

about children, the children in America who need more Head Start seats or the children in northern Nigeria who are being attacked and stolen away by Boko Haram who stole some 30 or 40 girls and some 31 boys.

I rise to talk about the children who are at America's border—through no fault of their own and through no fault of this administration—a baby or children laying on the floor with a blanket. Some have taken to the political grandstanding of blaming the President and the President's administration.

The United Nations has indicated that this is a proportion of international humanitarian crisis. Fifty-eight percent of the children that were questioned were not here for immigration issues; they are displaced internationally—they were forcibly displaced.

It is our job to address this question. We should address this question with humanitarian response, with more processing centers. We should have more detention centers that are there for families and children, so they can be processed appropriately; more immigration judges; we must deal with more children's organizations like the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, First Focus, Children's Legal Defense Fund.

Let us not grandstand on these babies. They are here because they have been forced to leave a devastating condition in their country. Attacking the administration is wrong.

#### EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is, once again, poised to act on an important issue facing our country.

Today, Senator DEAN HELLER, from my home State of Nevada, and Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island announced that they will be working to pass another extension of unemployment insurance for those who need a financial lifeline and have lost their jobs at no fault of their own.

The last time the Senate sent a bill to the House to help struggling Americans with unemployment insurance, Speaker BOEHNER and the Party of No let the bill expire.

By the end of this month, there will be 33,800 Nevadans cut off from unemployment insurance and another 3.1 million Americans asking why Congress has turned its back on them.

Is it any wonder that Congress is held in such low regard by the hardworking American people? The Speaker's answer to millions of Americans asking for help is deafening silence, with no plan to do anything.

I did not come to Congress to sit and wait for one person, the Speaker, to decide whether or not this body could act.

I urge the Speaker to bring up the Senate-passed unemployment insurance extension to help 3.1 million Americans who need a lifeline.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, DOMESTIC PROSPERITY AND GLOBAL FREEDOM ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3301, NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 636 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 636

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-48. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consider-

ation of the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-49. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 636 provides for consideration of two energy bills designed to

provide certainty for those American businesses that have been given excuse after excuse as to why their permit applications have been delayed by the President, the Department of Energy, and other Federal agencies.

The President and his administration have used every delaying tactic they can think of to put off approval of job-creating projects in the natural gas and oil sectors. Quite frankly, the American people are fed up with it. Republicans are here today to stand up for citizens, unions, and businesses that have stood up and called for a more expeditious process that removes politics from the permitting decision-making.

The rule before us today provides for consideration of two bills, H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act. Both bills receive a standard structured rule under this rule.

For H.R. 6, the Rules Committee makes in order four amendments—two from Democratic sponsors and two bipartisan amendments. For H.R. 3301, the rule makes in order three amendments, all sponsored by Democrats.

This is a straightforward and fair rule that will allow the House to fully debate the issues of liquefied natural gas exports and cross-border pipeline and transmission line projects.

House Republicans have been focused on this country's energy independence for years. The Energy and Commerce Committee has been out in front of this effort, holding hearings on the Obama administration's harmful policies, holding hearings on the job-killing regulations and those that place restrictions on development on public lands and thereby increase the cost of producing electricity and fuel.

Although President Obama is quick to take credit for an increase in natural gas and oil production in this country over the last few years, any honest observer knows that any increase in production has come as a result of efforts on private, not public land, and certainly not lands controlled by the Federal Government.

In continuing the Republican majority's focus on domestic production issues, utilizing the resources that we have here in North America, Representative CORY GARDNER introduced H.R. 6, the bipartisan Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, to provide for the expedited approval of exploration of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries. I am an original cosponsor of the legislation.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we have had hearings about the gridlock which has held up dozens of applications from domestic production companies looking to export liquefied natural gas. Since the first non-free trade agreement application was submitted to the Department of Energy nearly 4 years ago, seven have been approved. Twenty-four are awaiting action.

Interestingly enough, to counter what the Department of Energy knew would be the inevitable bipartisan criticism of its delays at the last hearing we held on this topic, the Department of Energy announced just days before the hearing the approval of another LNG export application.

For anyone who thinks that this activity in the House is futile, given HARRY REID's intransigence in taking up any legislation that comes to the Senate from the House, this action by the Department of Energy highlights that efforts taken in this body—the House—can have meaningful impacts beyond simply having legislation signed into law.

Sending a clear signal to the Obama administration that the people's House is fed up with its delaying tactics and refusal to move forward with the approval of legitimate permit applications is key to making progress toward a more robust domestic energy sector.

The delays which President Obama's administration has imposed on these applications make it more and more difficult. As applications sit collecting dust for these companies trying to secure financing and countries looking to do business with American suppliers, they will soon lose patience and look elsewhere for their needs. The window for these opportunities is closing, and it is the President's hand that is pushing it down.

Mr. GARDNER's legislation is straightforward. Indeed, it is a two-page bill with a clear purpose and intent. The legislation expedites the decisionmaking process for authorization to export natural gas by requiring the Department of Energy to issue a decision within a finite number of days.

This legislation does not force the Department of Energy to make a decision or to make a decision a certain way. It simply says: make a decision.

Moreover, an increase in liquefied natural gas exports in the United States can have major positive ramifications on international relations.

I recently traveled to the Ukraine for their elections. I saw firsthand how Russia's cruel restrictions on natural gas are affecting the region's social and political atmosphere. Officials from the Ukraine and other Eastern European countries have told members of the Energy and Commerce Committee that the mere mention that the United States is increasing its LNG exports can have dramatic impacts on Russia's influence over the region. Mr. GARDNER's bill achieves that goal.

The passage of this bill will move the United States yet another step closer to both assisting our allies abroad as well as creating a more robust domestic industry at home.

The second bill included in today's rule, H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, authored by Chairman UPTON of the Energy and Commerce Committee, further improves the laws governing the permitting of oil and gas pipelines which

cross the United States border between either Mexico or Canada.

As the country has witnessed over the past few years, despite overwhelming support from the American people for the project, President Obama and his Secretary of State—first Hillary Clinton and now John Kerry—have refused to approve the Keystone pipeline to bring oil from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico.

Those of us who have followed the process over the many years that this administration has had the Keystone application under its review know that the delays which the President has imposed on this approval process have been done purely for political considerations and, in the process, have harmed the country's relationship with one of our closest allies, our neighbor to the north.

If the goal of the President's delays—which he is clearly doing for his friends in the environmental lobby and certainly not for the many unions who have loudly called for the project's approval—was to stop development of the oil sands in Canada, the President again has failed.

Canada recently approved the exploration of a new pipeline to its western coast, where oil would be transported and exported to Asia. Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee have been highlighting this possibility for years. Apparently, our predictions are about to come true.

H.R. 3301 is about more than simply the Keystone pipeline. This legislation is about preventing the President—and future Presidents, regardless of their party—from playing politics with decisions that should be made on the merits of the project.

This President has repeatedly ignored the State Department's comprehensive environmental review of the application, which found that minimal adverse impacts would occur from the building and operation of a cross-country pipeline, and has instead decided to base the decision purely on those special interests.

This is not how major national projects should be evaluated in this country, and Chairman UPTON's legislation ensures that future decisions will be done without the shadow of politics looming over them.

However, although the legislation removes the politics out of such decision-making, it still ensures that other key safeguards in the approval process remain in place. Cross-border pipelines would still have to meet the Natural Gas Act's requirements, and they would still comply with all relevant Federal, State, and local siting and environmental law.

The Department of Commerce and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission both will play roles in this process, as well as the Department of Energy. Decisions must be made within a 120-day timeframe to prevent the types of delaying tactics that we have seen from the administration with regard to energy projects.

To be clear, this legislation applies only to projects which cross national borders and does not make changes to the application process for interstate and intrastate energy projects.

Mr. Speaker, both bills before us today are commonsense responses to the problems we have experienced when the President decides to play politics with the Nation's domestic energy industry.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying bills. First of all, this rule is not open, and it denies some important and germane amendments. This is consistent with the increasingly closed mindset of this Republican leadership.

I want to remind my colleagues that this is now the most closed Congress in history. There have been 62 closed rules in this Congress alone. That is a title I don't think either party would enjoy having, but this is the most closed Congress in history. Speaker BOEHNER, in his opening speech, said that openness would be the new standard. I guess he misspoke because that is not what is happening on these bills, and it hasn't been happening on most other important pieces of legislation. The approval rating of Congress from a poll, I think, Gallup did last week is at 7 percent. My friends can't blame that on President Obama, and they can't blame that on someone else. They are running the show here in the House. This is a reflection on the work or on the lack of work that is being done here.

I think the American people want a full and open debate on important issues. I think the American people want us to focus on things that will actually make their lives better and that have a chance of actually becoming law. We have millions of our fellow citizens who are unemployed, and we can't even get the Republican leadership to bring an extension of unemployment insurance to the House floor for a vote. We can't even get it on the floor for a vote.

We are trying to raise the minimum wage so that we are not subsidizing McDonald's or Wendy's, which pay their workers minimum wage. We are trying to give people a raise so that work actually pays in this country. We can't even get a minimum wage bill to this House floor for a vote. We can't even debate it, and we can't have a vote on it. They are blocking it.

We need to fix our immigration system. It is broken. An immigration re-

form bill passed in the United States Senate in a bipartisan way, and it solves many of the problems that some of my friends on the other side are complaining about, but the leadership of this House won't even let us bring a bipartisan immigration reform bill to the House floor so that we can vote on it.

It is no wonder why, under this Republican leadership, the approval rating of this body is 7 percent. I think that is history in and of itself. I don't know whether there was ever a Congress in the history of this country that had such a low rating.

Now here we are with this legislation, H.R. 6, the amazingly named Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, which would improve neither our domestic prosperity nor global freedom. Instead, it would undermine the Department of Energy's approval process for the export of liquefied natural gas. The current process allows the DOE to evaluate the impacts of LNG exports on domestic natural gas prices for consumers and manufacturers as well as environmental impacts.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Energy is already aggressively approving LNG exports. The amounts already approved for exports would transform the United States into the world's second largest exporter of LNG. Further, under the bill, LNG would not be exported any faster. I urge my colleagues not to be fooled by the rhetoric that you may hear on the floor today. Passing this bill will not magically solve the natural gas problem in Ukraine or in other parts of the world.

The other bill, H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, would dramatically weaken the environmental review process for trans-border pipeline and electrical transmission line projects. This bill, which is a blatantly transparent effort to "rig the game" in favor of the Keystone pipeline project, would preclude the Federal Government from reviewing a project's full impacts, including oil spills and the consequences for landowners, public safety, drinking water, wildlife, and, yes, Mr. Speaker, climate change. Let me say those two words again because I know that many of our Republican colleagues tend to stick their heads in the sand when they hear them—climate change.

I think it is important to say a few things. Here is what we know. We know that burning fossil fuels releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. We know that carbon dioxide traps heat. We know that the levels of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere are higher than they have been in 800,000 years. We know that 9 of the 10 warmest years since 1880 have been in the last decade. We know that last month was the warmest month of May ever recorded.

Yet, to hear some of my Republican friends, we should just move along—nothing to see here, nothing to worry about. There is no need to worry that

the Arctic ice sheets are melting, leading to rapidly rising sea levels. There is no need to worry about more severe and deadly weather events. There is no need to worry about profound impacts to agricultural production. At best, you will hear them say that the science is still unsettled. It isn't. Climate change is real—it is happening—and we need to figure out what we should do about it.

Sometimes they will say: Well, I am not a scientist, so I can't really comment about it. Mr. Speaker, I am not a scientist either, but I know that, if I drop my pen, it will fall to the floor because of gravity. No, most of us here in Congress are not scientists, but the overwhelming majority of the best and brightest scientific minds in the world have concluded that climate change is real, that it is happening, and humankind is currently making the problem worse.

It would be nice, given the enormity of this problem, if my Republican friends would work with Democrats and would work with the White House to try to fashion a response. Instead, they deny that it is a problem, and we get more of the same old-same old. I regret that very, very much, but I can't quite understand, Mr. Speaker, why my Republican friends continue to ignore this critically important issue. I hope it isn't because of their borderline pathological hatred of President Obama. I hope that it isn't because of the Big Oil special interests and the millions and millions of dollars they pour into Republican campaigns. Whatever the reason, I hope that future generations will forgive them, because this is something that we should have been addressing years and years and years ago, and the continued blocking of any serious attempts to deal with climate change by the majority in this House, I think, is unconscionable.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, vote against the rule because it is not an open rule, and a lot of germane amendments—they were germane—were not made in order. I am glad one of the authors of the bill got his amendment made in order, but he authored the bill, so I guess he gets special preference. There is no reason why all of the amendments couldn't have been made in order, and there is no reason why this couldn't have been an open process, because we are not really doing much this week. As for this legislation we are dealing with here today, my guess is it ain't going anywhere.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of a response.

Two months ago, in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, this House agreed to loan guarantees for the country of Ukraine as they dealt with an internal crisis in their country. It is interesting that, probably less than 24 hours after this House passed that loan guarantee, Vladimir Putin said: Do you

know what? Your natural gas price just doubled. In fact, next year, it is going to cost you an extra \$1 billion. So, in effect, he used natural gas pricing policy to offset the loan guarantees that we had provided to the country of Ukraine to deal with their internal problems.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that this Congress can adjust and affect right now. We can remove the stranglehold that Vladimir Putin holds over Ukraine and, indeed, over the entirety of Eastern Europe, and we can do it with the passage of this bill today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the rule for both H.R. 6 and H.R. 3301, and I will address both of these bills. I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 3301 and a recent cosponsor to H.R. 6 after we amended it out of our committee.

As for H.R. 3301, this legislation would create a North American energy market with our free trading partners Canada and Mexico.

If we want to create this market, we need to have statutory authority. It is true that the Presidential permitting process dates back through many administrations, but to really create this market, we need some certainty, and that is why it should be in statute. These past administrations were forced to use executive orders, but Congress has failed to act. Congress has the duty to regulate the commerce of the United States, and cross-border energy infrastructure projects fall well within that space. Unfortunately, cross-border decisions have now fallen victim to election cycles and political considerations. H.R. 3301 will resolve these issues and those proposed by the amendments debated here today.

Let me say that I wish we had an open rule. Some of the amendments considered by the Rules Committee I would have liked to have voted for, but let's not take that away from the quality of these two pieces of legislation.

H.R. 3301 provides for an environmental review of the cross-border segment of the pipeline. The entire length of the pipeline is reviewed for environmental impacts under existing law. Any time a pipeline crosses Federal lands, waters, endangered habitats, a National Environmental Policy Act review—also known as “NEPA”—must be completed by the Federal Government. Otherwise, the environmental permit must come from the State environmental agency if it is within the State. There are more than 40,000 miles of pipeline in the U.S. that have been constructed with in-depth environmental reviews. This will continue to be the case. H.R. 3301 doesn't take anything away except the State Department only has to deal with their responsibility in its coming from Canada to the

United States or from Mexico to the United States or vice versa. There will be environmental reviews by Federal agencies and State agencies, and this will continue to be the case.

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

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Also, this bill doesn't deal with the Keystone XL. Pending applications for permits are grandfathered into the current process, and as a fail-safe, we have pushed the effective date of the legislation back to July 1 of 2016. This legislation isn't about Keystone no matter how badly opponents want to make it. It is about future projects and how to meet the energy needs of the 21st century.

Let me talk about H.R. 6. H.R. 6 would actually quantify how this should be done on exporting LNG, and most of those permits are in Louisiana and Texas. Most of the responsibility is with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, and they take 12 to 18 months to do the environmental reviews. The Department of Energy's only responsibility is if it is in the national interest to export LNG. We are going to keep that in the law, but we want to make sure they give a 30-day response because they have actually already had a possible 18 months to review these applications.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have very little to add to what my colleague from Texas just said.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want my colleagues to understand why I think we should reject this rule. Let me just mention two amendments that were germane and that were brought to the Rules Committee by our colleague from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

One amendment clarifies that a viable merchant marine is in the public interest and should be taken into consideration when processing applications under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act. The other grants priority to the processing of approvals for LNG facilities that will be supplied with or will export LNG by U.S. flag vessels.

These are, basically, two amendments that are germane to this bill that would strengthen our shipping industry, and they were ruled out of order. For no reason, they were just randomly ruled out of order. Those are the kinds of things that Members of Congress do not have an opportunity to vote on when you close the process. Again, this is the most closed Congress in the history of our country—with more closed rules than any other Congress in history. So the tendency of this leadership, notwithstanding what the Speaker promised, which was to have a more open and transparent process, has been to become the most closed Congress in history.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that mirrors the bipartisan measure that overwhelmingly passed the Senate this month. It takes aim at some of the VA's most pressing problems, including the expansion of veterans' access to care, holding VA officials accountable, and increasing medical personnel and needed facilities.

This issue of the VA is something that we need to address. It is important, and it is something on which, I think, there is bipartisan agreement that we ought to focus on, and our use on this floor would be better spent dealing with that.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the Congresswoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

□ 1300

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4841, the bill I introduced to overhaul the VA. The Senate has passed this legislation, and now, we must act swiftly and pass the Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 without delay.

Over the past several weeks, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has held hearing after hearing on the multitude of issues that plague the VA. These hearings have covered everything from the gaming strategies to hide long patient wait times and bonuses received by VA executives, to capacity problems in the VA health system, and outdated appointment scheduling software.

These hearings clearly demonstrate that the VA needs an overhaul, and H.R. 4841 seeks to accomplish this. Our veterans have sacrificed so much for us. We have a moral obligation to ensure that sweeping reforms are implemented across the VA, making it an organization that exists with one purpose: to serve our veterans.

As lawmakers, we cannot address these multiple issues through piecemeal legislation. We must pass legislation that addresses the patient access crisis, manages patient care, and holds employees accountable.

H.R. 4841 addresses patient access by expediting the hiring of more VA health care providers and authorizes leases for 26 more health care facilities. It allows our rural veterans who have waited too long for appointments to see a doctor in their community.

It improves access to mobile vet centers for our rural veterans and expands access to survivors of military sexual assault. It strengthens partnerships between the VA and the Indian Health Services, an arrangement that is successfully working on the Navajo Nation in my district.

This bill addresses the VA's outdated appointment scheduling system and outdated IT infrastructure through a technology task force. It prohibits the

falsification of data to report patient wait times and mandates transparency by requiring the VA to publish patient wait times and data that measures the quality of care at all VA medical facilities.

It holds employees accountable by giving the Secretary the authority to immediately fire senior executives who fail to serve veterans.

This bill even helps our student veterans receive instate tuition at public colleges and universities and extends GI benefits to surviving spouses.

This bill is truly an overhaul of the way our veterans access care, of the way the VA manages care, and of the VA culture.

I will fight for the provisions in H.R. 4841 in the conference committee that convenes later today. However, a conference committee is not needed if the House passes this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. The Senate overwhelmingly agreed that these reforms are necessary, and now, the House must act without delay to make these sweeping reforms law.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The fact of the matter is that a conference committee is meeting on this very issue. In fact, they are having their first meeting this afternoon.

The issues of access, the issues of accountability for VA personnel who have not held themselves to high standards, those are provisions that have already passed the floor of this House, some on suspension and some under a rule.

These bills are before the conference committee with the Senate. It is appropriate that they be acted upon expeditiously, but in no way does defeating the previous question enhance that flexibility or the rapidity with which those questions are taken up.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I will insert into the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

##### H.R. 3301—NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

(Rep. Upton, R-Michigan, and 20 cosponsors, June 24, 2014)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3301, which would require the specified Secretary to issue a "certificate of crossing" for any cross-border segment of an oil pipeline (Secretary of State) or electric transmission facility (Secretary of Energy) within 120 days after the completion of the environmental review, unless the Secretary finds that the cross-border pipeline or electric transmission facility "is not in the public interest of the United States."

The bill's 120-day approval requirement would circumvent the current authority for

issuing Presidential Permits for cross-border pipelines and transmission facilities provided by Executive Orders 13337 and 10485, as amended, which allow for the full consideration of the complex issues raised by the building of such infrastructure. That process dates back through many Administrations and has effectively addressed cross-border permitting decisions in a manner that serves the national interest.

H.R. 3301 would impose an unreasonable deadline that would curtail the thorough consideration of the issues involved, which could result in serious security, safety, foreign policy, environmental, economic, and other ramifications. By preventing the opportunity for the necessary assessment of all factors relevant to the national interest, the bill would create significant policy risks and create legal uncertainty for permitting applicants. Additionally, the bill would prevent assessment of whether modifications to border-crossing pipelines or electric transmission facilities are in the national interest, which is provided for through the current process.

H.R. 3301 would also raise serious trade implications by eliminating the current statutory requirement that the Department of Energy authorize orders for exports and imports of natural gas to and from Canada and Mexico.

Because H.R. 3301 would circumvent longstanding and proven processes for determining whether cross-border pipelines and electric transmission facilities are in the national interest by removing the Presidential permitting requirement, if presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me just read one line here. It says:

Because H.R. 3301 would circumvent longstanding and proven processes for determining whether cross-border pipelines and electric transmission facilities are in the national interest by removing the Presidential permitting requirement, if presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

So we are discussing—we are spending time here discussing a bill that will probably not be brought up at all in the Senate and will be vetoed by the White House. So this is just kind of an exercise in futility, when we should be here trying to figure out how to deal with some of the bigger issues like climate change.

If you don't want to talk about climate change, let's talk about increasing the minimum wage. If you don't want to talk about that, let's talk about extending unemployment insurance for people who have lost their jobs.

If you don't want to talk about that, let's talk about immigration reform. Let's talk about something that actually matters, something that—quite frankly, some of the things that are urgent for us to focus on.

Instead, we get these bills that are being brought before us, under a restrictive process, again, which is in keeping with the mindset of this Congress, which is closed.

Notwithstanding what the Speaker said, that there would be this new commitment to openness, this is now the most closed Congress in history.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague from Arizona's motion because Arizona veterans demand immediate action.

At the Phoenix VA, managers and employees placed veterans on secret lists where they had to wait months to see a doctor. Even more horrifying are new whistleblower allegations that veterans died while waiting on these lists and that VA managers ordered the records altered to cover up these deaths.

This is not just immoral; it is criminal. Those responsible for this disaster must be prosecuted and held accountable. They should also take responsibility for what they have done to our veterans.

I call on the Phoenix VA management currently on administrative leave to resign immediately and return the bonuses they received over the past 2 years and the pay they have received while on administrative leave.

Ongoing audits by the VA and the VA Office of Inspector General reveal systemic problems with wait times, with the scheduling process, and with the honesty and integrity of the system.

In a letter to the President sent yesterday, the Office of Special Counsel revealed that the VA's procedures for responding to whistleblower disclosures are woefully inadequate. This is totally unacceptable.

VA and Congress must take action to provide our veterans the care they need now, recoup bonuses paid to VA executives who fraudulently manipulated the data, and fire VA executives responsible for these inexcusable actions.

I appreciate the bipartisan work taking place to reform the VA and to provide our veterans the care that they need. In fact, I cosponsored and voted for both House bills.

The bottom line is that there is bipartisan legislation that can help our veterans get the care they need and hold bad actors accountable right now, so that is why I support this motion to send a bill to the President's desk as quickly as possible.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Again, access and accountability are parts of the VA reform bills that have been passed by this House and currently that is in conference. Even today, they are having their first meeting of the conference committee.

I, too, wish the administration would fire someone for incompetence. Whether it be at the VA, the Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service, healthcare.gov, the list of incompetencies grows larger every day and just begs the question: What do you have to do to get fired by the Obama administration?

I have got to share with you something else. This Statement of Administration Policy—and this is the first time I have seen it here as we are presenting the bill today—but it closes with the statement: "Because H.R. 3301"—that is the permitting bill—

“would circumvent longstanding and proven processes.”

Proven processes? These processes are broken. That is why the legislation is necessary—because the administration refuses to act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I find it somewhat interesting here that my colleague from Texas is all upset about the slowness of the permitting process when it comes to these pipelines.

I think that there is bipartisan concern about the way the VA is currently being managed. I think there is bipartisan concern that we ought to make sure that the system is more responsive to our veterans.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK came to the floor and offered a statement, which will be the subject of the previous question, that I think makes a lot of sense. I mean, what she is talking about is a bill that is the companion to the one that Senator MCCAIN introduced in the United States Senate.

I am a little kind of bothered by the fact that there is not more impatience on the other side of the aisle to fix this VA system, to get it right. Again, you could point all the fingers you want at the administration, and they are trying to get it right.

There are things that we can do right now to more aggressively and quickly address some of these issues, and that is what Mrs. KIRKPATRICK was talking about. That is what Ms. SINEMA was talking about. That is what Senator MCCAIN is talking about in the United States Senate, Senator SANDERS as well.

That, to me, seems urgent. We ought to do this right now, and to kind of use the excuse that, well, we passed a couple of these things and maybe there will be a conference committee that will resolve all this stuff—let's just do it. Let's just get this done.

Again, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question, so that we can bring up the very legislation that Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Ms. SINEMA talked about.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Again, I would reiterate that the veterans bills passed by this House, passed by the House of Representatives, have now gone to conference with the Senate. The most expeditious way to accomplish the goals the gentleman referred to is for the conference committee to give its report and bring that back to the floor of the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just—I mean, there is just so much that I want to say here, given the

fact that there is so much that we need to do to help the American people, and we are not doing it in this Congress.

We are bringing up kind of the same old-same old energy bills that are going nowhere, that don't respond to the needs of our country, and certainly don't address the issue of climate change.

My colleague talks about how the process is broken. He says the Keystone XL has taken 5 years and counting and that shows that the process is broken.

Let me just say that that project is a highly controversial project, with significant environmental impacts. Because the Obama administration took the time to do the environmental review, we have more information on the project's impacts on climate change.

The State Department's final environmental review found that tar sands produce significantly more carbon pollution than conventional oil, that building the Keystone XL pipeline could allow more rapid expansion of the tar sands, and that this expansion would exacerbate climate change. That is something that we can't afford to do.

Last month, our Nation's leading climate scientists released the country's third national climate assessment. The report confirms that climate change is real, is being caused by humans, and is already harming communities across America.

The report tells us the scientific evidence is unequivocal. The impacts are being felt in every region. They are growing more urgent, and they are going to get worse if we don't act.

A record drought is continuing to destroy crops in California. Torrential rains have flooded Florida. Wildfires are getting more intense. Coastal areas are being inundated as sea levels rise.

No sector of our economy, from oyster hatcheries on the West Coast to maple syrup producers in New England, are untouched. Business as usual is no longer an option. The same old-same old doesn't work.

If we are serious about taking action on climate change, saying no to the Keystone XL pipeline, to me, is an obvious place to start; and the pipeline would produce more carbon pollution than any other project pending in the United States.

The additional carbon pollution from this single project is equivalent to building seven new coal-fired power plants.

Now, if we can't say “no” to this project on climate grounds, where are we going to draw the line?

□ 1315

So I commend the Obama administration for taking the time to get this decision right.

The environment matters. For years, my friends on the other side of the aisle ignored the environment. I mean, it was always that the environmentalists were the enemy. You know, being good stewards of the environment was

somehow a bad thing to do. Well, look at what is happening around us.

So I think it is time that there be a change of attitude, and it is time that we actually bring serious legislation to the floor that deals with, how do we meet our energy needs but how do we also deal with this issue of climate change?

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, the oil produced in the Province of Alberta belongs to the country of Canada. Yes, it may traverse the United States, if the Keystone pipeline is built. But if it is not, the oil will traverse western Canada and be shipped to China. The oil will still be burned. The carbon will still go into the air.

Who would you rather have in charge of the refining process: refineries in China who do not have the environmental controls, or refineries in Texas who do?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I am going to offer if we defeat the previous question in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question, and I urge a “no” vote on the rule.

Again, I just want to remind my colleagues what we would like to bring up. If we defeat the previous question, we will bring up an amendment to the rule that brings legislation forward that mirrors the bipartisan measure that overwhelmingly passed in the Senate this month dealing with some of the VA's most pressing problems. So that is why defeating the previous question would be important.

Let me just close by saying, again, on the environmental issues here, listening to my friend from Texas talk about the issue of climate change, all you hear is excuses why we can't do something, and why we need to do the same old-same old.

I have to tell you that if we don't deal with this issue sooner, rather than later, then history will not look kindly upon us. We may not have a history in the future if we don't address this issue sooner, rather than later.

This is a big deal. This is a big deal. This is something that we ought to be talking about on the House floor at this very moment. If you want to talk about an energy policy, we ought to also talk about climate change. But



yet there is nothing. There is nothing. It really is appalling.

And the legislation that is being brought before us today is going nowhere. So we are wasting our time talking about bills that are going nowhere. They are going nowhere in the Senate. The White House has already issued a veto threat. So we are just kind of spinning our wheels here.

Instead, maybe we could use this week to do something productive. If you defeat the previous question, we could actually bring up the Senate-passed VA bill and get that done and help our veterans. And get it done quickly. Maybe that would be a good thing to do. Maybe that would make this week worth it, rather than a week spent talking about things that are going nowhere.

So with that, Madam Speaker, I'm going to urge my colleagues again to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule. And I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, if it were really true that the actions we take here don't mean anything, then why did the Department of Energy suddenly release one of the export licenses merely on the fact that the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on H.R. 6, the bill offered by the gentleman from Colorado, CORY GARDNER, to require a time certain for the export license to be decided upon?

Why does the gentleman from New Mexico, Senator UDALL, have very similar legislation pending over in the Senate? I would say this is one proposal that perhaps has a very good chance of becoming law, even in divided governments, such as we have today.

On the issue of the previous question, I would remind the body that the most expeditious way to get to a solution for the problems that are being experienced by our Nation's veterans within the VA system is for the conference committee to proceed.

If we pass something today, it still goes back over to the Senate. It doesn't expedite a darn thing. The conference committee is the correct way for that to go. So I do urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of two key pieces of legislation to move our country toward a more energy-independent environment. I certainly thank Chairman UPTON and CORY GARDNER for producing bipartisan pieces of legislation to address real problems that have arisen in the permitting process, when politics are injected into what should be a merit-based system.

H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, are thoughtful pieces of legislation that deserve the support of this body.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 636 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4841) to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4841.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 184, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz
Amash	Bridenstine	Coble
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Bachmann	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Bachus	Brown (GA)	Collins (GA)
Barletta	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Barr	Bucshon	Conaway
Barton	Burgess	Cook
Benishek	Byrne	Cotton
Bentivoglio	Calvert	Cramer
Bilirakis	Camp	Crawford
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Crenshaw
Black	Carter	Culberson
Blackburn	Cassidy	Daines
Boustany	Chabot	Davis, Rodney

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

NAYS—184

Barber	Davis (CA)	Honda
Barrow (GA)	Davis, Danny	Horsford
Bass	DeFazio	Hoyer
Beatty	DeGette	Huffman
Becerra	Delaney	Israel
Bera (CA)	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Jeffries
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	Doggett	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Keating
Bralley (IA)	Duckworth	Kelly (IL)
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Kennedy
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kildee
Bustos	Enyart	Klimer
Butterfield	Eshoo	Kind
Capps	Esty	Kirkpatrick
Capuano	Farr	Kuster
Cárdenas	Fattah	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Levin
Chu	Gallego	Lipinski
Ciilline	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Clark (MA)	Garcia	Lowey
Clarke (NY)	Grayson	Lujan Grisham
Clay	Green, Al	(NM)
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Lujan, Ben Ray
Clyburn	Grijalva	(NM)
Cohen	Gutiérrez	Lynch
Connolly	Hahn	Maffei
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Maloney,
Cooper	Heck (WA)	Carolyn
Costa	Higgins	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Himes	Matheson
Cuellar	Hinojosa	Matsui
Cummings	Holt	McCarthy (NY)

McCollum Peters (MI) Sinema  
McDermott Peterson Sires  
McGovern Pingree (ME) Slaughter  
McIntyre Pocan Speier  
McNerney Price (NC) Swalwell (CA)  
Meng Quigley Takano  
Michaud Rahall Thompson (CA)  
Miller, George Richmond Thompson (MS)  
Moore Roybal-Allard Tierney  
Moran Ruiz Titus  
Murphy (FL) Ruppersberger Tonko  
Nadler Ryan (OH) Tsongas  
Napolitano Sánchez, Linda Van Hollen  
Neal T. Vargas  
Negrete McLeod Sanchez, Loretta Veasey  
Nolan Sarbanes Vela  
O'Rourke Schakowsky Visclosky  
Owens Schiff Walz  
Pallone Schneider Wasserman  
Pascrell Schrader Schultz  
Pastor (AZ) Schwartz Waters  
Payne Scott (VA) Waxman  
Pelosi Sewell (AL) Welch  
Perlmutter Shea-Porter Wilson (FL)  
Peters (CA) Sherman Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—28

Campbell Lewis Rush  
Cantor Loeb sack Scott, David  
Carney Lofgren Serrano  
Crowley Meeks Smith (WA)  
Edwards Miller, Gary Southerland  
Fitzpatrick Mullin Stutzman  
Hanabusa Nunnelee Velázquez  
Hanna Polis Williams  
Kingston Pompeo  
Lankford Rangel

## □ 1347

Messrs. GARCIA, GALLEGO, AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. LUETKEMEYER and TIBERI changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 186, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

## AYES—221

Aderholt Calvert Diaz-Balart  
Amash Camp Duffy  
Amodei Capito Duncan (SC)  
Bachmann Carter Duncan (TN)  
Bachus Cassidy Ellmers  
Barber Chabot Farenthold  
Barletta Chaffetz Fincher  
Barr Coble Fleischmann  
Barton Coffman Fleming  
Benishek Cole Flores  
Bentivolio Collins (GA) Forbes  
Bilirakis Collins (NY) Fortenberry  
Bishop (UT) Conaway Foxx  
Black Cook Franks (AZ)  
Blackburn Cotton Frelinghuysen  
Boustany Cramer Gardner  
Brady (TX) Crawford Garrett  
Bridenstine Crenshaw Gerlach  
Brooks (AL) Culberson Gibbs  
Brooks (IN) Daines Gibson  
Broun (GA) Davis, Rodney Gingrey (GA)  
Buchanan Denham Gohmert  
Bucshon Dent Goodlatte  
Burgess DeSantis Gosar  
Byrne DesJarlais Gowdy

Granger Graves (GA) McAllister  
Graves (MO) McCarthy (CA)  
Griffin (AR) McCaul  
Griffith (VA) McClintock  
Grimm McHenry  
Guthrie McKee  
Hall McKinley  
Harper McMorris  
Harris Rodgers  
Hartzler Meadows  
Hastings (WA) Meehan  
Heck (NV) Messer  
Hensarling Mica  
Herrera Beutler Miller (FL)  
Holding Miller (MI)  
Hudson Mulvaney  
Huelskamp Murphy (PA)  
Huizenga (MI) Neugebauer  
Hultgren Noem  
Hunter Nugent  
Issa Nunes  
Jenkins Olson  
Johnson (OH) Palazzo  
Johnson, Sam Paulsen  
Jolly Pearce  
Jones Perry  
Jordan Pittenger  
Joyce Pitts  
Kelly (PA) Poe (TX)  
King (IA) Posey  
King (NY) Price (GA)  
Kinzinger (IL) Reed  
Kline Reichert  
Labrador Renacci  
LaMalfa Ribble  
Lamborn Rice (SC)  
Lance Rigell  
Latham Roby  
Latta Roe (TN)  
LoBiondo Rogers (AL)  
Long Rogers (KY)  
Lucas Rogers (MI)  
Luetkemeyer Rohrabacher  
Lummis Rokita  
Marchant Rooney  
Marino Ros-Lehtinen  
Massie Roskam  
Ross

## NOES—186

Barrow (GA) Duckworth  
Bass Edwards  
Beatty Ellison  
Becerra Engel  
Bera (CA) Enyart  
Bishop (GA) Eshoo  
Bishop (NY) Esty  
Blumenauer Farr  
Bonamici Fattah  
Brady (PA) Foster  
Braley (IA) Frankel (FL)  
Brown (FL) Fudge  
Brownlee (CA) Gabbard  
Bustos Gallego  
Butterfield Garamendi  
Capps Garcia  
Capuano Grayson  
Cárdenas Green, Al  
Carson (IN) Green, Gene  
Cartwright Grijalva  
Castor (FL) Hahn  
Castro (TX) Hastings (FL)  
Chu Heck (WA)  
Ciocelli Higgins  
Clark (MA) Himes  
Clarke (NY) Hinojosa  
Clay Holt  
Clever Honda  
Clyburn Horsford  
Cohen Hoyer  
Connolly Huffman  
Conyers Israel  
Cooper Jackson Lee  
Costa Jeffries  
Courtney Johnson (GA)  
Cuellar Johnson, E. B.  
Cummings Kaptur  
Davis (CA) Keating  
Davis, Danny Kelly (IL)  
DeFazio Kennedy  
DeGette Kildee  
Delaney Kilmer  
DeLauro Kind  
DeBene Kirkpatrick  
Deutsch Kuster  
Dingell Langevin  
Doggett Larsen (WA)  
Doyle Larson (CT)

Price (NC) Schwartz  
Quigley Scott (VA)  
Rahall Scott, David  
Richmond Sewell (AL)  
Roybal-Allard Shea-Porter  
Ruiz Sherman  
Ruppersberger Sinema  
Ryan (OH) Sires  
Sánchez, Linda Slaughter  
T. Speier  
Sanchez, Loretta Swalwell (CA)  
Sarbanes Takano  
Schakowsky Thompson (CA)  
Schiff Thompson (MS)  
Schneider Tierney  
Schrader Titus

## NOT VOTING—24

Campbell Kingston Pompeo  
Cantor Lankford Rangel  
Carney Loeb sack Rush  
Crowley Meeks Serrano  
Fitzpatrick Miller, Gary Smith (WA)  
Gutiérrez Mullin Velázquez  
Hanabusa Nunnelee Walberg  
Hanna Polis Williams

## □ 1355

Messrs. CUMMINGS and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CUSTOMER PROTECTION AND END USER RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 629 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4413.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

## □ 1352

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4413) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end users manage risks to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, June 23, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113-476 by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) had been postponed.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-476 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: