

unanimous consent. This legislation is noncontroversial, and I urge the House to pass this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to commend my colleague, Representative RUIZ of California, for sponsoring this legislation, for working so hard to bring all of the diverse interests to the table, and for coming up with a noncontroversial, bipartisan solution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) to speak on his legislation.

Mr. RUIZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of my bill, H.R. 4867, the Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act, which is a noncontroversial, bipartisan bill that passed unanimously out of the House Natural Resources Committee and is supported by the Department of the Interior.

The bill would aid economic development in the city of Banning, California, through a land swap, supported by all of the parties involved. Currently, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and a private landowner, Mr. Lloyd Fields, would like to exchange two parcels of land which are nearly identical in size and value, but they are restrained from doing so because one of the parcels is currently held in trust by the United States on behalf of the tribe.

My bill facilitates an equitable land swap between the Morongo Tribe and the landowner to provide more consolidated reservation land for the tribe and commercial development opportunities for the landowner, the city of Banning and Riverside County.

The bill is consistent with the Department of the Interior's policy of promoting land consolidation within Indian country and facilitating economic development. We can all support this type of commonsense, bipartisan legislation for the simple reason that it benefits all parties involved and spurs job creation.

This bill serves as a model for how land use issues can be addressed by a community's coming together while upholding the sacred government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes.

I would like to thank Chairman Robert Martin of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians in the city of Banning for bringing this issue to my attention; my colleague, Representative PAUL COOK from California, for being an original cosponsor; and Senator BOXER from California for introducing the companion bill. I would also like to thank the Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs' Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member HANABUSA for holding a hearing on this bill as well as to thank Chairman HASTINGS and

Ranking Member DEFAZIO for considering this bill in committee and for their help in bringing it to the floor today.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 4867, the Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4867, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1617

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5682, APPROVAL OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 748 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 748

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5682) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommend.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. POLIS, my friend,

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.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years, President Obama, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State Kerry, and Senate Democrats have made sure that the American people would continue to wait for the Keystone pipeline.

The Keystone pipeline provides jobs, energy security, and perhaps most of all a closer and better relationship with our friends from Canada.

Mr. Speaker, quite honestly, the bottom line is we need to do business with our friends in Canada rather than friends in other places around the world who may be using that money that they receive for reasons that are not in America's best interest. We trust the Canadians.

Today we have a bill on the floor because we believe that House Republicans, being led by Dr. BILL CASSIDY, can lead us to a way to construct the Keystone pipeline, provide us with a closer relationship with Canada, and make sure that the TransCanada application to construct the Keystone XL pipeline will be done. That is why we are here on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

With that said, I rise in support of not only this rule that will provide the context for the bill but also the legislation.

Let me be perfectly clear today: this bill to approve the Keystone pipeline is a jobs bill. Over the last few years, too many Americans have been out of work, not always in the right places where jobs were available, but too many Americans are out of work, and this is an area where people are out of work and need the work and can get it.

Wages have been stagnant, and median incomes for American families have fallen because this administration and the policies of the Democratic Party have led to a stagnation of the free enterprise system, and an opportunity in particular in the area of energy has been a political issue rather than a jobs issue for the American people.

The Keystone pipeline would support tens of thousands of great-paying jobs and help resolve some problems in this area and across a multistate area of the West. Yet President Obama, Secretary Hillary Clinton, and Senate Democrats have stood constantly and consistently in the way of job-creating, shovel-ready projects.

For 6 years we have known that the impact of the Keystone pipeline would be positive on the American economy, with positive benefits that it would provide for the American people. For 6 years, we have known that the pipeline would add over a billion dollars of revenue to a tepid economy, a billion dollars in places where people are out of work, need work. And it can be done through efficiency and effectiveness of this pipeline.

Americans have been looking for leadership to secure energy independence, energy independence to where we no longer have to go across the oceans to receive the energy that we need. With this pipeline, it is an important step, I believe, in the right direction.

When completed, the Keystone pipeline will transport over 800,000 barrels of oil every single day. That is equivalent to half of our daily oil imports from the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, that is competition with the current system. That is how you get prices lower at the gas pump, by having competition, competition with the Middle East for the oil that we will use in this country.

This will further help lower energy costs for American families while helping to bolster our national security by weaning us off oil from nations that sometimes do not have our best interests in their own mind.

Instead of partnering with countries in the Middle East, the Keystone pipeline lets us work together with our dear friends from Canada.

By approving the Keystone pipeline, the Federal Government will reduce our dependency overnight while creating much-needed jobs and providing billions of dollars in economic opportunity in the USA.

We all know that Keystone can accomplish what the American people want, and that is that we need to work together. Mr. Speaker, we need to work together.

Finally, what has happened is that the Senate Democrats are asking for this bill. Regardless of the reason, what we are doing here today is to work together on ideas that we have been trying to push for a long, long time.

In September of 2008, TransCanada submitted their application to the Department of State to construct the Keystone pipeline. Yet the Obama administration has blocked and delayed construction of the pipeline at every single turn. Excuse after excuse after excuse rather than getting it done.

The State Department, led by Secretary Hillary Clinton and Secretary Kerry, has stood firmly in the way of jobs created by this project. They have held dozens of meetings and issued study after study, each of which confirms what Republicans have said all along, and that is, the pipeline will create jobs and inject billions of dollars into the American economy while doing so in a safe and limited environmental impact way.

Beginning in 2011, with Republicans, as soon as they won this body and became the majority, we started passing laws to jump-start the pipeline. Time after time I have been on the floor of this body—and, Mr. Speaker, you have stood faithfully in your chair to listen to the debates. It is you, Mr. Speaker, who has been behind this idea to make sure that we would keep it as a part of our objective. An objective for the American people, opportunities for the American people, and a friendship with the Canadians. Sadly, Senate Democrats have refused to allow even a vote.

Yet just yesterday the Keystone pipeline suddenly became a hot topic on the Senate floor. A hot topic because they want to get it done now.

Well, so what has changed? Last week, after 6 long years, Members of the Senate finally decided to listen to the American people. The House has been listening and acting for 4 years now, but now that the Senate is prepared to join us, we are here to work together.

The House is prepared to pass this bill from Dr. BILL CASSIDY, oh, yes, from an energy State called Louisiana. A dear friend of not only this body but a dear friend of consumers and families who understand that we need to reduce even further costs at the gas pump, that we need to be concerned about where we buy our oil and our energy and to make sure we are doing business with the friends and people we know.

So they can pass it and they can send it to the President's desk. We are going to send the same bill. Same bill they are doing in the Senate is the same one we are going to do here. We are going to get it to the President. No more delays, no more excuses. It is actually time to make the Keystone pipeline a reality.

Said another way, the election is over; let's get our work done.

I am proud that the House has led on this issue. I look forward to the Senate joining us. I hope the President will do the same thing. I hope we will sign another jobs bill that has been passed by the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

Last night, we got a notice that the Rules Committee was going to have an emergency hearing to expedite very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I was very excited. I thought we were going to deal with an emergency. Perhaps it was Ebola, perhaps it was dealing with the use of force overseas, or emergencies here at home like the thousands of families that are separated because of our broken immigration law or the emergency of balancing our budget before we leave the next generation with a burden of debt. I was really hopeful that the ma-

jority was ready to take on a pressing issue facing the country.

Sadly, I was too optimistic. I found out that the bill that was such an emergency, that was expeditiously brought before the Rules Committee and now to the floor is actually a bill that we have already voted on this Congress to bypass the administration's review policy and streamline the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Turned out last night's Rules Committee meeting was far from an emergency. The majority should not have waived clause 11 of rule XXI that normally requires 3 days to review legislation before we vote on it.

To be clear, we have not had 3 days to read this bill. Now, one could argue, since we have pretty much passed the darn thing before and it hasn't changed much, maybe we didn't need the full 3 days, but why are we doing another bill?

□ 1630

I truly hope we are not setting the tone for the 114th where great Representatives, Democratic and Republican, come from all parts of the country to tackle the issues facing our great Nation, balancing the budget, fixing our broken immigration system, and getting our economy moving; and we vote on the same bill, in the case of repealing the Affordable Care Act, 53 times in the 113th Congress.

One time, I understand. The House wants to do it, that is what the people were elected to do, if they believe that, and that is what a majority says, then do it. But what are the other 52 times besides a waste of taxpayer money?

The Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act being revived today is nothing new. Again, it bypasses the pending review process and would immediately authorize the TransCanada Keystone pipeline company to build an 875-mile pipeline from Canada through the United States to the Gulf of Mexico for the exportation of oil.

This bill would expedite a tar sands project without requiring a Federal environmental or administrative review process basically saying that those are automatically concluded and/or sufficient.

I asked Chairman WHITFIELD in our Rules Committee what their discussion with the administration was on this. When did they last have testimony, formal or informal, from the administration? Where is the administration in this approval process?

Mr. WHITFIELD informed me that there had been no updates from the administration that they have requested for 6 months, so for all we know, the President might be ready to approve or not approve this project tomorrow, next week, next month—I don't know—but it seems like the two branches of government aren't talking to one another.

Normally, if Congress is interested in where a particular approval process is,

we would hold hearings, and we would ask the relevant questions—what are the current sticking points, are there issues that are still pending—rather than bypass any legitimate issues that might still be there around the routing.

As many of you know, the routing has already been changed so as not to impact the Ogallala aquifer, and there could very well be other important issues that affect residents of the States through which the Keystone pipeline would pass.

Clearly, this project is a great favor to our friendly neighbors to the north, the great nation of Canada. The question that we need to figure out as a country is: Does it benefit America? Does it benefit Americans?

There are pros and cons. Obviously, if it goes in your neighborhood, it is not a particular benefit to you—or through your farm—and that was some of the issues that we heard from in the impact statements that are currently being reviewed by the administration.

There is a review process underway. We all wish that review process went faster. We all wish that NEPA would go faster. We all wish that a wide variety of review policies would go faster, but we don't know how that is going to be concluded, and I think it is important that, while they get through it as soon as possible, they are able to do so and take all factors into account.

If Congress wants to change the approval process for these kinds of projects, I think that is a legitimate discussion to have. If Congress determines it needs to reconfigure a review process for a project like this, maybe we would go into the statute and we alter the different agencies or we assign different responsibility or criteria.

That would be a relevant discussion to have, not bypassing something that Congress set up in statute. The President is doing what Congress told him to do in reviewing this process—not this Congress, but the underlying statute when it was passed.

Now, of course, there are a lot of issues around Keystone XL, and rather than interrupting the State Department's ongoing review process, Congress should allow all the relevant issues to be properly addressed around this issue.

I want to emphasize that the Republicans brought this tar sands bill forward just one day after China and the U.S. came to a landmark agreement to address climate change. Tar sands are a high-polluting fuel that, on a life-cycle basis, tar sands crude produces about 20 percent more carbon pollution than conventional crudes.

In addition, we have a study from Cornell University with regard to the effect of the XL pipeline on gasoline for American citizens, and top energy economists in this Cornell study said that if the XL pipeline is built, consumers in our country may end up paying 10 to 20 cents more per gallon for gas as a result of tar sands being diverted.

That is millions of dollars a year out of the pockets of Americans and perhaps into the pockets of wherever all this oil is going. But, again, of what benefit to America is this project?

There is also the simple matter of how a bill becomes a law, okay, so we have a House bill, a Senate bill, and let's take a wild presumption, maybe both Chambers will pass this bill. What happens next? It goes to the President. The President can sign a bill or veto a bill.

Essentially, the President can sign a bill approving the Keystone pipeline, which is something that he can do now without this bill. He can approve the pipeline, and if Congress goes through all this deliberative effort at taxpayer expense, talk, and votes and all this stuff, the President still has a decision.

Now, again, obviously, if there are two-thirds in both Chambers, Congress can seize power on a particular issue and exert its own will, but that hasn't been the case on these Keystone pipeline votes, and I don't expect it to be the case on this one.

So it is just an exercise in senseless hot air being thrown around the Chamber where we can pass bills and the same situation prevails if it passes or not; namely, the President can decide whether they want this to go forward or not. If Congress wants to alter that approval process, let's look at the statutory rules around how projects are reviewed for future projects and see if we can reach a bipartisan consensus about that.

I wish that this had been an emergency piece of legislation. I wish that we were tackling a potential public health crisis. I wish that we were tackling terrorism. I wish we were tackling balancing the budget, and I wish we were tackling securing our borders. But we are not.

We are tackling something that isn't going anywhere and, even if passed, will give the President the same choice that he has today, much to do about nothing.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, just so we really are a little bit clear, the President indicated last week what he might do on this exact issue of Keystone pipeline. He said that he would consider signing the bill if it creates jobs.

So, Mr. President, the study from your own State Department said that construction on Keystone would create over 42,000 jobs, so there is one answer to our President.

Another one, the President said he would consider signing the bill if it was good for the American people, good for their pocketbooks, if it were to reduce gas prices. Now, that is what the President said.

Once again, I have good news. Good news. Keystone pipeline will move up to 830,000 barrels of oil a day through an efficient process. Instead of it coming from halfway around the world,

which adds cost to the transportation, it will come through a pipeline and be here real efficiently, so I think we are in good stead there to meet the test for the President.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to let you know that I have got five or six speakers that are here who are excited about this opportunity for jobs, a jobs bill that is on the floor today and the creation of legislation to have the XL pipeline.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Raleigh, North Carolina, Congressman HOLDING.

Mr. HOLDING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of American jobs and increased and efficient energy production. For too long, approval of the Keystone pipeline has been delayed, delaying thousands of new jobs—42,000 new jobs—and our struggling economy a much-needed boost.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans, both Democrat and Republican alike, support building the Keystone pipeline. Why? Because it is common sense. But for 6 years, it has been delayed. The Keystone pipeline will create jobs, grow our economy, and help our Nation provide a secure source of energy that does not have to come from halfway around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am focused on building a stronger economy for American families, and job creation is a top priority to accomplish that. Approving the Keystone pipeline advances all of these goals. I urge my colleagues in the strongest terms to support this rule and support the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. POLIS. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the passage of the rule and H.R. 5682, the underlying bill. You first have to consider the opinion of the world's undisputed foremost climatologist, former NASA scientist Dr. James Hansen, the guru on this subject, Betty Crocker, Good Housekeeping Seal, one of the first scientists to warn of the dangers of burning carbon fuel.

Dr. Hansen is a member of the prestigious National Academy of Sciences, and he has likened the building and the use of the Keystone XL pipeline to the lighting of "the fuse to the biggest carbon bomb on the planet" and nothing less.

"The fuse to the biggest carbon bomb on the planet," that is Dr. Hansen. Dr. Hansen has warned the completion of this pipeline will only reinforce our dependence on fossil fuels, not strengthen our Nation's energy independence, as has been argued by some of my friends on the other side.

When you brush aside the studies funded by TransCanada and other oil companies and you analyze the pure scientific studies that have no political motivation, every analysis clearly

demonstrates that the Keystone XL pipeline poses major threats at every turn, in extraction, in transportation, in refining, and in consumption.

Nationwide, about 3.2 million gallons of oil spill from pipelines every year. Spills such as those pollute drinking water, ruin American farmland, potentially destroy sacred tribal grounds, and create an uninhabitable environment for our own homeowners.

In fact, in Kalamazoo, Michigan, there was a spill in 2010 of tar sands oil that cost \$1.2 billion and years and years and years to clean up. That is where the permanent jobs are going to be created, in cleaning up the spillage, and that is not the kind of jobs the American people want.

Building the pipeline carries the dirtiest oil from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico and is exactly the opposite of addressing climate change, which is what we should be doing today, and most of this oil will not go to America, but will go through America, endangering mid-America, and be exported overseas. There are no export restrictions on nondomestic crudes.

H.R. 5682 is a special interest earmark that will make the U.S. a permanent conduit to international markets for one of the dirtiest fuel sources on the planet.

My colleague and friend says that we are going to be helping our friend. Yes, Canada is our friend. We play hockey with them, basketball, whatever; but this oil is going to go to our other friend, China. This is about Canada shipping oil through America and endangering American lands to supply the Chinese with oil.

The Keystone XL proponents like to talk about these jobs it would create, but the vast majority are temporary. The permanent jobs measure but 35, and as I said, the permanent jobs will really be cleanup.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 45 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. As was mentioned by Mr. POLIS, these jobs are important if they are in transportation infrastructure. That creates real jobs in this country, getting goods to market, and my friends on the other side have resisted transportation infrastructure jobs.

Clean energy is permanent jobs. Wind and solar are permanent jobs. The only permanent jobs are the cleanups. When the U.S. and China have come together in historic agreement is not the time to light the fuse to the biggest carbon bomb on the planet.

For these and other countless reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no." It is time to return our focus to an issue that centers on true energy independence through renewable sources and greener, domestic energy production.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I think we are seeing the same heresy take

place here on the floor, and that is trying to scare people. It is Republicans who are trying to move a job bill, and jobs, the American people understand. Let's keep this thing right in the center of the table.

It is about jobs. It is about energy independence. It is about a working relationship with our friends. It is about lessening our dependence upon giving people in other countries in foreign lands our money that they don't always use in our best interest. It is about national security, and it is about a lot of things that make common sense. What makes common sense is not to scare people, but give them the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota, KEVIN CRAMER. He served on the commission up in North Dakota before he came to Congress, and he is a great young man.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. It seems it should be so unnecessary to have something that makes so much common sense become so historic, and yet, here, we find ourselves at a historic moment.

After years of debate and accommodation, the most environmentally studied and accommodated pipeline in the history of the world has been stranded on the President's desk, held hostage by Hollywood advisers and liberals, donors to politicians who either don't understand the issue or don't care.

□ 1645

But as signals of a possible vote in the United States Senate are being transmitted, the American people ought to find comfort in the fact that politics works, that when the American people speak, even the United States Senate listens.

So I am grateful that Congressman CASSIDY has brought this bill to the people's House, a bill that originated with my Senator, Senator HOEVEN in the Senate, so that we can tee it up for them this week so that next week they can do what they should have done a long time ago and pass this bill.

You know, I am a big part of the Keystone pipeline. When I was on the North Dakota Public Service Commission years ago, I carried the pipeline portfolio. I happened to oversee the siting of the original Keystone pipeline that goes through North Dakota and goes down to Cushing, Oklahoma. It crosses the border in North Dakota. It crosses eight counties in my State, 600 landowners' land. It crosses farms of farmers who know how to work the land and know the value of the topsoil and understand the value of the minerals underneath it. It crosses two scenic rivers and includes five pumping stations and runs 217 miles through my State.

I am proud to say that while not universally loved, not one inch of that pipeline through North Dakota required condemnation proceedings, not because I am a great regulator, but be-

cause North Dakotans understand value—the value of domestic energy, the value it has to job creation. And I want to talk about jobs in a little bit.

As vast reserves of oil are discovered and new technologies unlocked, energy security is within our reach this decade. The amount of oil that would flow to U.S. refineries in the Keystone XL represents 36 percent of what we import today from the Persian Gulf alone. The fact of the matter is that, today, over 71 percent of the Bakken shale crude that is produced in North Dakota is shipped by rail. Now, I have nothing against trains—I thank God that we have a robust rail system—but railing oil costs more. It is a little more dangerous. It is not as efficient as pipelines. It also requires trucks to get the oil to the rail facilities. Again, trucks are good—they are not bad at all—but they are not as safe or as efficient as pipelines, and they take a toll on our highway infrastructure.

According to the director of the North Dakota Department of Mineral Resources, Lynn Helms, approval of the Keystone XL will cause two things to happen, and listen carefully: 300 to 500 truckloads per day will be taken off of North Dakota highways, and there will be 10 fewer trains every week leaving the State. He also calculates that greenhouse gas emissions from rail are 1.8 times that of a pipeline and 2.9 times the emissions from pipeline transportation, and spills from truck transportation occurs at three to four times the rate of spills from pipelines. So yes, sometimes accidents happen, but they happen far more frequently with trucks.

Approval of the XL will result in 450,000 to 950,000 kilograms per day less greenhouse gas emissions in North Dakota alone, as well as significant decreases in dust and 60 to 80 fewer spills per year.

America's national security, Mr. Speaker, and America's economic security are tied directly to America's energy security. We can do a lot better, and we need to.

Now, the environmental safeguards in the Keystone pipeline—I said it is the most studied pipeline in the history of the world—they are rigorous and they are appropriate. They have been tested and they work. I can attest to that. I toured the Keystone during construction, and I met many of the men and women who worked on the line. Those, Mr. Speaker, are real jobs. Those pipe layers are real workers doing real jobs. The restaurant owners, the hotel owners, the retailers, the subcontractors, those are real jobs, and they should not be diminished by considering them something other than real jobs. We have the lowest workforce participation rate since 1978 in this country. Let's put people back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to stand here and support this rule and ask my colleagues to do the same. Support final passage. Put people back to work and make America more energy

secure and keep the prices low for the American consumer.

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

So again, I was excited that perhaps the Rules Committee was going to consider emergency legislation on public health or Ebola or the war with ISIS or our budget. How about a deficit of half a trillion dollars, I call that an emergency. Instead, here we are dealing with a bill, something that Congress already passed that even if they passed again would make the decisionmaker exactly the same decisionmaker we have today, namely, the President of the United States.

Rather than considering the Keystone pipeline bill—and if we weren't going to deal with one of the real emergencies—why not at least bring up bills that create new green energy jobs in our innovation and energy sector like the bipartisan Public Lands Renewable Energy Act that I offered along with Representatives GOSAR, THOMPSON, and HECK? The Public Lands Renewable Energy Act would expand renewable energy development and create jobs while protecting our Nation's public health and environmental resources. It would provide the framework for a competitive leasing system for wind and energy, solar energy, on public lands. The innovative leasing process would help move our Nation forward with clean energy development while providing funding for conservation, States, and localities. How about that? Let's use some of our great public lands that have good solar or wind characteristics for solar and wind. I think that would be a great bipartisan bill to bring up here today.

Another example of a bill that we could consider today that would create jobs and move to a renewable energy future is the Renewable Electricity Standard Act, H.R. 3654, which I co-introduced in order to boost renewable energy markets across the country. The bill would make sure that utilities generate 25 percent of their electricity from renewable energies like wind, solar, and biomass by 2025. It is a goal, and my great State of Colorado already has a 30 percent renewable energy standard. That legislation would build on the success of over 30 State-based renewable energy standards, including the standard in the great State of Colorado by creating a true national market for renewable energy. It would create jobs and save consumers money on utility bills, help keep gas cheap at the pump, and provide billions in local tax revenues for small towns while cutting carbon pollution. That, to me, sounds like a better idea than spending our time debating a bill that, even if passed, will leave the project that it is talking about in the same situation it is before the bill is discussed.

Instead, Republicans are moving forward on a bill that clings on to Big Oil interests and does nothing to make energy more affordable for American consumers, does nothing to move forward

to a clean energy future, and does nothing at all because, even if it passes, it has to go to the President to sign, who is currently the person reviewing the applications as we speak.

The emergency Rules Committee meeting and closed rule today does not allow me to bring forward the Public Lands Renewable Energy Act as an amendment. It doesn't allow me to bring forward the Renewable Electricity Standard Act as an amendment. In fact, the closed rule today ensures that no Member, Republican or Democratic, of this great body can offer an amendment to improve this bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to set the tone for the next Congress by rejecting this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, and I will tell you, we are trying to keep the stage set that we in the Republican majority are leading for jobs for America. We are leading to help gas at the pump be less than what it has been. It doubled under President Obama's watch because they have not done the things that would allow more energy to be gotten. Sure, it is being gotten now on private lands, but on Federal lands, we need to do the same.

Once again, the same old worn-out rhetoric standing in the way of jobs in this country. That is why Republicans are now here on the floor again today. Our last bill is about jobs, too, before we leave.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Gainesville, Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee.

I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 5682, to authorize the construction of the Keystone pipeline. You know, it is not every day that I come back—and we have been gone for awhile from debating while we have been out actually campaigning and listening to the American people, and the American people spoke rather loudly last week, and it is good to come back and begin to put into practice what they have said. In fact, it is amazing to me how debates that went on so far here and coming to the floor—in fact, from people that normally we never disagree on—I am actually bringing to the floor a little bit of bipartisanship here.

In fact, I know that some will think there is no better argument for the pipeline—in fact, there is no better one that I have heard than one that I read in the paper today from a distinguished colleague in the other Chamber just across the way who does not share the Republican point of view. He said in regards to the Keystone pipeline:

It would be a tremendous windfall for all of us. It is something we can count on. I can't for the life of me understand why we haven't, to date, been able to move this piece of legislation forward.

Well, good grief, neither do I. In fact, if I was to spend the rest of my 5 minutes just trying to understand why the Senate can't move bills, we would be here all night, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from the other side, the other body, the Senate, summed it up clearly. He said: I don't understand why we can't move stuff.

What I have also missed, Mr. Speaker, coming back to the floor of the House, is things that I have never heard before, I mean, not at least in north Georgia where I am from. When we talk about jobs—and I have heard it talked about here on the floor of the House this afternoon; in fact, it was said that this is a waste of taxpayer money. To bring bills like this up, that it is a waste of taxpayer money. What is a waste of taxpayer money is the House Republicans passing jobs bills for Americans regardless of their party, jobs for them, and having them sit in a Senate that never woke up. That is a waste of taxpayer money. Where do I go to get my money back from that side of the aisle?

You know what is another thing that is amazing to me today, I actually heard something, Mr. Speaker, and you may have to help me with this because I don't understand because it was just said here on the floor of the House that this bill was a special interest earmark. I have never heard jobs described as a special interest earmark. Are you telling me that the Congress, in looking to give people jobs, is a special interest earmark? I think that is exactly what we are supposed to be doing. Are you kidding? This is exactly what the election was about just a couple of days ago. It is exactly what the American people spoke of. It is exactly what they are tired of—of government standing in the way of jobs.

Emergency legislation, an "emergency rule," another term I have just heard on the House floor just a few minutes ago, that we were coming to the floor with an emergency rule and that we were going to do something special. Undoubtedly, they have never met somebody who does not have a job. I have been without a job. And if you were to tell me that I could get a job when I was looking for a job, that is emergency legislation. It is whatever it is, and I am looking for a job, and there are millions of families looking for jobs. Special interests it is not; it is the work of this body. And to say it is a waste of time, have we lost that much of our vision of what the American people sent us here to do?

Are there things that we could bring up? I appreciate my friend from Colorado. Are there a multitude of bills we could bring up? Yes. But as my parents once told me, they said: DOUG, that is the supper you are getting tonight. You either eat it or go to bed hungry.

The bill we have before us is a jobs bill—42,000 jobs—puts millions of people in jobs and the economy back together again in a way that helps our economy and helps the world, but yet

all we are worried about is what could be. Well, what could be is not good enough for somebody who can't pay their house payment, who can't send their kids to school. It is bad.

If you are watching and if you want to think about this right now, there is a clear difference. And the clear difference is that the Republicans have listened to the folks at the ball fields, have listened to the folks at the churches and the synagogues, who have heard "I need a job."

I want to work together for good jobs, and we will get to better jobs; but what is before us right now, Mr. Speaker, is this bill. This is the bill that is before us, and there is bipartisan support for this. And we can claim what is not in it. We can claim what it is. But I would never ever want to come to this podium, Mr. Speaker, and ever say that a jobs bill is an earmark, that a jobs bill is something that we shouldn't be taking up or that it is a waste of time, because when we say that bills like this are a waste of time, then we might as well say to people on the unemployment line, "You are a waste of time," and this Republican will never do that because the American people expect better from us. That is why this rule needs to pass; that is why this bill needs to pass; and that is why this Republican majority will do what it is sent here to do—govern.

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

Mr. Speaker, the other side here is arguing like somehow passing this bill would lead to this pipeline being built. That simply isn't the case. The current review process, the decision lies with the President and the Secretary of State. If this bill, in identical form, were to pass both Chambers, the President of the United States will have a choice—approve it or not approve it—the same choice he has now.

□ 1700

So in no way would this Republican bill that we are considering here today make a decision for the President. The President is elected by the people in the country. Congress itself gave the President the authority to review this bill. It only becomes law if he chooses to sign it.

I should point out that this bill exempts TransCanada from multiple environmental laws like the National Environmental Policy Act or the Endangered Species Act. If the President were to approve the Keystone project, it probably wouldn't even be by signing this bill. He would probably approve it without waiving those laws or perhaps different areas, or perhaps there are other issues that this body doesn't know about because Mr. WHITFIELD hasn't consulted the President on what the pending issues are in 6 months.

So again, as a Member of this body who is not on the committee of jurisdiction, I can't say that I have been briefed by the administration on what the pending issues are. Apparently, Mr.

WHITFIELD hasn't either. So let's find out what they are and are there additional areas that have to be rerouted, are there precautions that have to be made because of the high temperature of the tar sands as they race across our country.

Approving this Keystone XL pipeline, which this bill, again, would not do—it would simply go to the President who could choose whether he wants to move forward or not, just as he can now—but it would simply benefit foreign oil interests. The real issue is where are the benefits for the American people—the health and safety of the American people, the integrity of agriculture-based economies in the areas that would be affected. Does Congress really want to give TransCanada special benefits and exemptions or should they be held to the same standard as other important energy projects?

We need to help America grow renewable energy to wean ourselves off of our reliance on fossil fuels. If Congress wants to weigh in on how large energy projects should be approved, by all means, let's do it. But, quite frankly, you don't do it by presenting a bill to the President which gives him the exact same options that he has today. It doesn't move the ball down the road one way or the other.

I share the desire that my colleagues have that hopefully the process is nearing its completion. Whether that is a week or a month or 6 months, I don't know. Apparently, the committee doesn't know either, because they haven't asked the Executive. But I do trust that they are taking the factors that Congress wrote into law into consideration and, hopefully, will come to the conclusion one way or the other regardless of whether this bill is passed or not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas (Mr. BARTON). As the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, he knows about as much as anybody in the United States Congress about not just the needs of jobs and energy in this country, but, as the distinguished former chairman of the committee, he led this fight for many, many years.

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

First of all, let's try to define what this bill actually does. We have had a lot of rhetoric on the House floor the last 30 minutes or so. It is a pretty simple bill. It removes the President from the decisionmaking authority. He can sign the bill and it would become law; he cannot sign it after so many days and it can become law; or he can veto it—but he doesn't have to make the decision whether to build the pipeline or not. That is the first thing. It takes the President out of the decisionmaking

loop, except for the fact that he has the option as the President of the United States to sign the bill into law, veto it, or to let it become law without his signature.

Secondly, it says that if the bill does become law and the environmental groups still want to contest it, you get expedited judicial review so that we immediately get a decision. That is what the bill does. It is a simple bill.

A lot of the Keystone pipeline has already been built. From some of the rhetoric on the floor, you would think that it hadn't even been started yet. The reason the State Department and the President are even in the loop is because it is an international pipeline. Having said that, the international part of it has been built. The connection between Canada and the United States has been built and is operational. The part that is in question is within the interior of the United States of America.

If you were building a pipeline that wasn't connected to the Keystone pipeline as it exists, you wouldn't have to have the State Department review it and you wouldn't have to have the President make a decision. But because it is the continuation or in addition to an existing international pipeline, the State Department has to make a decision and, in this case, the President right now has to make a decision.

It is an 800,000-barrel-a-day pipeline if we make it operational. That brings oil from Canada into the United States where it can go to any number of domestic refineries, or it could actually, as has been said, it could be exported potentially. But in all probability, they will get a better market price in the United States down on the Gulf Coast and they would prefer to sell it here. But the market would make that decision, Mr. Speaker.

So, if at first you don't succeed, try, try, and try again. The House leadership, on a bipartisan basis, is going to send another bill on the Keystone pipeline to the other body. My understanding is that they are going to vote on it next week if it passes the House tomorrow, and then we will send it to the President. This would be a great Thanksgiving present for the American people, as has been pointed out: more job creation, more options for domestic refineries, potentially lower gasoline prices than they even are today for motorists and our consumers. It is a win-win-win.

There is no group in America that opposes it. Republicans support it; Democrats support it; labor unions support it. The only group is the radical environmentalists that probably make up 2 or 3 percent of the population. I just don't understand it.

I want to thank the committee of jurisdiction for bringing the bill to the floor, for the Rules Committee reporting out the rule. I urge a strong "yes" vote on the rule, and tomorrow I urge a strong "yes" vote on the bill.

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

What we have here is Congress trying to interfere with a highly technical review process that has already resulted in the rerouting of the proposed pipeline to ensure that the integrity of the Ogallala aquifer is preserved and that there are potentially other important issues to Americans that live in the affected areas where the pipeline would be built. Instead of hearing what those issues are or talking to the administration about what pending issues remain or are standing in the way of approval, Congress is seeking to shortcut that process, exempt the XL pipeline from the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act to immediately order it to be built regardless of the legitimate issues that should be waived.

When my colleague says, oh, somehow it is only 2 percent of the American people that oppose it, that is not the discussion we are having here today. It is not about who supports it or who opposes it. There needs to be the studies that are done to make sure that the routing of it maintains the health and safety of the American people, doesn't jeopardize the economy in the affected areas. Those are the issues that have already resulted in several changes of the plan and could result in additional changes to the plan of where and how the pipeline could be built. For Congress to somehow say we are just tired of dealing with the technical issues and we just want it done puts American lives at risk, puts America's health at risk.

We all wish that this process could have been completed 6 months ago, 3 months ago. We hope it is completed a month from now, 6 months from now. But giving the President the same choice he has today by passing this bill doesn't move the process forward. We should be taking advantage of our last few precious weeks before the end of the year to address some of the important pieces of legislation that the Senate has sent over, but somehow what we are debating, repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 53rd time or the Keystone pipeline again and again, somehow this body hasn't had time to even consider or debate or allow a vote on important pieces of legislation like the bipartisan immigration reform package that received more than two-thirds support in the United States Senate. There is a companion bill that is bipartisan that has been introduced in the House. There is a discharge petition at the desk for Members to sign to demand a simple up-or-down vote to fix our broken immigration system, secure our borders, reduce our budget deficit by over \$200 billion.

There is a discussion of jobs with the Keystone project. Well, let me tell you, this bill on immigration reform that if this body allows a vote on would create over 250,000 jobs for American citizens.

Or how about the Employment Non-Discrimination Act? The Senate has acted on a bill that would prevent an employer from firing somebody just be-

cause they are gay or lesbian. It shouldn't be any of your boss' business who you date or who you love after work. The Senate passed that. More than three-quarters of the American people support it. We filed a discharge petition on that bill. We would love to be acting on that bill here today instead of yet again shortcutting the process with regard to an oil project.

This Congress has been a frustrating Congress. Unfortunately, here in our final weeks, I hope we are not setting the tone for an equally ineffective and inefficient 114th Congress. The American people deserve better. It is time to move forward with the renewable energy agenda, with balancing our budget, with fixing our broken immigration system, with making college more affordable, rather than talking in circles about projects that are already under review and won't be any more or less under review if the bill passes because it requires the signature of the same President who is currently charged with making this decision under current law in statutes passed by the United States Congress. Let's not waste our limited time on bills that won't go anywhere and won't do anything.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform, to the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for that purpose?

Mr. SESSIONS. I object.

Mr. POLIS. Well, unfortunately, yet again, we have been stymied in our efforts to address a critical issue facing the American people with a bill that would create over 250,000 jobs for American citizens, would secure our border, restore the rule of law, and unite American families. That is what the work of Congress should be; that is what the American people want Congress to do. If the 113th Congress can't do it, I sure hope that the President moves forward with the powers that have been granted to him by Congress and that the 114th Congress proves to be better than this Congress is in its waning days.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much time I have remaining?

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we heard our friends on the Democrat side talk about special interest money. They were talking about green energy: \$18 billion a year is spent, money that would be spent like what was spent on Solyndra, sole-source contracts to companies that have gone belly up. Those are the ideas of the Democrat Party and the ideas of this President.

The ideas of this President are they have taken over 6 years—2,246 days—the President of the United States, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State Kerry, an administration that stands in the way of the operation of getting people jobs, of doing the things that the American people want and need. That is why what happened this first Tuesday in November, the American people said: We have had enough.

□ 1715

I, as a Republican, don't take it that we are just outstanding and they elected us. What they said is: We are sick and tired of the direction we're headed. We want serious things to happen.

We have a brand new Governor in Maryland and a brand new Governor in Illinois. There is a lot of information that is out there, ready for us. We Republicans came right back to work. The Senate is doing the same. They are trying to pass this. We are trying to take the exact same bill that we were asked to do, with the expectation and understanding it can pass this body.

It is a well-understood bill. It hasn't taken us 6 years—2,246 days—to figure it out. If this administration can't figure the dang thing out, they need to admit they do not know how to read or lead. And I don't know which one it is, but either they can't read or they cannot lead. They need to know that the American people expect us to go get the work done. That is what you heard Mr. COLLINS say. The Republican Party is up to the task. The Republican Party, through the leadership of JOHN A. BOEHNER and the leadership of what will be MITCH MCCONNELL, the Senate majority leader, is going to do exactly that.

We are going to take all the issues, including the one the gentleman talks about all day and every day—and that is immigration—and we are going to have an immigration bill. And we are going to do the right thing.

But today we are talking about jobs: jobs and opportunities for people that need them. We need competition for the price of energy. We need to make sure we don't depend as much on the Middle East and that we work with our friends from Canada. And it does not take the Republican Party 6 years, or 2,246 days, to try and make a decision. The Republican Party is here today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 185, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

YEAS—233

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

NAYS—185

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

Doggett	Lee (CA)	Richmond
Doyle	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	Lewis	Ruiz
Ellison	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Engel	Loebsock	Rush
Eshoo	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)
Esty	Lowenthal	Sánchez, Linda
Farr	Lowey	T.
Fattah	Lujan Grisham	Sanchez, Loretta
Foster	(NM)	Sarbanes
Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray	Schakowsky
Fudge	(NM)	Schiff
Gabbard	Lynch	Schneider
Gallego	Maffei	Schrader
Garamendi	Maloney,	Schwartz
Garcia	Carolyn	Scott (VA)
Grayson	Maloney, Sean	Serrano
Green, Al	Matsui	Sewell (AL)
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Sherman
Hahn	McDermott	Sinema
Hanabusa	McGovern	Sires
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Slaughter
Heck (WA)	Meeks	Speier
Higgins	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Himes	Michaud	Takano
Holt	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Honda	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Horsford	Nadler	Tierney
Hoyer	Napolitano	Titus
Huffman	Neal	Tonko
Israel	Nolan	Tsongas
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Van Hollen
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Vargas
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Veasey
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Vela
Kaptur	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
Keating	Payne	Visclosky
Kelly (IL)	Pelosi	Walz
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kildee	Peters (CA)	Schultz
Kilmer	Peters (MI)	Waters
Kind	Pingree (ME)	Waxman
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Welch
Kuster	Polis	Wilson (FL)
Langevin	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	
Larson (CT)	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta	Hall	Negrete McLeod
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Perry
Campbell	Issa	Runyan
Costa	McKeon	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	Miller, Gary	
Enyart	Moran	

□ 1745

Ms. CASTOR of Florida changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 517, I was detained en route from National Airport. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

SUNSCREEN INNOVATION ACT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2141) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2141

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sunscreen Innovation Act”.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF NONPRESCRIPTION SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Subchapter I—Nonprescription Sunscreen and Other Active Ingredients

“SEC. 586. DEFINITIONS.

“In this subchapter—

“(1) the term ‘Advisory Committee’ means the Nonprescription Drug Advisory Committee of the Food and Drug Administration or any successor to such Committee;

“(2) the term ‘final sunscreen order’ means an order published by the Secretary in the Federal Register containing information stating that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients—

“(A) is GRASE and is not misbranded if marketed in accordance with such order; or

“(B) is not GRASE and is misbranded;

“(3) the term ‘GRASE’ means generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs, as safe and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling of a drug as described in section 201(p);

“(4) the term ‘GRASE determination’ means, with respect to a nonprescription active ingredient or a combination of nonprescription active ingredients, a determination of whether such ingredient or combination of ingredients is GRASE;

“(5) the term ‘nonprescription’ means not subject to section 503(b)(1);

“(6) the term ‘pending request’ means each request with respect to a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient submitted under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act) for consideration for inclusion in the over-the-counter drug monograph system—

“(A) that was determined to be eligible for such review by publication of a notice of eligibility in the Federal Register prior to the date of enactment of such Act; and

“(B) for which safety and effectiveness data have been submitted to the Secretary prior to such date of enactment;

“(7) the term ‘proposed sunscreen order’ means an order containing a tentative determination published by the Secretary in the Federal Register containing information proposing that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients—

“(A) is GRASE and is not misbranded if marketed in accordance with such order;

“(B) is not GRASE and is misbranded; or

“(C) is not GRASE and is misbranded because the data are insufficient to classify such ingredient or combination of ingredients as GRASE and not misbranded and additional information is necessary to allow the Secretary to determine otherwise;

“(8) the term ‘sponsor’ means the person that submitted—

“(A) a request under section 586A;

“(B) a pending request; or

“(C) any other application subject to this subchapter;

“(9) the term ‘sunscreen’ means a drug containing one or more sunscreen active ingredients; and