

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 194, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—220

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

NOES—194

Amash	Bass	Bishop (NY)
Andrews	Beatty	Blumenauer
Barber	Becerra	Bonamici
Barrow (GA)	Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)

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

NOT VOTING—17

Amodei	Culberson	Petri
Bachmann	Doyle	Pitts
Camp	Fattah	Ross
Coble	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Collins (GA)	McNerney	Schwartz
Cook	Miller, Gary	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1217

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, during roll-call vote 54, on the vote on Passage of H.R. 2954—The Public Access and Lands Improvement Act, I was away from the House floor and intended to vote “aye.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2954, THE PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 2954, the Clerk may make technical and conforming changes, and that the amendment to page 17, line 17 refer to the first usage of “decision” on that line.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Mr. CANTOR, the majority leader, for the recitation of the schedule.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic Whip, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than noon to accommodate the Democrat Members' issues retreat. On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 3193, the Consumer Financial Protection and Soundness Improvement Act, authored by Representative SEAN DUFFY. This bill reforms the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to make the Bureau accountable to hardworking American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the debt limit borrowing authority runs out as early as the end of this month; therefore, I expect action to avoid default as soon as possible.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

The gentleman ends with the observation that you expect action to avoid default as soon as possible. As you know, Mr. Leader, very well—as we all know—beginning tomorrow, the Treasury Department will have to start using extraordinary measures because

the authorization for the debt limit to be extended will end on the 7th. Secretary Lew has written to all of us and warned us that, on Monday, stating that:

Time is short. Inaction could cause harm to our economy, rattle financial markets, and hurt taxpayers.

I know that my friend has made similar comments, as I have made similar comments. We agree on this proposition. But I am concerned that we only have 7 legislative days scheduled for the rest of the month.

Does the gentleman expect that we will take an up-or-down vote on a clean debt limit extension next week or before the end of this month?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my remarks just prior, I would say to the gentleman that I am confident that the United States is not going to default on its debt and that we will resolve the need to increase the borrowing authority of this country prior to any deadline that the Treasury issues.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate that information. I want to say that the debt limit extension will have—Mr. Leader, I want to give you the information—in my view, well over 180 votes on our side of the aisle if that is a clean debt limit so that America can pay its bills and default is not a risk. As the gentleman indicates, we don't want it to be.

The Speaker has indicated that it would be solved long before we would come to any deadline precipitating another crisis and undermining confidence.

□ 1230

I want to tell the gentleman, the majority leader, that I will assure him that if we get a clean debt limit extension on the floor, that Democrats will work with him and his party to pass that in a way that we have a significant majority for that bill.

Mr. Leader, I was encouraged to see last week at your retreat that the House Republicans put forward a set of principles for immigration reform and have now expressed a readiness to discuss how to fix our broken immigration system. I am sure you have seen the response from my side of the aisle, not only from the President, but myself and Leader PELOSI, has been positive. We see the steps that have been taken as positive steps. We do look forward to working together on these principles.

We were just somewhat disappointed, however, that one of your Members, RAÚL LABRADOR of Idaho, was quoted yesterday as saying there was:

Overwhelming support for the idea of doing nothing this year. It is a mistake to have an internal battle this year about immigration.

I would hope that Mr. LABRADOR's remarks do not lead us to a place where we will either not proceed or to pass immigration reform on this floor.

The majority leader has indicated in some of our colloquies that he believes

the immigration system is broken. Again, we share that view, and I think almost all Members share the view that the immigration system is not working as intended. There have been four bills passed out of Judiciary and another out of Homeland Security. Homeland Security was essentially unanimous in terms of dealing with security. We have introduced, as the majority leader knows, H.R. 15, which is a compilation of the bipartisanly passed Senate provisions, dropping the border security provision and inserting the border security passed out of the Republican-led Homeland Security Committee, I think by unanimous vote, but maybe it was by voice vote.

I would hope that we could, therefore, move forward and that Mr. LABRADOR's observation that there was "overwhelming support for the idea of doing nothing this year" would not be the prevalent view. We will again be ready to discuss this, and I can tell you that the overwhelming majority of my party, as I think the gentleman knows, would vote for the Senate bill. We don't think that the Senate bill is perfect. We would like to see a House bill. We have introduced a House bill, and we would like to consider it on the floor.

I will close with this observation with reference to immigration. I am sure the gentleman read the comments of former Speaker Dennis Hastert:

The House will act in its own way, as it should; but it should act soon. Immigration reform is necessary for our economic recovery.

Again, this is former Speaker Dennis Hastert of Illinois. He goes on to say:

First, securing our borders, so we know who is entering our country and for what purpose.

I think there is unanimous consensus that needs to be addressed.

He continues:

Second, a legalization of those folks who are already here.

Again, I think there is consensus on that.

He goes on to say we should provide them with:

A path to citizenship, much like any other immigrant would have.

Apparently, there is not necessarily consensus on that, but we do have consensus on the first proposition. He goes on to say:

These two things being satisfied, I believe immigration reform can move forward. It will make us economically stronger. It is politically smart, and morally right.

That was quoted in Politico on February 2. Those are words of former Speaker Hastert. I would hope and I know the gentleman has been very constructive in his comments that we can move forward together in reaching some agreement so we can see comprehensive immigration legislation on the floor consistent with the principles of both parties, and we can come together and pass some legislation.

I yield to the gentleman as to the prospects of doing so.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman knows, we have been on this floor before and I have said that we believe in the majority that the immigration system in this country is broken. There needs to be reform. I think I have also said to the gentleman, as I have said publicly this week, we have to go about a rebuilding of the trust here. I think the fundamental issue right now is there is doubt cast on this White House, this President, this administration's willingness to implement the laws given the track record that we have seen on laws like ObamaCare and others.

I have said to the gentleman I believe that reform is badly needed. I believe that we have got a situation at the border and the interior that needs to be fixed. The gentleman knows I have been very outspoken on the issue of kids and the fact that so many are here, unbeknownst to themselves, brought here, and know no other place as home and then are stuck without any sense of the fact that they will be accepted in the country that they know.

But before we can even get there, there needs to be some trust. There needs to be some trust built by this President with this Congress because it seems that the track record is full of examples of the White House and the administration picking and choosing in terms of the regulations, the laws, and the provisions that it wants to implement. If it doesn't like to implement one, then it will just seemingly ignore that.

I don't think that the gentleman agrees that that is the way this system was designed or our Framers had in mind in terms of equal branches of power, one that makes the laws and one that fully and faithfully executes the law, and obviously a judiciary that provides that extra check and balance.

So again I would say to the gentleman, I would ask, if he is talking with the White House, please ask them to begin to work with us on any number of things to demonstrate that they are willing to actually drive toward the same result and not just work around us in terms of a unilateral result that they may seek.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. LABRADOR, and I will quote again, said there was:

Overwhelming support for the idea of doing nothing this year.

Now in light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the observation is that the system is broken, and in light of Speaker Hastert's observation that it is morally the right thing to do, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I don't place much stock in this what I would call a rationalization of trust.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind this House that George Bush, President George Bush, couldn't get the support of his party for immigration reform. His party rejected President Bush on this issue, this issue of trust. There are less illegal immigrants having come

over the border in the last 5 years than there were during the Bush administration. There have been more people deported, in many cases with tragic results of separating families, over the last 5 years than there were in the Bush administration.

This is a question of what is morally right to do.

This is a question of what is morally right to do, to fix a broken system that is breaking apart families, undermining our economy, and abandoning what so many say is the right thing to do.

So with all due respect to, frankly, trying to distract us on this trust issue, this is not a trust issue. This is an issue of law and the administration's performance both on border security and enforcing the law in this respect, a bad law and a law that ought to be changed, a law that is causing families to be torn apart.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood on this floor as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe with my colleague, FRANK WOLF, and I believe Mr. CANTOR, perhaps, has been in some of these discussions himself when we have been dealing with the Soviet Union about keeping families together. So I will tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter of trust. This is a matter of whether the House of Representatives is going to do what Speaker Hastert has urged us to do, what President Bush urged us to do, and for which I think there are the votes to do on this floor if a bill is brought to the floor that accomplishes the principles that both parties have articulated.

Are there differences? There are some. Do we need to resolve them? We do. But we need to act. I say with all due respect to my friend, the majority leader, that I hope that those principles do not fall by the wayside as Mr. LABRADOR projects there is a consensus in your party to allow to happen.

So I would urge us to move and urge us to work together on the principles that Mr. BOEHNER and yourself have put forward and which we have responded to in a positive way.

Mr. Leader, there is also other business that needs to be done. We continue to be concerned, we were concerned when there were 1.2 million people who had fallen through the cracks and had no help. Now there are 1.7 million Americans who have lost their emergency unemployment insurance since December 28. An additional 72,000 will lose their insurance next week. We believe that needs to be addressed and reinstated, as we have done every time that we were in a similar place as we are today in terms of the availability of jobs and the seekers of jobs.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the majority leader if he can give us some view of the sustainable growth rate reimbursement for doctors who give our senior citizens medical care? That was extended with a temporary patch to March 31, Mr. Speaker, and

that needs to be addressed permanently. There is a consensus, I understand, among the committees for a fix on that, but there is no pay-for on that. That is always the problem. It is easy to say we are going to fix; it is very difficult to pay for those fixes. On both of those issues, I would ask the gentleman on unemployment insurance and the SGR, whether the gentleman has any view on either one of those coming to the floor any time soon?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, on both of those issues, there is a lot of work. On the SGR, he is exactly right; it is always the pay-for. We saw the struggle that surrounded the recent budget agreement, and coming up with \$23 billion in cost reductions and savings over 10 years was very difficult. It is hard for folks outside of Washington to imagine why that is the case when you are dealing with trillions of dollars being spent.

I share the gentleman's frustration. I would like to see, as well as, I think, the seniors of this country would like to see, an end to a formula that doesn't work in terms of reimbursements to providers, and one that will allow for a better way and a more quality health care future for our seniors.

So I do share the goal that we should replace the SGR and at the same time ensure that seniors are not going to see a diminution in the quality of their care. The gentleman knows that these discussions are ongoing in committee as we speak.

As far as the UI situation, as the gentleman knows, there are currently 6 months of unemployment benefits available to folks who have, unfortunately, found themselves out of work. We care about those folks and want to do all we can to do what they really want, which is to get back to work. This goes back towards the administration's willingness to work with us.

Our leadership, Mr. Speaker, sent a letter to the President last week outlining four things, just four of the many things he spoke about in the State of the Union address, where there is pretty much agreement on what we need to do together. We have not heard back from the administration. One of those things was the SKILLS Act. If we don't want to accept the new norm of chronic unemployment, we ought to be going full-time overspeed to try to grow the economy, to increase the competitiveness of the American economy so people can get back to work, and so they can take care of their families. We know that the chronically unemployed have a real problem because if they are without either a high school diploma or a college degree, they are at a great disadvantage for today's job opportunities.

□ 1245

The SKILLS Act can address that. All we have heard is the President wants to, once again, create another commission to review all the studies

that have been combed through before and that have resulted in our bill, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina's bill, the SKILLS Act.

Again, if the administration is so concerned about trying to addresses the plight of the chronically unemployed, let's go for jobs, not just accepting the new norm.

So again, discussions, building trust with one another, driving towards resolve could actually help the situation so that we can address this serious problem that plagues the communities of this country.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I might say the SKILLS Act, of course, was considered on this floor. We could have had a bipartisan bill, and I would like to see a bipartisan bill.

As the majority leader knows, I have been a strong proponent of an agenda that we call Make It In America, which wants to expand manufacturing in America. We believe that when we expand manufacturing, grow jobs in America, Americans are going to be more likely to Make It In America, succeed, get a job, be able to support their families.

So there is, I think, not disagreement on that. There was disagreement on the SKILLS Act. We believe the SKILLS Act essentially retreated in investments with skills.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I will certainly yield.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, my point is that the President, rather than going and acting unilaterally and appointing another commission, could easily have picked up the phone and said, "Hey, I want to come up there," or, "You all come here, and let's talk about getting the job done," rather than doing what is always done, which is kicking the can and creating another commission to go over the studies and outcomes of other commissions. That is my point.

If you have differences with the SKILLS Act, if the gentleman doesn't speak, we understand that. But the bottom line is we both agree we have to improve the outlook for skills for the chronically unemployed.

Why aren't we doing something on that? Why isn't there any response from the White House? That is my point. We could do this. We could work together and achieve results. And so again, I understand the gentleman's disagreement with the SKILLS Act, but let's work through it. The White House doesn't seem to want to do any of that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in America believes the White House doesn't want to do something about that. The President of the United States has talked about it. In every one of his State of the Unions he talked about it. In this State of the Union, he talked about expanding manufacturing and training. So the President has talked about it, all the time

about wanting to invest in giving the skills to American workers that they need to either stay employed or get the kind of skilled jobs that are available in our economy, that pay well.

There are a number of bills, I will tell the majority leader, in the Make It In America agenda that I would love to work with the majority leader on that deal exactly with that. I have a bill myself—actually, I think somebody else introduced it—called the Jobs bill, which is job opportunities between our shores, which is exactly on point of dealing with advanced manufacturers, community colleges, and other organizations in cooperation with work investment boards to identify what skills are needed, to invest in training.

The gentleman is correct, we all want to do that, and we certainly ought to be able to work towards that. He is incorrect in that the President has not only not focused on that, he has worked on that. The Secretary of Labor, Tom Perez, has worked on it; Penny Pritzker, the Secretary of Commerce, is very committed to that end; as is Arne Duncan, the Secretary of Education, and they have all talked about that. So let us work on it.

What the gentleman talked about, he cares a lot about, and I think he does. Mr. Speaker, I absolutely take him at his word. He cares about those people who have—through no fault of their own—lost their job, work wasn't available, they downsized, whatever, they lost their job.

He said he is concerned about those people, as he should be, as I am, as we all are. But one of the real tragedies is, particularly with those folks who are 45 or 50 and above, once they have lost a job, they have a terrible time in this economy finding a job. There are three people looking for every one job that is available. And a lot of those people, as the gentleman has observed, don't have the skills.

So the issue is not just about giving them skills; it is, in the interim, do we let them and their families fall through the cracks, fall through a safety net, fall out of the insurance that they paid into, their employer paid into, in the event they lost their job they would not lose the ability to support themselves to put some food on their table? That is why we are so adamant that unemployment insurance be extended.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, it has been extended under every administration when the facts were as they are today—Republican administration, Democratic administration—for the reasons that the majority leader pointed out. We care about those people. We are worried about those people. So I would hope that that would be on the floor.

On the SGR, let me close by suggesting that there is, as the gentleman knows, an Overseas Contingency Operations account. The CBO scores that significantly.

The good news is that we are not spending as much money as we were. We spent over a trillion dollars in the

last decade in Afghanistan and Iraq. Better to spend that money in this instance here at home. I would suggest, respectfully, that that is one alternative to doing what the gentleman says we all want to do, and that is fix the sustainable growth rate on a permanent basis so that doctors and Medicare patients are not worried about whether their medical services are going to be available to them. I would hope we would look at that alternative, and I would be glad to discuss with the majority leader other alternatives as well.

Unless the majority leader has anything further to say, thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY,
FEBRUARY 6, 2014, TO MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 10, 2014

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 5 years, the Obama administration has played politics with the Keystone XL pipeline, a project that is essential to reducing our dependence on foreign oil and creating jobs.

Progress has been blocked at every turn by the President more concerned with his popularity with environmental extremists than supplying our Nation with OPEC-free energy.

House Republicans have joined with members of the labor movement to move this project forward. Just last year, I worked through my committee to advance H.R. 3 to approve the Keystone pipeline with Congressman LEE TERRY. The House passed the bill back in May of 2003, but once again we were ignored by the Senate and the President.

The State Department just released its final Environmental Impact Statement, which estimates that Keystone XL will produce 42,000 jobs and will be safe.

President Obama often talks about wanting to create jobs, improving our economy, and strengthening our energy independence. He claims to support an all-of-the-above energy strategy. But with his stopping the Keystone pipeline and his war on coal, we are losing jobs, we are not strengthening the economy, and we are decreasing our ability to become energy independent.

Mr. President, stop dragging your feet and approve the Keystone pipeline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

SERGEANT BRIAN LALOU

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the family of Sergeant Brian LaLou from Chester County, Pennsylvania. Tragically, in the summer of 2012, Sergeant LaLou took his own life while he was at his duty station at the U.S. Embassy in Greece. What happened next was unconscionable.

During the course of an autopsy performed by Greek authorities, his heart was removed and not returned to his body before it was sent home to his family for a proper burial. When the Greek Government finally sent the family a heart, it was not their son's. The DNA testing revealed that it belonged to someone else.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Commandant of the Marine Corps in December seeking answers for this young man's family. The response from the Pentagon so far has been silence.

The LaLou family deserves answers. They deserve peace of mind. It is time for the Greek authorities and the Pentagon to tell Sergeant LaLou's parents what happened to their son's heart, because we know what happened to his family's.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, if I told you we could create tens of thousands of truly shovel-ready jobs, increase the prospects of American energy independence, and avoid undue environmental harm, how long would it take you to sign on the dotted line? For the President, it would take over 5 years. That is how long the application for the Keystone XL pipeline has been languishing on his desk.

In his State of the Union address, the President talked about the need to grow jobs and pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy, yet he has failed to take action on a project that does just that. Even after the release of a report from his own State Department last week clearly stating there would be little to no negative effect environmentally, the President still will not take the lead.

This project has support from Members of both parties, as well as the support of both business groups and labor groups.

The President said he has a pen. Now is the time to use it. Approve the Keystone XL pipeline, get Americans to work, and truly support a plan for an all-of-the-above energy strategy that sends a message to the rest of the world.