadvantaged and vulnerable children could lose access to child care, which is also essential for working parents to hold down a job.

Because of sequestration, 9,730 fewer children in Texas will receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and Hepatitis B due to reduced funding for vaccinations.

Texas could lose up to \$543,000 to provide services to victims of domestic violence, resulting in up to 2,100 fewer victims being served.

Texas will lose approximately \$2,402,000 to help upgrade its ability to respond to public health threats including infectious diseases, natural disasters, and biological, chemical, nuclear, and radiological events.

In addition, Texas will lose about \$6,750,000 in grants to help prevent and treat substance abuse, resulting in around 2,800 fewer admissions to substance abuse programs. And the Texas State Department of

Public Health will lose about \$1,146,000 resulting in around 28,600 fewer HIV tests.

Mr. Chairman, I join with Chairman ROGERS and the Subcommittee chairs in calling upon 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."

I agree with them that if an agreement is not reached and sequestration remains in place, "the likely alternatives could have extremely damaging repercussions."

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us compounds the damage already being done by sequestration. It is for this reason that I urge all Members to join me in voting against H.R. 1900 as an unwise, unnecessary, and irresponsible measure.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1900, which would place new, arbitrary deadlines on the pipeline permitting process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and related agencies.

H.R. 1900 attempts to solve a problem that simply doesn't exist. The Government Accountability Office has given FERC's permitting process good marks, saying that it is predictable and consistent for applicants. Under this bill, FERC would have a year to consider any project, no matter how many miles it may cover or how complex it may be. Other agencies, like the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, would have to issue decisions on licenses or permits related to the project within 90 days of FERC's issuance of its final environmental document, even if the project applicant does not actually apply for a permit or submit the required information within that time frame. If the agency failed to meet this deadline, the permit or license would be "deemed approved" and FERC would be permitted to overrule any conditions the agency requests.

By needlessly short-circuiting the review process, this bill jeopardizes the environment and public health. While we all support timely review, we should provide adequate time for analysis of complex projects. A one-size-fits-all process with arbitrary deadlines prevents federal agencies from doing their job to protect taxpayers and communities. I urge a no vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, ninety percent of pipeline projects are approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission within twelve months; the other ten percent take longer because they are bigger and more complicated projects. The Natural Gas Pipeline Trade Association said in July 2013 that FERC's existing permitting process is "generally very good."

By creating a rushed application process and limiting the ability of other agents to provide commentary to FERC, the H.R. 1900 limits FERC's ability to understand the impacts of a pipeline on a local community, the public's health, our national infrastructure, and our environment. These are serious decisions about our local communities—they deserve thoughtful and comprehensive analysis. H.R. 1900 takes something that is not a problem, and creates one.

I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-25. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1900

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act".*

#### SEC. 2. REGULATORY APPROVAL OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS.

*Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:*

*"(1) The Commission shall approve or deny an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a prefired project not later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed, as defined by the Commission by regulation.*

*"(2) The agency responsible for issuing any license, permit, or approval required under Federal law in connection with a prefired project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is sought under this Act shall approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval not later than 90 days after the Commission issues its final environmental document relating to the project.*

*"(3) The Commission may extend the time period under paragraph (2) by 30 days if an agency demonstrates that it cannot otherwise complete the process required to approve or deny the license, permit, or approval, and therefor will be compelled to deny the license, permit, or approval. In granting an extension under this paragraph, the Commission may offer technical assistance to the agency as necessary to address conditions preventing the completion of the review of the application for the license, permit, or approval.*

*"(4) If an agency described in paragraph (2) does not approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval within the time period specified under paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable, such license, permit, or approval shall take effect upon the expiration of 30 days after the end of such period. The Commission shall incorporate into the terms of such license, permit, or approval any conditions proffered by the agency described in paragraph (2) that the Commission does not find are inconsistent with the final environmental document.*

*"(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'prefired project' means a project for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a natural gas pipeline with respect to which a prefiling docket number has been assigned by the Commission pursuant to a prefiling process established by the Commission for the purpose of facilitating the formal application process for obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity."*

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113-272. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall

be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113-272.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In the quoted subsection (i)(1), insert "For purposes of the deadline established in this paragraph, an application shall not be considered complete unless the application includes sufficient information to demonstrate that the pipeline project will utilize available designs, systems, and practices to minimize methane emissions to the extent practicable." after "by regulation."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1900 attempts to solve a problem that simply doesn't exist.

The bill seeks to change FERC's process even though the pipeline companies have testified that the permitting process is "generally very good." Thousands of miles of natural gas pipelines are being approved under the current system. We have real energy challenges in this country and should be seeking real solutions to these challenges, not spending our time on problems that don't exist.

My amendment addresses a real problem—the dangers of climate change and the contributions of natural gas infrastructure to this growing threat—and it prevents waste by ensuring that we use it and don't lose it.

Climate change is the most urgent energy challenge that we face today. If the global average temperature continues to increase, we will face even more serious impacts, including flooding of coastal cities, increased risks to our food supply, unprecedented heat waves, exacerbated water scarcity in many regions, increased frequency of high-intensity tropical cyclones such as Hurricane Sandy and the recent supertyphoon in the Philippines, and an irreversible loss of plants and animals that share this planet with us.

Our behavior is driving these changes. We must take responsibility for the situation and work to halt it. We should not leave this task to our children and grandchildren and condemn them to a more uncertain and unsafe world.

Many hope that natural gas, or methane, will serve as a critical bridge fuel as we work to reduce our carbon pollution, but natural gas poses its own challenges. Although natural gas emits

less carbon dioxide than coal or oil when burned, the development and transportation of natural gas results in releases of methane, which is a potent greenhouse gas 25 times more damaging to the climate than carbon dioxide. This is a serious concern.

According to a study by the World Resources Institute, leaks from natural gas systems "represent a significant source of global warming pollution in the U.S." The study further found that methane leaks occur at every stage of the natural gas life cycle—at the wellhead, from compression facilities, and from pipelines. These fugitive methane emissions can reduce or even negate the net climate benefits of using natural gas as a substitute for coal and oil.

The good news is that we can reduce methane emissions by applying proven, cost-effective technologies throughout the natural gas system. My amendment will ensure that new pipelines incorporate designs, systems, and practices that minimize leaks, thereby conserving gas and reducing pollution. We will still need to address problems with existing infrastructure and other sources within the natural gas system, but this would be a very important start. It is precisely what we should expect and require of energy infrastructure that will be around for decades.

By including this requirement in the law, the applicants are informed before they begin their application of the requirement for this information and would have ample time to include it in permit applications. Encouraging the prevention and monitoring of leaks would have the added benefit of increasing pipeline safety.

The language does not require an applicant to wait for the development of something new. These technologies exist today and only need to be applied "to the extent applicable." This makes both economic and environmental sense. By reducing pipeline leaks, the amendment ensures that more of our domestic energy resources will be used and fewer of these resources will be wasted.

□ 1015

The amendment doesn't fix the core problems with H.R. 1900, including the bill's arbitrary and harmful deadlines, but it does ensure that the bill addresses an energy problem that actually exists.

If we are going to revisit the law governing the permitting of natural gas pipelines, this is the kind of common-sense step that we should be discussing.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the EPA already asserts that it has authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions—and methane is defined as a greenhouse gas.



The EPA's New Source Performance Standards capture GHG emissions above a certain threshold. Permits are already required for facilities whose emissions are anticipated to be above that threshold. The EPA's permitting process should be the forum for this decisionmaking.

FERC's primary role, rather, should be as an economic regulator—the same way that it is today, and the same way it would be after H.R. 1900 would become law. It would want to defer environmental matters like this to the appropriate agency, which would be the EPA.

The amendment is structured such that the determination would have to be made before the NEPA analysis would begin. In other words, when the FERC "complete" application is filed and FERC is put into the role of determining methane "best practices" rather than EPA. This puts the cart before the horse. Such decisions on methane emissions should be made as part of the EPA permitting process.

Regarding methane emissions in general, the industry has every incentive to control methane leaks. Escaping methane is escaping product—something they do not want to happen. That means losses for their businesses.

This amendment would add unnecessary requirements to a problem that is already being addressed. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Tonko amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-272.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike paragraph (4) (and redesignate accordingly).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, under H.R. 1900, if an agency cannot complete its review of a gas pipeline permit application by the bill's arbitrary 90-day or, in some cases, 120-day deadline, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, is required to automatically issue the permit.

This permitting provision broadly applies to the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and rights-of-way through Federal lands.

It simply goes too far, is completely unreasonable, and it runs counter to the author's intent. The intent of the author is to speed the approval of interstate natural gas pipelines. Instead, what this provision will do, if my amendment is not adopted, is create greater delays and, I believe, greater likelihood of litigation that will delay our important natural gas infrastructure in this country.

So my amendment is straightforward. It simply strikes this provision that requires FERC to automatically issue other agencies' permits.

You heard Mr. WAXMAN say—and I said the same thing—that what this bill does is turns FERC, whose jurisdiction is limited to reviewing interstate electric transmission lines, natural gas pipelines, and oil pipelines, into a superpermitting agency. It goes and grabs EPA's jurisdiction and authority, the Interior Department's, the Army Corps of Engineers', and other agencies', and settles into FERC this superpermitting authority that really is completely unreasonable.

Right now, these permits are typically detailed documents that include safety requirements, emission limits, technology and operator requirements, and conditions to ensure that communities are protected and the water, wetlands, and other environmental resources are considered, especially when you have a complex interstate natural gas pipeline coming through your communities.

Agencies need the ability and time to analyze all of these details and then draft appropriate permit conditions to protect our communities back home, protect the health and safety, protect landowner rights, and propose cleanup requirements in case there is an accident.

Under H.R. 1900, FERC acts as a superpermitting agency. If an agency cannot meet the strict deadlines, FERC apparently will write and issue the permit itself. This is a recipe for natural gas pipeline delays, and that is why so many are fearful of the consequences of this bill. After all, FERC now already grants 90 percent of the natural gas interstate pipeline applications that come before it.

So it makes no sense to have FERC issuing permits for other agencies. FERC doesn't have the expertise to grant land management rights-of-way through Federal land or to set water pollution discharge limits. That is not a workable solution. It is a recipe for greater litigation and delay.

Besides litigation, delays, and other complications, there are going to be real environmental and safety impacts if permits automatically go into effect without the responsible agencies completing the necessary analysis. It could

result in permits being issued that are inconsistent with the requirements of the Nation's environmental laws. That is why the Pipeline Safety Trust and numerous environmental organizations strongly oppose the bill.

The Army Corps of Engineers and EPA also express concern that automatic permitting could lead to permits that do not meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act. This could result in harmful water pollution and air pollution.

So in addition to delays, lawsuits, and environmental harm, automatically issuing permits without an agency confirming the legal requirements is going to undermine the public's acceptance of interstate natural gas pipelines going through our communities. That is the last thing you want to happen.

We are undergoing a national gas revolution in this country that, generally, is very positive. So why would you try to pass this bill that would lead to greater litigation delays, uncertainty, and that the industry itself says may not be necessary?

Agencies should act expeditiously on pipeline applications, but they also need time to conduct the necessary environmental and safety reviews. In some cases, it will take longer than a 90- or 120-day environmental review. Some of these pipelines are very complex and they go over hundreds of miles through environmentally sensitive areas. People need time and the businesses need time to work through the conditions.

So we should not sacrifice these protections when the pipeline permitting process is already working well, nor should we take critical health, safety, and environmental functions away from the agencies.

My amendment doesn't fix all the problems, but it eliminates an unworkable provision. If you do not want to complicate the interstate natural gas pipeline process that the industry says is generally very good, then I urge you to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment from the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, there has been reference that Ms. CASTOR presented relating to what the industry wants that says this will actually mess it up. It will make pipeline permitting take longer.

Let me read for you what was written in a letter to me on November 14 of this year from that industry association. This is a letter from INGAA, signed by Mr. Santa, the president and CEO, who said:

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 attempted to coordinate the permitting of new natural gas pipelines by designating FERC as the lead agency under NEPA and granting FERC the authority to set deadlines for permitting agencies to act on pipeline actions. EPA

2005, however, did not confer upon FERC the authority to enforce such deadlines. As a result, permitting agencies routinely ignore them.

It is critical that pipeline expansion keep pace with demand in such regions as New England. A clear, timely review of permits associated with proposed pipeline projects is critical to meeting these goals.

The industry is full-throatedly in support of making sure that H.R. 1900 becomes law, and this amendment would prevent the key provisions of that from happening.

We know we are seeing skyrocketing prices. The worst residential price increases in the country are in the gentlewoman's home State of Florida, where natural gas is now \$15.43 an mcf—68 percent above the natural average in the home State of the gentlelady who has offered this amendment.

Part of this enormous price increase in Florida and in other States is a direct result of insufficient pipeline capacity to keep up with production and demand inside the State of Florida—and that is great. I am glad there is demand in Florida. We now just simply need to get them affordable energy so they can continue to grow jobs for Florida families.

In July of this year, the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1900, where multiple stakeholders testified, including NextEra Energy, a Florida-based energy company which, in addition to being the largest wind company in North America, is also one of the Nation's largest purchasers and consumers of natural gas power for electric power generation.

Regarding the possibility that an agency might ultimately choose to deny an application because of H.R. 1900, something that this amendment is offered to make sure doesn't happen, ostensibly, NextEra stated the following in its testimony:

In infrastructure development, a timely "no" is much preferable to an interminable "maybe."

That is, we have folks who just simply need certainty. They need answers.

The gentlewoman from Florida talked about increased litigation. I am thrilled to see folks on the other side of the aisle finally worried about the plaintiffs' bar and excessive delays that the plaintiffs' bar throws into the regulatory process. I promise my cooperation full-throatedly to work across the aisle to make sure that H.R. 1900 doesn't add a single job in the plaintiffs' bar anywhere in the United States of America.

Finally, Ms. CASTOR's amendment was offered because they are concerned about the idea that a permit would be deemed approved after a certain time, claiming in some cases that this has been unprecedented. Yet in the Clean Water Act, within 45 days of receipt of an application, under 33 U.S.C. 129, if no ruling has been issued, a permit "shall be deemed approved."

Under TSCA, section 5, again, a company seeking an application must submit a notice of commencement to EPA

within 30 days, after which the chemical is considered an existing chemical. That is, the request is deemed approved.

This is not unprecedented.

The idea that this provision is extreme or unprecedented is simply not supported by the facts, and the precedent for applications being approved if a governing agency fails to act is very common in our Federal law.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Castor amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-272.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, after paragraph (5), insert the following new paragraph:

"(6) This subsection shall not apply to a project unless the Commission has considered and responded to applicable State and local objections or concerns about approval of the project."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, the majority earlier said that this measure is just common sense. So I have a question: Is it common sense not to consider the interests of State and local governments in allowing FERC to have this permitting process?

My amendment is quite simple. The concerns of State and local communities must be considered in any natural gas pipeline permitting process and should not be disadvantaged by a permit approval process that weighs heavily in favor of the pipeline industry and could deem approved a permit that tramples the concerns of communities that are affected.

This issue I know all too well.

Three years ago, a pipeline exploded in my district. I don't want that to happen to any of you. Let me tell you what happened in my district.

First of all, when it exploded, no one knew that there was a pipeline running in the middle of a densely populated area. The fire department didn't know, the police department didn't know, the city manager didn't know, and the city council didn't know.

It took over an hour and a half for the local gas operator to go to another destination, pick up a key, come back to the community, and open the gate so they could turn off the valve.

Meanwhile, what happened?

There were 8 lives lost; 38 homes totally destroyed, with just a concrete pad left; and 45 other homes badly damaged. Three people were considered missing for more than 2 weeks because there was so little DNA left from the intense fire to positively identify them.

□ 1030

There are people in that community today 3 years later who are still shell shocked, and the city's fathers and mothers are very concerned about making sure that pipeline safety includes notifying local communities.

One of the truly frightening lessons of the San Bruno tragedy was that the many pipeline operators don't even fully know the conditions of their own pipelines. I can tell you that my communities are much more aware and engaged in natural gas pipeline safety and location decisions.

The concerns and objections of State and local officials must be adequately considered and taken into account in the decisionmaking process on where to place potentially dangerous natural gas transmission lines. The consequences of these decisions to local communities cannot be overstated. They have a fundamental stake in these decisions on whether to permit a new pipeline project in their communities.

I ask you to support my amendment, which would ensure that, at the very least, FERC considers and responds to local and State concerns or objections submitted as part of the FERC permit process before a natural gas pipeline permit is approved or potentially deemed approved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MEADOWS). The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would like to say to the gentlelady from California that all of us certainly have great sympathy and were shocked by the events in San Bruno. I know it was a horrific incident and that many people lost their lives and homes and that it certainly disrupted the community.

Mr. Chairman, in response to that accident, Congress reenacted a reauthorization of the Pipeline Safety Act in late 2011. That bill included provisions on requiring the verification of maximum allowable operating pressures for pipelines constructed before 1970 and an expansion of the current Pipeline Integrity Management Program to cover more miles of pipe and, therefore, require more inspections. The accident investigation in San Bruno determined that the natural gas pipeline

that failed had been installed in the mid-1950s, using incorrect materials and welding, incorrect even given the standards of the day. Fortunately, that legislation passed unanimously in the House and in the Senate.

I would also note that, under the Natural Gas Act, FERC, when reviewing a proposed natural gas pipeline, must find that it meets the public convenience and necessity, in other words, the public interest. The Commission does have mechanisms in place to listen to the concerns of landowners, of communities, and they balance that with the need for energy infrastructure that meets national needs for a broad number of citizens. The FERC process, under section VII of the Natural Gas Act, is open, fair, and it invites participation by local communities and landowners already, and that has been in place for 70 years.

So I think all of us understand where the gentlelady from California is coming from. We do genuinely believe that the existing process certainly considers local communities and the input from those communities. Because of that, I would respectfully ask that we not agree to the amendment of the gentlelady of California.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113-272.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

#### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until such time as there is no Presidential order issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I offer an amendment that responds, I believe, to the importance of the issue and also to the purpose of the underlying bill, and it deals with safety.

My amendment delays the date upon which the bill can be implemented until such time that the Federal Government is no longer operating under a budget dictated by the sequester, which some would call a "meat-ax," that is dipping into and diving into the works of the Federal Government, such as agencies like FERC.

The likely impact of this bill, if passed, is to put FERC in a position of having to work faster, to issue decisions with fewer experienced employees, and to have a reduction in resources, thereby impacting safety and security, if I might say, because FERC, like virtually every other 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. I might add, Mr. Chairman, the important aspect of this is that the ultimate results will be, FERC, if you don't do your work, if you are not thoughtful, if you are not deliberative, we deem the approval.

There is no evidence that FERC is backlogged. This has nothing to do with the Keystone pipeline, the procedures of which are in another agency altogether. So you would ask: What problem is this bill solving? None. Absolutely none. With a budget of \$306 million—because of sequestration—and with a \$15 million reduction in spending, 5 percent of FERC's budget is impacted. This is a bill seeking a solution to a problem that does not exist, and it is dangerous to have legislation that deems approval when the agency which has jurisdiction has not completed its investigation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Since I am the only one who will be speaking, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, sequestration is not only impacting the whole of the work of FERC's; but, in actuality, sequestration is undermining the economy of the United States of America.

In my State alone, we have lost 153,000 jobs. The United States has lost 1 million jobs. It is so devastating that I offer to submit a letter for the RECORD from the Republican cardinals, dated November 18, 2013, calling upon the Budget Committee to rid us of the disastrous sequestration.

It indicates that we have a severe problem in sequestration. This legislation to expedite the approval of needed gas pipelines is, again, an initiative looking for a solution. Since fiscal year 2009, FERC has completed action on 92

percent of their pipeline applications. Mr. Chairman, there is no problem. There is no backlog. The idea that sequestration's impact is overstated is not true. According to an analysis conducted by Regional Economic Models and Third Way, the damage to the economy caused by sequestration is substantial.

I would also like to offer a personal story that deals with the impact far-reaching. It is the fact that pediatricians today are seeing babies who are malnourished. Because of these horrible cuts and the cuts in SNAP, mothers are putting water in the formula. It may be a far reach; but because we are under these horrible caps of sequestration, it is impacting the far reaches of government. Even babies are suffering and are malnourished because of sequestration.

So, if this bill passes today, my desire is—if it even goes anywhere, if it finds a problem that it is trying to solve—that it should not be implemented at all; but if it is implemented, it certainly should not burden an agency that has proven to do its work timely 92 percent of the time. It should not burden that agency by insisting that it goes into implementation right away. It should not be in until we have moved forward and have gotten rid of sequestration.

In conclusion, there are enormous amounts of human toll impact through social safety net and health education: 600,000 women and children thrown off WIC; 807,000 fewer hospitals for Native Americans; the national security impact of the U.S.'s "let's prepare for WMD incidents."

So I ask my colleagues not to support the underlying bill, but to support the Jackson Lee amendment—no action until sequestration is gone.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple, straightforward, and practical. It simply postpones the effective date of the bill until the end of sequestration.

Although I share many of the concerns of my colleagues and the administration regarding the wisdom of this legislation, my amendment does not effect any change in the bill's regulatory scheme.

Because of sequestration the legislation would achieve the opposite effect intended by proponents.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

My amendment avoids this outcome by conditioning the effective date of this bill upon the termination of sequestration.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in recognizing how detrimental sequestration has been to our fiscal policy and to the economy.

Earlier this week, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, joined by the 12 subcommittee chairs, wrote a letter to the budget conferees in which they call upon the budget conference to reach an agreement as soon as possible because, among other things: "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".

The appropriators go on to state that: "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."

Rather, my amendment merely delays the date upon which the bill can be implemented until such time as the Federal Government is no longer operating under a budget dictated by the "meat ax," instead of a balanced plan of needful investment and deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, 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 Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) or other federal agencies do not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

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.

This is because 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 if H.R. 1900 were to become law the most likely outcome is that FERC and other agencies would be required 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.

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with Chairman ROGERS and the subcommittee chairs.

Sequestration is bad fiscal policy. It results in unwanted and unintended legislative con-

sequences. It is bad for the economy. It is unfair to the American people.

I urge support of the Jackson Lee Amendment because it will prevent the bill before us from yielding unwanted and unintended results.

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.

#### SEQUESTRATION: ECONOMIC IMPACT BY STATE, 2014

	Full Sequester				Non-Defense Sequester Only				Defense Sequester Only			
	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss
Alabama	-\$2.7	-1.25%	-31,467	-1.20%	-\$1.6	-0.76%	-19,502	-0.74%	-\$1.1	-0.50%	-11,997	-0.46%
Alaska	-\$0.6	-1.22%	-6,242	-1.32%	-\$0.4	-0.76%	-3,808	-0.81%	-\$0.2	-0.46%	-2,439	-0.52%
Arizona	-\$3.7	-1.18%	-39,624	-1.15%	-\$2.0	-0.63%	-22,794	-0.66%	-\$1.7	-0.55%	-16,876	-0.49%
Arkansas	-\$1.2	-0.97%	-15,244	-0.93%	-\$0.7	-0.58%	-9,275	-0.57%	-\$0.5	-0.39%	-5,985	-0.37%
California	-\$22.0	-1.02%	-211,777	-1.00%	-\$11.0	-0.51%	-112,422	-0.53%	-\$11.1	-0.52%	-99,590	-0.47%
Colorado	-\$3.6	-1.08%	-37,589	-1.09%	-\$2.0	-0.61%	-21,569	-0.63%	-\$1.6	-0.48%	-16,062	-0.47%
Connecticut	-\$2.5	-1.08%	-23,200	-1.01%	-\$1.1	-0.47%	-11,012	-0.48%	-\$1.4	-0.61%	-12,212	-0.53%
Delaware	-\$0.6	-1.02%	-5,662	-1.01%	-\$0.3	-0.64%	-3,606	-0.65%	-\$0.2	-0.39%	-2,062	-0.37%
DC	-\$3.4	-3.02%	-25,180	-2.96%	-\$3.2	-2.81%	-23,278	-2.74%	-\$0.2	-0.22%	-1,905	-0.22%
Florida	-\$9.0	-0.95%	-101,912	-0.96%	-\$5.6	-0.59%	-65,104	-0.61%	-\$3.4	-0.36%	-36,933	-0.35%
Georgia	-\$5.6	-1.09%	-62,276	-1.11%	-\$3.3	-0.64%	-37,371	-0.66%	-\$2.3	-0.45%	-24,969	-0.44%
Hawaii	-\$1.1	-1.48%	-13,702	-1.60%	-\$0.7	-0.92%	-8,276	-0.97%	-\$0.4	-0.56%	-5,437	-0.63%
Idaho	-\$0.7	-1.02%	-9,205	-0.96%	-\$0.4	-0.59%	-5,654	-0.59%	-\$0.3	-0.43%	-3,561	-0.37%
Illinois	-\$6.4	-0.83%	-63,703	-0.82%	-\$4.0	-0.52%	-40,931	-0.53%	-\$2.4	-0.31%	-22,847	-0.29%
Indiana	-\$3.0	-0.94%	-33,551	-0.89%	-\$1.8	-0.55%	-20,614	-0.55%	-\$1.2	-0.39%	-12,979	-0.34%
Iowa	-\$1.4	-0.89%	-17,087	-0.83%	-\$0.8	-0.51%	-10,171	-0.49%	-\$0.6	-0.38%	-6,937	-0.34%
Kansas	-\$1.9	-1.22%	-21,412	-1.12%	-\$0.9	-0.54%	-10,417	-0.55%	-\$1.1	-0.68%	-11,017	-0.58%
Kentucky	-\$2.0	-0.97%	-24,006	-0.97%	-\$1.2	-0.59%	-14,621	-0.59%	-\$0.8	-0.38%	-9,410	-0.38%
Louisiana	-\$2.5	-1.04%	-28,651	-1.05%	-\$1.3	-0.54%	-15,110	-0.56%	-\$1.2	-0.50%	-13,571	-0.50%
Maine	-\$0.8	-1.27%	-10,014	-1.18%	-\$0.4	-0.67%	-5,448	-0.64%	-\$0.4	-0.60%	-4,576	-0.54%
Maryland	-\$6.5	-1.85%	-64,522	-1.82%	-\$5.0	-1.42%	-49,758	-1.40%	-\$1.5	-0.43%	-14,803	-0.42%
Massachusetts	-\$4.4	-0.98%	-40,626	-0.91%	-\$2.4	-0.52%	-23,079	-0.52%	-\$2.1	-0.46%	-17,589	-0.39%
Michigan	-\$4.0	-0.85%	-43,903	-0.82%	-\$2.6	-0.55%	-29,581	-0.55%	-\$1.4	-0.30%	-14,391	-0.27%
Minnesota	-\$3.1	-0.88%	-30,295	-0.82%	-\$1.6	-0.46%	-16,772	-0.46%	-\$1.5	-0.43%	-13,555	-0.37%
Mississippi	-\$1.5	-1.32%	-19,568	-1.25%	-\$0.8	-0.65%	-9,925	-0.63%	-\$0.8	-0.67%	-9,663	-0.62%
Missouri	-\$3.2	-1.02%	-35,958	-0.97%	-\$1.9	-0.60%	-22,045	-0.59%	-\$1.3	-0.42%	-13,351	-0.38%
Montana	-\$0.5	-1.03%	-6,634	-0.99%	-\$0.3	-0.72%	-4,631	-0.69%	-\$0.1	-0.31%	-2,010	-0.30%
Nebraska	-\$1.9	-0.90%	-11,240	-0.87%	-\$0.6	-0.55%	-6,897	-0.53%	-\$0.4	-0.35%	-4,356	-0.34%
Nevada	-\$1.3	-0.83%	-14,243	-0.86%	-\$0.8	-0.51%	-8,797	-0.53%	-\$0.5	-0.32%	-5,464	-0.33%
New Hampshire	-\$0.8	-1.05%	-8,560	-0.97%	-\$0.4	-0.53%	-4,573	-0.52%	-\$0.4	-0.52%	-3,997	-0.45%
New Jersey	-\$4.7	-0.87%	-45,215	-0.86%	-\$3.1	-0.56%	-30,141	-0.57%	-\$1.7	-0.31%	-15,126	-0.29%
New Mexico	-\$1.1	-1.26%	-13,800	-1.22%	-\$0.8	-0.90%	-9,978	-0.89%	-\$0.3	-0.35%	-3,833	-0.34%
New York	-\$9.7	-0.78%	-88,297	-0.76%	-\$6.3	-0.51%	-59,715	-0.52%	-\$3.4	-0.28%	-28,688	-0.25%
North Carolina	-\$5.0	-1.03%	-58,211	-1.06%	-\$2.8	-0.58%	-32,886	-0.60%	-\$2.2	-0.45%	-25,389	-0.46%
North Dakota	-\$0.4	-0.96%	-4,957	-0.92%	-\$0.2	-0.58%	-3,004	-0.56%	-\$0.2	-0.38%	-1,958	-0.37%
Ohio	-\$5.5	-0.92%	-60,106	-0.88%	-\$3.4	-0.57%	-38,840	-0.57%	-\$2.1	-0.35%	-21,341	-0.31%
Oklahoma	-\$2.0	-1.05%	-23,440	-1.05%	-\$1.3	-0.67%	-15,064	-0.68%	-\$0.7	-0.38%	-8,397	-0.38%
Oregon	-\$2.1	-1.05%	-23,295	-0.97%	-\$1.1	-0.54%	-12,853	-0.54%	-\$1.0	-0.51%	-10,471	-0.44%
Pennsylvania	-\$6.6	-0.99%	-71,014	-0.94%	-\$4.3	-0.65%	-48,035	-0.64%	-\$2.3	-0.34%	-23,056	-0.31%
Rhode Island	-\$0.6	-1.13%	-6,560	-1.05%	-\$0.3	-0.62%	-3,633	-0.58%	-\$0.3	-0.51%	-2,934	-0.47%

## SEQUESTRATION: ECONOMIC IMPACT BY STATE, 2014—Continued

	Full Sequester				Non-Defense Sequester Only				Defense Sequester Only			
	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss
South Carolina .....	-\$2.2	-1.04%	-27,294	-1.06%	-\$1.3	-0.60%	-16,074	-0.63%	-\$0.9	-0.44%	-11,251	-0.44%
South Dakota .....	-\$0.4	-0.98%	-5,432	-0.92%	-\$0.3	-0.64%	-3,514	-0.59%	-\$0.1	-0.35%	-1,923	-0.32%
Tennessee .....	-\$3.1	-0.99%	-36,334	-0.96%	-\$2.0	-0.64%	-23,664	-0.62%	-\$1.1	-0.35%	-12,717	-0.33%
Texas .....	-\$15.2	-0.99%	-153,541	-1.00%	-\$8.3	-0.54%	-87,003	-0.57%	-\$6.9	-0.45%	-66,702	-0.43%
Utah .....	-\$1.8	-1.19%	-20,932	-1.17%	-\$1.01	-0.70%	-12,736	-0.71%	-\$0.7	-0.50%	-8,219	-0.46%
Vermont .....	-\$0.3	-0.99%	-4,151	-0.92%	-\$0.2	-0.59%	-2,553	-0.57%	-\$0.1	-0.40%	-1,602	-0.36%
Virginia .....	-\$8.3	-1.67%	-85,776	-1.71%	-\$5.5	-1.12%	-56,965	-1.13%	-\$2.7	-0.55%	-28,867	-0.57%
Washington .....	-\$5.6	-1.37%	-54,359	-1.31%	-\$2.3	-0.56%	-24,332	-0.59%	-\$3.3	-0.81%	-30,084	-0.72%
West Virginia .....	-\$0.9	-1.17%	-10,673	-1.12%	-\$0.6	-0.82%	-7,638	-0.80%	-\$0.3	-0.35%	-3,046	-0.32%
Wisconsin .....	-\$2.6	-0.86%	-29,312	-0.80%	-\$1.4	-0.48%	-17,097	-0.47%	-\$1.1	-0.38%	-12,249	-0.34%
Wyoming .....	-\$0.4	-0.96%	-4,072	-0.98%	-\$0.2	-0.60%	-2,594	-0.62%	-\$0.1	-0.36%	-1,482	-0.36%
U.S. TOTAL .....	-\$179.4	-1.04%	-1,883,824	-1.02%	\$105.7	-0.61%	-1,145,337	-0.62%	-\$73.9	-0.43%	-740,487	-0.40%

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentledady from Texas does have a reputation of being very innovative in her legislative strategy. While I would agree with her—and many of us would agree—that I am frustrated with the budget process and that many of us don't think the budget process works, she is, with this amendment, trying to bring to a conclusion sequestration.

I would simply say that we do not believe it is appropriate to, nor do we think that we are equipped to, debate the sequestration issue, which is a budget issue. Today, we are simply trying to expedite the building of additional natural gas pipelines to streamline the permitting process in order to help people throughout America have lower electricity rates and, perhaps, to increase our exports. So I would oppose her amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113-272.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. GAO STUDY.

Not later than May 1, 2014, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(1) assesses the extent to which the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is expected to experience delays in issuing certificates of public convenience and necessity for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline project;

(2) assesses the extent to which other Federal, State, or local permitting authorities are expected to experience delays in issuing permits required under Federal law in connection with the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is required; and

(3) examines the effect of anticipated Congressional appropriations or other resources on the ability of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and other Federal agencies to review applications for certificates and permits described in paragraphs (1) and (2) in a timely manner.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a solution desperately searching for a problem.

In July of 2013, before the committee, Commissioner Moeller said that 90 percent of permit applications to FERC are already approved within 12 months and that the delays on the remaining 10 percent are due to either the complexities of the proposed projects or incomplete applications, something which indicates there is hardly a need for the amendment. In addition to that statement, there has been no record of any backlog of permit applications that justifies the need to overhaul pipeline permitting regulations.

There is an old saying, If it ain't broke, don't fix it. I am curious as to why it is we are trying to fix something here that is not broken.

I am worried that, if this legislation were to somehow become law, we would already see that the agencies and the courts, in their consideration, would rush around to try and figure out what it was the Congress intended and how these matters could or should be proceeded upon more expeditiously. That, according to the government agencies that appeared before the committee, is completely unnecessary.

Having said these things, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues here that the amendment that I offer today simply directs the GAO to take another look at the permitting process and to take into consideration these issues to tell us what it is that

needs to be done to better expedite the process.

□ 1045

Why this? The reason is very simple. The committee had one day of hearing, had very little support for the legislation, no explanation of why it was needed, the agencies appearing before the committee said it really wasn't necessary, and other witnesses testified that it wasn't needed.

The report of the GAO will identify the problems which exist, and we can then use the oversight authority of the committee and the Congress to fix such problems as might be found and have an intelligent record as to what can, or should, be done to make this a step which, in fact, will help us move forward on pipeline permitting.

Now, I want to make it very clear I am not opposed to natural gas pipelines, nor am I opposed to moving forward speedily and intelligently. The system is working, the Congress has devised a system of permitting that works, sees to it that safety is properly attended to, and has given proper oversight, including legislation recently to ensure that proper behavior and proper safety of the pipelines do take place.

I urge the committee to support my amendment. It gives us a bill of which we can be proud, instead of a bill about which people are going to scratch their heads and wonder what was the Congress doing when they foisted this miserable thing upon us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), which would strike the entire piece of legislation and replace it with a GAO study.

The GAO back in February of this year issued a report detailing what they called the "complex" natural gas pipeline permitting process. This amendment would simply ask the GAO to duplicate many of those same findings that were done in a report issued less than a year ago, and there is simply no need for that.

I understand the gentleman from Michigan thinks this legislation is unnecessary, but I respectfully disagree. I

will give one example of where the claims regarding the approval timelines for natural gas permit pipelines have been dubious.

It has been erroneously repeated by opponents of this legislation that FERC testified in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee that 90 percent of the permits are being done on time. This is simply not the case. This is not what FERC stated in their testimony. It stated that 90 percent of the certificates are being completed within 12 months. There is an awful lot of difference between a certificate and a permit.

FERC is in control of only the certificate process, but they are at the mercy of other agencies with respect to the permit approval process. This is the main reason for the need for this legislation, because FERC has absolutely no enforcement authority over the other agencies to process permits on schedule. This brings accountability to other agencies.

Even though 90 percent of certificates are being processed by FERC in the 12-month period, it doesn't tell the full story. It would be talking about the bills that the House of Representatives passed and talking only about our naming of post offices and not talking about the substantive legislation, the important things, we do here in the House of Representatives.

I would also remind the gentleman from Michigan that the need for this legislation is so great that it garners support not just from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, but also the major electricity trade associations across the country: Edison Electric Institute, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the American Public Power Association, as well as the New England Ratepayers Association, whose members are experiencing skyrocketing natural gas prices.

This amendment would gut the bill and ignore the core problem of stubbornly high natural gas prices in certain regions across the Nation. It dismisses the need for an improved permitting process for natural gas pipeline infrastructure completely.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the gentleman's agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is unnecessary. Every witness before the committee found no reason why it had to be enacted into law. It was made very clear that there have been no incidences of egregious delay by any events before the permitting authorities. There is no need for the legislation.

The amendment is a friendly amendment offered to enable us to find out if there are, in fact, problems; and if there are, in fact, problems, then we will be able to take the necessary action to correct whatever problems might exist.

At this particular time, there is no evidence of need for the legislation. In 90 percent of the time, the permits have been granted within the 1-year period. It is only necessary to allow time for others where the permitting application was incorrectly or improperly done and only where the complexity of the situation requires more time.

What I am hearing from the other side is they feel that there is need for us to move more rapidly in these complex cases where serious mistakes can be made and we can have the danger of an unsafe pipeline resulting.

I would remind my colleagues that a pipeline explosion, only the failure of a gas pipeline, is like a nuclear event.

I urge the adoption of the amendment, and if not adopted, the rejection of the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I just reiterate there is enormous importance to this legislation. While I appreciate that the gentleman from Michigan offered his amendment in a friendly tone, it guts the legislation in its entirety.

I also want to offer that H.R. 1900 is offered in a friendly manner. It is offered friendly to places like Michigan, New York, Florida, and Arizona, places that are paying unnecessarily high prices for natural gas in their parts of the country.

With that, I would urge rejection of this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-272 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. TONKO of New York.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. DINGELL of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) on which further proceedings were

postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 233, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 605]

#### AYES—183

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

#### NOES—233

Aderholt	Blackburn	Carter
Amash	Boustany	Cassidy
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Bachmann	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Bachus	Brooks (AL)	Coble
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Coffman
Barr	Broun (GA)	Cole
Barrow (GA)	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Barton	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Benishek	Burgess	Conaway
Bentivolio	Calvert	Cook
Bilirakis	Camp	Cotton
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Cramer
Black	Capito	Crawford



Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rigell
Culberson	King (NY)	Roby
Daines	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Denham	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Dent	LaMalfa	Rogers (MI)
DeSantis	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	Lance	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Lankford	Rooney
Duffy	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Roskam
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Ross
Ellmers	Long	Rothfus
Farenthold	Lucas	Royce
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Runyan
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Marchant	Salmon
Fleming	Marino	Sanford
Flores	Masse	Scalise
Forbes	Matheson	Schock
Fortenberry	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert
Fox	McCaul	Scott, Austin
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Sessions
Galleo	McKeon	Shimkus
Gardner	McKinley	Shuster
Gerlach	McMorris	Simpson
Gibbs	Rodgers	Smith (MO)
Gingrey (GA)	Meadows	Smith (NE)
Gohmert	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Goodlatte	Messer	Smith (TX)
Gosar	Mica	Southerland
Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Stewart
Granger	Miller (MI)	Stivers
Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary	Stockman
Graves (MO)	Mullin	Stutzman
Green, Al	Mulvaney	Terry
Green, Gene	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)
Griffin (AR)	Neugebauer	Thornberry
Griffith (VA)	Noem	Tiberi
Grimm	Nugent	Tipton
Guthrie	Nunes	Turner
Hall	Nunnelee	Upton
Harper	Olson	Valadao
Harris	Owens	Vela
Hartzler	Palazzo	Wagner
Hastings (WA)	Paulsen	Walberg
Heck (NV)	Pearce	Walden
Hensarling	Perlmutter	Walorski
Holding	Perry	Weber (TX)
Hudson	Peters (MI)	Webster (FL)
Huelskamp	Peterson	Wenstrup
Huizenga (MI)	Petri	Westmoreland
Hultgren	Pittenger	Whitfield
Hunter	Pitts	Williams
Hurt	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Pompeo	Wittman
Jenkins	Posey	Wolf
Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Womack
Johnson, Sam	Reed	Woodall
Jones	Reichert	Yoder
Jordan	Renacci	Yoho
Joyce	Ribble	Young (AK)
Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)	Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—14

Campbell	Huffman	Polis
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Radel
Garrett	Kingston	Ruiz
Herrera Beutler	Lowenthal	Rush
Hoyer	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1122

Messrs. STUTZMAN, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, STOCKMAN, CHABOT, and SCHOCK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 605 I was detained chairing a Financial Services Subcommittee hearing.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. ROBY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida

(Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

## AYES—184

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

## NOES—233

Aderholt	Benishek	Brooks (AL)
Amash	Bentivoglio	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Bilirakis	Broun (GA)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Barber	Black	Burgess
Barletta	Blackburn	Calvert
Barr	Boustany	Camp
Barrow (GA)	Brady (TX)	Cantor
Barton	Bridenstine	Capito

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

## NOT VOTING—13

Campbell	Hoyer	Radel
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Ruiz
Garrett	Kingston	Rush
Herrera Beutler	Lowenthal	
Honda	McCarthy (NY)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1128

SO THE AMENDMENT WAS REJECTED.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 606, I was detained chairing a Financial Services subcommittee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted, “no.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

SPEIER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 236, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 607]

AYES—183

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

NOES—236

Aderholt	Benishek	Brooks (AL)
Amash	Bentivolio	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Bilirakis	Brown (GA)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Barber	Black	Burgess
Barletta	Blackburn	Calvert
Barr	Boustany	Camp
Barrow (GA)	Brady (TX)	Cantor
Barton	Bridenstine	Capito

Carter	Hunter	Reichert
Cassidy	Hurt	Renacci
Chabot	Issa	Ribbie
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Rice (SC)
Coble	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Cole	Jones	Roe (TN)
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Cook	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Costa	King (NY)	Rokita
Cotton	Kinzing (IL)	Rooney
Cramer	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Crawford	Labrador	Roskam
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Ross
Culberson	Lamborn	Rothfus
Daines	Lance	Royce
Davis, Rodney	Lankford	Runyan
Denham	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Latta	Salmon
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Sanford
DesJarlais	Long	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Schock
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Schrader
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Farenthold	Massie	Sessions
Fincher	Matheson	Shimkus
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster
Fleischmann	McCaul	Simpson
Fleming	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Flores	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Forbes	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
Fortenberry	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Fox	McMorris	Southerland
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Stewart
Gallego	Meadows	Stivers
Garcia	Meehan	Stockman
Gardner	Messer	Stutzman
Gerlach	Mica	Terry
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Tiberi
Goodlatte	Mullin	Tipton
Gosar	Mulvaney	Turner
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Granger	Neugebauer	Valadao
Graves (GA)	Noem	Vela
Graves (MO)	Nugent	Wagner
Green, Gene	Nunes	Walberg
Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee	Walden
Griffith (VA)	Olson	Walorski
Grimm	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Paulsen	Webster (FL)
Hall	Pearce	Wenstrup
Hanna	Perlmutter	Westmoreland
Harper	Perry	Whitfield
Harris	Peters (CA)	Williams
Hartzler	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Hastings (WA)	Petri	Wittman
Heck (NV)	Pittenger	Wolf
Hensarling	Pitts	Womack
Holding	Poe (TX)	Woodall
Hudson	Pompeo	Yoder
Huelskamp	Posey	Yoho
Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)	Young (AK)
Hultgren	Reed	Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—11

Campbell	Hoyer	Radel
Castro (TX)	Kingston	Ruiz
Carrett	Lowenthal	Rush
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1133

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 607 I was detained chairing a Financial Services subcommittee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON

LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON

LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 243, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]

AYES—175

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

NOES—243

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Camp
Amash	Black	Cantor
Amodei	Blackburn	Capito
Bachmann	Boustany	Carter
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Barber	Bridenstine	Chabot
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Coble
Barrow (GA)	Brown (GA)	Coffman
Barton	Buchanan	Cole
Benishek	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Bentivolio	Burgess	Collins (NY)
Bilirakis	Calvert	Conaway

Cook Johnson (OH)  
Costa Johnson, Sam  
Cotton Jones  
Courtney Jordan  
Cramer Joyce  
Crawford Kelly (PA)  
Crenshaw King (IA)  
Cuellar King (NY)  
Culberson Kinzinger (IL)  
Daines Kline  
Davis, Rodney Labrador  
Denham LaMalfa  
Dent Lamborn  
DeSantis Lance  
DesJarlais Lankford  
Diaz-Balart Latham  
Duffy Latta  
Duncan (SC) LoBiondo  
Ellmers Long  
Farenthold Lucas  
Fincher Luetkemeyer  
Fitzpatrick Lummis  
Fleischmann Maffei  
Fleming Marchant  
Flores Marino  
Forbes Massie  
Fortenberry Matheson  
Foxy McCarthy (CA)  
Franks (AZ) McCaul  
Frelinghuysen McClintock  
Gallego McHenry  
Garcia McIntyre  
Gardner McKeon  
Garrett McKinley  
Gerlach McMorris  
Gibbs Rodgers  
Gibson Meadows  
Gingrey (GA) Meehan  
Gohmert Messer  
Goodlatte Mica  
Gosar Miller (FL)  
Gowdy Miller (MI)  
Granger Miller, Gary  
Graves (GA) Mullin  
Graves (MO) Mulvaney  
Green, Al Murphy (FL)  
Green, Gene Murphy (PA)  
Griffin (AR) Neugebauer  
Griffith (VA) Noem  
Grimm Nugent  
Guthrie Nunes  
Hall Nunnelee  
Hanna Olson  
Harper Owens  
Harris Palazzo  
Hartzler Paulsen  
Hastings (WA) Pearce  
Heck (NV) Perlmutter  
Hensarling Perry  
Himes Peterson  
Holding Petri  
Hudson Pittenger  
Huelskamp Pitts  
Huizenga (MI) Poe (TX)  
Hultgren Pompeo  
Hunter Posey  
Hurt Price (GA)  
Issa Reed  
Jenkins Reichert

## NOT VOTING—12

Campbell Hoyer  
Castro (TX) Kingston  
Duncan (TN) Ruiz  
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY) Smith (NJ)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

## □ 1138

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIN-  
GELL) on which further proceedings  
were postponed and on which the noes  
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 175, noes 239,  
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 609]

## AYES—175

Andrews Green, Al  
Bass Green, Gene  
Beatty Grijalva  
Becerra Gutierrez  
Bera (CA) Hahn  
Bishop (GA) Hanabusa  
Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL)  
Bonamici Heck (WA)  
Brady (PA) Higgins  
Braley (IA) Himes  
Brown (FL) Hinojosa  
Brownley (CA) Holt  
Bustos Honda  
Butterfield Horsford  
Capps Huffman  
Capuano Israel  
Cárdenas Jackson Lee  
Carney Jeffries  
Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)  
Cartwright Johnson, E. B.  
Castor (FL) Kaptur  
Chu Keating  
Cicilline Kelly (IL)  
Clarke Kennedy  
Clay Kildee  
Cleaver Kilmer  
Clyburn Kind  
Cohen Kuster  
Connolly Langevin  
Conyers Larsen (WA)  
Cooper Larson (CT)  
Courtney Lee (CA)  
Crowley Levin  
Cummings Lewis  
Davis (CA) Lipinski  
Davis, Danny Loeb sack  
DeFazio Lowey  
DeGette Lujan Grisham  
DeLauro (NM)  
DeBene Lujan, Ben Ray  
Deutch (NM)  
Dingell Lynch  
Doggett Maffei  
Doyle Maloney,  
Duckworth Carolyn  
Edwards Maloney, Sean  
Ellison Matsui  
Engel McCollum  
Enyart McDermott  
Eshoo McGovern  
Esty McNerney  
Farr Meeks  
Fattah Meng  
Foster Michaud  
Frankel (FL) Moore  
Fudge Moran  
Gabbard Nadler  
Gallego Napolitano  
Garamendi Neal  
Grayson Negrete McLeod

## NOES—239

Aderholt Brooks (AL)  
Amash Brooks (IN)  
Amodei Broun (GA)  
Bachmann Buchanan  
Bachus Bucshon  
Barber Burgess  
Barletta Calvert  
Barr Camp  
Barrow (GA) Cantor  
Barton Capito  
Benishek Carter  
Bentivolio Cassidy  
Billirakis Chabot  
Bishop (UT) Chaffetz  
Black Coble  
Blackburn Coffman  
Boustany Cole  
Brady (TX) Collins (GA)  
Bridenstine Collins (NY)

Ellmers Lance  
Farenthold Lankford  
Fincher Latham  
Fitzpatrick Latta  
Fleischmann LoBiondo  
Fleming Long  
Flores Lucas  
Forbes Luetkemeyer  
Fortenberry Lummis  
Foxy Marchant  
Franks (AZ) Marino  
Frelinghuysen Massie  
Garcia Matheson  
Gardner McCarthy (CA)  
Garrett McCaul  
Gerlach McClintock  
Gibbs McHenry  
Gibson McIntyre  
Gingrey (GA) McKeon  
Gohmert McKinley  
Goodlatte McMorris  
Gosar Rodgers  
Gowdy Meadows  
Granger Meehan  
Graves (GA) Messer  
Graves (MO) Mica  
Griffin (AR) Miller (FL)  
Griffith (VA) Miller (MI)  
Grimm Miller, Gary  
Guthrie Mullin  
Hall Mulvaney  
Hanna Murphy (FL)  
Harper Murphy (PA)  
Harris Neugebauer  
Hartzler Noem  
Hastings (WA) Nugent  
Heck (NV) Nunes  
Hensarling Nunnelee  
Holding Olson  
Hudson Owens  
Huelskamp Palazzo  
Huizenga (MI) Paulsen  
Hultgren Pearce  
Hunter Perlmutter  
Hurt Perry  
Issa Peters (CA)  
Jenkins Peterson  
Johnson (OH) Petri  
Johnson, Sam Pittenger  
Jones Pitts  
Jordan Poe (TX)  
Joyce Pompeo  
Kelly (PA) Posey  
King (IA) Price (GA)  
King (NY) Reed  
Kinzinger (IL) Reichert  
Kirkpatrick Renacci  
Kline Ribble  
Labrador Rice (SC)  
LaMalfa Rigell  
Lamborn Roby

## NOT VOTING—16

Blumenauer Kingston  
Campbell Lofgren  
Castro (TX) Lowenthal  
Delaney McCarthy (NY)  
Herrera Beutler Miller, George  
Hoyer Radel

## □ 1142

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois  
changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN).  
The question is on the amendment in  
the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule,  
the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;  
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs.  
ROBY) having assumed the chair, Mr.  
HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Com-  
mittee of the Whole House on the state  
of the Union, reported that that Com-  
mittee, having had under consideration  
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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 420, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1145

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIERNEY. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TIERNEY moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1900 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

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

#### SEC. 3. NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY AND COMMUNITY RIGHT TO KNOW.

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect unless the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies, determines that implementation of the Act will not—

(1) adversely impact natural gas pipeline safety; or

(2) inhibit the ability of communities to meaningfully engage in the process of siting of natural gas pipelines that affect them.

Mr. POMPEO (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, colleagues, this is the final amendment to the bill, and, as you know, it will not kill the bill. It will not send it back to committee. If this motion is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended. And I ask you to consider doing that.

Over the last several years, it is my understanding that FERC has approved 69 major natural gas pipelines. They span over 3,000 miles in 30 States with a total capacity of nearly 30 billion cubic feet per day.

The Government Accountability Office, the firm that does our research for us, has found that FERC's pipeline permitting is predictable, it is consistent, and it gets pipelines built. For some

reason, the underlying bill replaces that existing natural gas permitting process with a process that appears to be arbitrary, unworkable, and a one-size-fits-all approach.

The bill would force regulatory agencies to comply with what many believe are unreasonable permitting deadlines—1 year for FERC and 3 months for other permitting agencies—to render decisions on applications no matter how complex they are and potentially before the public risks are fully understood, particularly by our local areas.

If the underlying bill didn't attempt to fix an existing permitting process that many, including the pipeline trade association, agree is not broken, then perhaps my amendment wouldn't be necessary. If the majority had supported any of the responsible amendments that were proposed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and others here a little while ago, perhaps it wouldn't be necessary. But it is necessary.

The motion states that this bill will not take effect until FERC determines its implementation will not adversely impact natural gas pipeline safety and that it will not inhibit the ability of communities to engage in the process of siting natural gas pipelines. The motion seeks to protect public safety. It seeks to ensure that our constituents continue to have a voice in the permitting process.

Madam Speaker, I don't believe that that is too much to ask. It shouldn't be. So let's, please, do the reasonable thing. Let's stand up for safety. Let's stand up for our local constituencies and communities and support this motion.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, while we share every one of our colleagues' concerns about pipeline safety, nothing in this legislation does anything to impact the safety of pipelines all across the country. Indeed, putting in new pipelines, increasing capacity for natural gas pipelines, will actually allow the retirement of older pipelines which might present even more risk.

We all know the tragic incident that happened in San Bruno, California. This body has taken action to rectify that. There were pipeline safety bills passed with all of the Members of the House, and it passed in the Senate as well, to make sure that every pipeline built is done so in a way that is safe and responsible and with plenty of time for community input.

The motion to recommit suggests that H.R. 1900 would eliminate that time. It does nothing of that nature. In

every case, for a complex pipeline, there will be nearly 2 years' time for communities and interest groups who have concerns about the pipeline going into their territory, their region, to make their voices heard and to make their concerns registered in the public place.

I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to recommit and pass the underlying legislation, H.R. 1900.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 233, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 610]

YEAS—180

Andrews	Farr	Lynch
Barber	Fattah	Maffei
Bass	Foster	Maloney,
Beatty	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Becerra	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Bera (CA)	Gabbard	Matsui
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Bishop (NY)	Garcia	McDermott
Blumenauer	Grayson	McGovern
Bonamici	Green, Al	McIntyre
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	McNerney
Braley (IA)	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Meng
Brownley (CA)	Hanabusa	Michaud
Bustos	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Moore
Capps	Higgins	Moran
Capuano	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Cárdenas	Hinojosa	Nadler
Carney	Holt	Napolitano
Cartwright	Honda	Neal
Castor (FL)	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
Chu	Huffman	Nolan
Ciçilline	Israel	O'Rourke
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Clay	Jeffries	Pascarell
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Connolly	Kaptur	Pelosi
Conyers	Keating	Perlmutter
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)
Courtney	Kennedy	Peters (MI)
Crowley	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
Cummings	Kilmer	Pocan
Davis (CA)	Kind	Polis
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Kuster	Quigley
DeGette	Langevin	Rahall
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Levin	Ruppersberger
Doggett	Lewis	Ryan (OH)
Doyle	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
Duckworth	Loeb sack	T.
Edwards	Lofgren	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Lowey	Sarbanes
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Schakowsky
Enyart	(NM)	Schiff
Eshoo	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schneider
Esty	(NM)	Schwartz

Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier

## NAYS—233

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
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  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallego  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy

## NOT VOTING—17

Campbell  
Castro (TX)  
Clyburn  
Costa  
Cramer  
DeLauro

Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
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)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
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

Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

□ 1155

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, November 18, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from the Honorable Tom Schedler, Secretary of State, State of Louisiana, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held November 16, 2013, the Honorable Vance M. McAllister was elected Representative to Congress for the Fifth Congressional District, State of Louisiana.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,

Clerk.

SECRETARY OF STATE,

STATE OF LOUISIANA,

Baton Rouge, LA, November 18, 2013.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Saturday, November 16, 2013, for Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana show that Vance M. McAllister received 54,449 or 59.65% of the total number of votes cast for the office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Vance M. McAllister was elected as Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all parishes involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHEDLER,

Secretary of State.

□ 1200

## SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE VANCE M. MCALLISTER, OF LOUISIANA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable VANCE M. MCALLISTER, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Lou-

isiana delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. VANCE M. MCALLISTER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 113th Congress.

The Chair has determined that the children in the well are 12 years and younger.

## WELCOMING THE HONORABLE VANCE M. MCALLISTER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Louisiana delegation, I would like to welcome Louisiana's newest Congressman, VANCE MCALLISTER, of the Fifth Congressional District.

VANCE is a resident of Swartz, Louisiana, and has been married for 15 years to Kelly. They are the proud parents of five beautiful children.

VANCE is a veteran of the United States Army and Louisiana National Guard. He is a self-made businessman and a well-regarded entrepreneur.

I look forward to serving with you, VANCE, on behalf of the people of Louisiana.

Welcome to the United States House of Representatives.

Now I would like to yield to my good friend, CEDRIC RICHMOND.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you, Mr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to welcome the newest member of the Louisiana delegation, the Representative of Louisiana's Fifth Congressional District, to Washington, D.C., and to this distinguished body. There is no doubt in my mind that he will be a welcome addition.

While he has never served in or held elective office, Mr. MCALLISTER brings with him the value of the many experiences and accomplishments he has attained through his lifetime. Like Mr. BOUSTANY said, he is a veteran, a successful businessman, and a devoted family man. He has committed himself to addressing the needs of the people of Louisiana and finding commonsense solutions to the problems that plague the Nation.

One thing that I have come to know as a Member who represents Louisiana