

ENHANCE LABELING, ACCESSING, AND BRANDING OF ELECTRONIC LICENSES ACT OF 2014

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2583) to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission, 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. 2583

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 "Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014" or the "E-LABEL Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Communications Commission (referred to in this section as the "Commission") first standardized physical labels for licensed products such as computers, phones, and other electronic devices in 1973, and the Commission has continually refined physical label requirements over time.

(2) As devices become smaller, compliance with physical label requirements can become more difficult and costly.

(3) Many manufacturers and consumers of licensed devices in the United States would prefer to have the option to provide or receive important Commission labeling information digitally on the screen of the device, at the discretion of the user.

(4) An electronic labeling option would give flexibility to manufacturers in meeting labeling requirements.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO ALLOW ELECTRONIC LABELING.

Title VII of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 720. OPTIONAL ELECTRONIC LABELING OF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the term 'electronic labeling' means displaying required labeling and regulatory information electronically; and

"(2) the term 'radiofrequency device with display' means any equipment or device that—

"(A) is required under regulations of the Commission to be authorized by the Commission before the equipment or device may be marketed or sold within the United States; and

"(B) has the capability to digitally display required labeling and regulatory information.

"(b) REQUIREMENT TO PROMULGATE REGULATIONS FOR ELECTRONIC LABELING.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of the Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014, the Commission shall promulgate regulations or take other appropriate action, as necessary, to allow manufacturers of radiofrequency devices with display the option to use electronic labeling for the equipment in place of affixing physical labels to the equipment."

SEC. 4. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

The amendment made by section 3 shall not be construed to affect the authority of

the Federal Communications Commission under section 302 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a) to provide for electronic labeling of devices.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROVAL OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5682.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 748, I call up the bill (H.R. 5682) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5682

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

SECTION 1. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) FEDERAL JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any legal challenge to a Federal agency action regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act, and any permit, right-of-way, or other action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law, shall only be subject to judicial review on direct appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal,

State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided 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.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5682, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pipelines are the energy lifelines that power nearly all of our daily activities. Pipelines are a very safe and cost-effective means to transport the products that fuel our economy. In fact, pipelines today supply more than two-thirds of the energy used in the United States. The Keystone XL project will be a critical addition to this extensive network, increasing our Nation's supply of oil and, thus, helping to reduce the cost of oil.

H.R. 5682 closely follows H.R. 3 that this House passed last year. Since the passage of H.R. 3, the State Department completed its Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on January 31 of 2014. However, there has still been no action by the administration on the pipeline. There have been excuses, the most recent of which is pending litigation in the State of Nebraska. However, H.R. 5682 takes that into account and allows for the re-routing in that State. There is simply no further reason to delay this important project, especially given the numerous benefits it will provide our Nation.

This pipeline will be a boon to economic development. Of particular interest to taxpayers, this pipeline doesn't require one Federal dollar to build. Further, the very nature of infrastructure creates jobs, and the Keystone XL is no exception. The U.S. State Department reconfirmed all of this last January. The State estimated that the Keystone XL will produce 42,000 jobs and \$2 billion in employee earnings. This project will have a significant positive economic impact, including an estimated \$3.1 billion in construction contracts, materials, and support services. Furthermore, the State confirmed that the estimated total property taxes for the project will be over \$55 million spread across 27 counties. The State Department called this impact "substantial for many counties."

The Keystone XL pipeline is the most extensively studied and vetted pipeline

project in the history of this country. The project will include 95 special mitigation measures, including 59 recommended by PHMSA, to prevent spills and to make this the safest pipeline ever built. In fact, I would argue that we are facing a manufactured stalemate, one that could be described as "paralysis by analysis."

The majority of Americans knows this is the right thing to do, so the Congress, through this bill, will lead where the President has refused. This project will create jobs, improve the Nation's economy, strengthen our transportation system, and help improve the Nation's economic security.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman mentioned taxpayers. I think taxpayers might be concerned that this foreign entity which will ship our oil over 1,700 miles across America will be exempt from a fee that all of the American companies and others using our current pipelines have to pay because of a bizarre ruling from the IRS, which often makes bizarre rulings. Tar sands oil will not be required to contribute toward the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

I think U.S. taxpayers might be concerned that a foreign entity which is going to ship tar sands oil 1,700 miles through the United States to an export zone, in all probability to be processed and exported in a tax-exempt area, won't be paying much, if any, taxes in the U.S. except some property taxes, and it won't have to contribute toward this trust fund. In case there is a spill with this line, the U.S. taxpayers and other entities in the U.S.—mostly U.S. companies—will be liable to pay for their mess. So I have a concern about taxpayers.

Another part of this is three citizens of the State of Nebraska brought litigation because this bill would give a foreign entity the right to take their private property in the United States of America—in Nebraska—by eminent domain. I don't know. I am not aware of any other time we have given a foreign entity the right to take the private property of U.S. citizens. These same citizens won a case in district court, and this bill would essentially nullify the ruling that they won, which is still under appeal to the Supreme Court in that State.

So here we have a foreign entity that won't pay taxes that other oil companies and others who ship by pipelines will be required to pay, a foreign entity that will be given the right to take the private property of U.S. taxpayers and residents—and for what? Yes, there will be construction jobs, and jobs are good, but those are fairly ephemeral, and there is a lot of other construction going on, particularly in the fracking area and with some proposed liquid natural gas export facilities that will help provide employment in the con-

struction trades. In this case, there will be 35 permanent jobs for this tax-exempt sludge that will be shipped to a zone in Texas where it is most likely to be exported.

□ 1800

Do we need to export more oil, gas, and diesel from the United States of America? Is that going to help lower the price at the pump for Americans? I don't think so.

And, in fact, we are today exporting 422,000 barrels of gasoline a day, 1.3 million barrels of diesel every day, and yet truckers are still being pretty well extorted at the pump. That is 54.6 million gallons of diesel, and yet our truckers are still being gouged at the pump because there is a diesel shortage.

Well, wait a minute. We are exporting that, and now we are going to take this tar sand goop, process it in the U.S., and export it. That is not going to help the truckers. It is not going to help the American consumers.

And then there are some minor environmental issues. You know, tar sands do create 81 percent more greenhouse gas than most other forms of fossil fuel extraction. They are going to destroy forever large portions of boreal forest. Now, sure, that is a Canadian issue. If I lived in Canada, I would be protesting this. I don't. But we don't need to facilitate it in the United States of America by building a pipeline there.

They will use precious water resources, create huge waste pits that will be polluted with the extract, except for the part which is shipped south to be processed and shipped overseas.

So I really don't see this as something where we should preempt the laws of the United States. There were 2.5 million comments. Apparently the Republicans don't care much about the public comments. There are 2.5 million comments that are still being meaningfully evaluated that are raising concerns about various aspects of this project.

But here I will say, bad legislation; good politics. We are trying to help someone get elected to the Senate who is currently a Member of the House. The Senate is moving potentially ahead with this bill. So the House, with very little notice, decided they would bring up this bill which we have passed in one version or another eight previous times. So this is nothing but bare, naked politics and the use of the House to promote someone's candidacy to the United States Senate, which I think is really a disgrace to this institution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as was duly noted, this bill is about jobs. This will create jobs, tens of thousands of American jobs, which are long overdue, to enhance our energy independence and strengthen our national security.

However, today I want to simply talk about the safety of this pipeline. As the chairman noted, TransCanada has agreed to a number of additional mitigation measures to make the Keystone XL pipeline the safest ever built. These 59 special conditions were recommended by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and go above and beyond current regulations.

Several conditions will help ensure the use of high-quality steel welds, both of which will reduce the chance of a pipeline release. The pipeline will also include automatic shutoff valves and increase the depth of coverage.

In many places, the pipeline will be buried a foot deeper than the regulations require. Furthermore, TransCanada will provide enhanced right-of-way inspections and greater transparency.

I believe in an all-of-the-above energy solution which includes this important pipeline that will not only create jobs but will help us to be energy independent. This project will create private sector jobs while being the safest pipeline ever built.

This project, again, has been bipartisan. It passed out of three committees with bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation at a very important time, when we need those American jobs.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, would you tell me the time remaining, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. We have heard about the nature of this very dirty material that is dug, rather than pumped, and the fact that it will go through America, not to America.

Now, we might ask, on a day when U.S. oil production was announced to reach a 30-year high of more than 9 million barrels, why we would be even considering this. Well, it is not because this fits into our energy picture.

We will risk oil spills that are a mess to clean up. And we hear, oh, but oil spills won't occur. Well, the TransCanada pipeline, also known as Keystone, had 12 separate oil spills in its first year of operation, tens of thousands of gallons. It is hard to clean up. And, as you have also heard from my friend, this doesn't count as petroleum, and, therefore, they don't pay into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. So taxpayers are on the hook for this difficult cleanup.

But the real problem is none of these points. It is that it is taking us down the road where we should not be going. This is the most carbon-intensive liquid fuel—if you want to call it liquid—that we could possibly use. It is changing our very climate in ways that are deadly and costly. We shouldn't be going in this direction. It is that simple.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is baffling to me that after 6 years, the Keystone pipeline debate is still going on.

We have an opportunity to provide jobs, reduce our dependency on overseas oil, and spur real economic development, yet many would rather play political gamesmanship.

I am especially frustrated because I see the benefits the southern leg has already had on my district, and I know this approval will enhance those effects. This pipeline would provide high-paying jobs that are well above minimum wage—exactly the types of jobs this body likes to talk about. Yet despite the economic benefits this pipeline would provide, there has been zero action by this President and his administration.

So today I stand in support of H.R. 5682 as a call to this President and the Senate that it is time to approve the Keystone pipeline. If they truly want to help the American people, they will join us in moving this legislation forward.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering today yet another bill to force approval of the Keystone XL pipeline outside of the regular order required for all other international energy infrastructure projects.

This is a very early Christmas present from the United States Congress to one specific Canadian company. The vote effectively exempts TransCanada from the rigorous analysis and the permitting standards that all American companies are held to. Worse yet, TransCanada will be exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund that all conventional crude companies are supposed to pay into. So merry Christmas, TransCanada.

And what gift can we expect in return? Well, carbon pollution and heavy crude shipped through our country to export terminals and higher gas prices. Let's remember: TransCanada is on record saying that the Keystone XL pipeline would increase the price of oil in the United States.

So instead of rigorous, deliberative process, the GOP majority is rushing to raise gas prices in this country. This Christmas present to TransCanada is actually like a lump of coal for U.S. consumers at the pump. It is certainly a lump of coal for communities who are

sure to be impacted by this pipeline when something goes wrong. And it is absolutely a huge lump of coal for our global climate.

Congress should reject this massive corporate giveaway. We still have another 41 shopping days until Christmas. There is no need for us to play Santa for TransCanada today.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from western Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this is a jobs bill. It is a jobs bill not only in the House of Representatives, but it is a job bill in the Senate.

Now, in the House of Representatives, Dr. CASSIDY's bill is about creating tens of thousands of jobs for hardworking Americans. It is about an \$8 billion private investment that will not cost the American taxpayer one cent. It is about energy independence, and it is about America taking the lead in energy.

For 6 years, this House has passed pieces of legislation that would have created the Keystone pipeline. Every one of those pieces of legislation died in the Senate. Now, miraculously—and I will call it a job bill—the Senate now is entertaining this because of one job.

The tens of thousands of jobs of all these Americans, who you turned a deaf ear and a blind eye to, are now being answered by the Senate because of one job, one Senator who has the possibility of losing her seat because of the Keystone pipeline not being able to go through the Senate.

Isn't it ironic that we sit here today and we try to spin this into something it is not? It is truly a jobs bill. It is an American bill. It is a bill that is going to create billions of dollars in revenue.

And I would just ask my friends on the other side: Please look no further than last Tuesday. Last Tuesday's vote was a referendum on incompetency, not on incumbents.

I would like you to please open your eyes and your ears to the American people and let them rise. Let us create jobs. Let us reach the energy independence that we need to succeed in the global economy.

This is tomfoolery, what is going on tonight. Is it really about one job in the Senate or is it about thousands of Americans who have been held hostage by an administration that refuses to move forward a jobs bill in a time when they said we have created thousands or saved jobs?

The one job they are trying to save right now is in the Senate, ladies and gentlemen. It has nothing to do with policy. It is all politics.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCALLISTER).

Mr. MCALLISTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 6 years since the

application was filed for the Keystone pipeline.

This is my background. This is where I made my living to come up. Despite the opposition from environmental groups, the benefits of the pipeline will far outweigh any potential negative impacts. Approval of this should be a no-brainer.

Construction will lead to thousands of jobs, well paying jobs at a time when Americans are struggling to find work. Importing an efficient, reliable source of energy has the potential to decrease gas prices in the future, expand oil refineries along the gulf coast, and lessens our dependence on foreign energy sources.

In addition to the economic upsurge, this pipeline signifies a secure source of energy for our country, if needed. It is not merely an economic issue but a security issue as well. And each day that it is delayed is another day thousands of Americans are out of work.

I challenge you, Mr. Speaker: for those that say these are temporary jobs, talk to the men and women where I come from who have bought cars, bought houses, put children through college with these temporary jobs, as you call them. What, are they temporary legacies? Are they temporary retirements? Because that is what our community is built on.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCALLISTER. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman CASSIDY, for introducing this bill, which not only fulfills the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 but also protects the rights of private property owners should they be affected by the pipeline route.

With my past experience in pipeline construction, I can say that this project is no different from the thousands of other pipelines we lay each year—with one exception: it crosses national borders, giving President Obama the ability to delay it. The President is making political promises when it should be deemed practical.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let's just sum up.

We have the most carbon-intensive way of creating ultimately diesel and gasoline by extracting these tar sands. They contribute 81 percent more greenhouse gases. Of course many on the other side believe that greenhouse gases are potentially beneficial or aren't a problem.

We have a foreign entity here that will be exempt from paying taxes, like U.S. entities do, into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. And U.S. taxpayers will be stuck with the bill should a spill occur.

We have a foreign entity—granted, they are our friends and neighbors in Canada—but still, a foreign private corporation being given the right of eminent domain over citizens of the State of Nebraska.

□ 1815

We have, in fact, this company saying that it is likely, if this pipeline is completed, that gasoline prices will go up in Midwestern areas of the United States and their production will be exported from the United States; so it is not going to be a direct benefit to Americans or deal with energy independence, which we heard earlier.

Of course, we are cutting short the evaluation process that every other energy-producing entity in America has to go through in terms of environmental reviews, and of course, we are cutting off any meaningful consideration of the 2.5 million comments that have been received by the State Department.

But, hey, it could help a House Member beat a Senate Member and get elected to the Senate, so I guess it is a bad bill whose time has come.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate the numerous benefits this project will bring to our country, including jobs, energy security, safety, efficiency, and I would argue that more supplies of oil generally drive prices down, not up.

First, this pipeline safety, it is officially moved through this country safely. It is the safest way to move these products. There have been numerous additional mitigation measures. The State Department said it will reduce the risk of release.

Second, the State Department has explained this project will create over 40,000 jobs, over \$3 billion in construction contracts.

Finally, as I said, from sourcing more crude oil from our friendly neighbor in the north, it will reduce our reliance and most likely reduce the cost of energy to the American people.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of our Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BILL CASSIDY, the author of this bill, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a real leader in trying to build about energy independence in America.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 6 years since backers of the Keystone XL pipeline first submitted an application to the U.S. State Department, on September 19, 2008, to build this energy infrastructure project and bring jobs and greater energy security to America.

Now, building the Keystone XL pipeline would create more than 40,000 average annual jobs over a 1- to 2-year construction period, putting \$2 billion into workers' and their families' pockets and giving a much-needed boost to the American construction sector.

In addition, tens of thousands of jobs would be supported throughout the supply chain, jobs for manufacturers

that make the steel pipe, the thousands of fittings, valves, pumps, control, and safety devices required for a major pipeline.

In addition to my home State of Louisiana, manufacturers in Georgia, West Virginia, and throughout the country would benefit from the construction of this infrastructure project.

Now, economists have found that the pipeline would create 20,000 manufacturing jobs, an additional 118,000 spin-off jobs, including jobs within the U.S. refinery and petrochemical facilities. This would employ and improve the jobs for Americans who right now are struggling.

Refiners in Louisiana and along the gulf coast would benefit from a reliable supply of heavy crude transported through the Keystone XL pipeline. These petrochemical plants employing the families that right now are having the hardest time in this economy, this gives them those better jobs.

The final State Department review found the pipeline would create over 40,000 jobs without significant environmental impact.

Now, note, Canada's oil sands are going to be developed with or without this pipeline. The Canadian Government is already on record stating that oil sands derived from crude oil will be exported to overseas markets like China. It will be shipped on rail and in oil tankers, which may actually increase greenhouse gas emissions versus transportation to the U.S. by pipeline.

Now, the case for proving the Keystone XL pipeline is clear and obvious, so why hasn't the President approved it? And, up to this point, why hasn't Senator REID allowed a vote on approving Keystone? If there was ever legislation that should not be difficult to get through the Senate, it is the Keystone XL pipeline.

By the way, Pew Research reports that over 60 percent of Americans support it, as do major labor unions, every State along the pipeline's route, and a majority of the House of Representatives on eight separate occasions voting on similar bills in the affirmative.

So here we are on the ninth attempt. It has been 539 days, about a year and a half, since the House first sent a Keystone approval bill to the Senate in this Congress. That legislation could have been considered, amended, passed, or completely replaced; yet the bill has collected dust on Senator REID's desk. The bill considered today that I introduced is the language asked for by the Senate.

So we are going to make it as easy as possible for the Senate to finally get a bill to the President's desk that approves this long overdue Keystone XL pipeline.

Thanks to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Natural Resources Committee, the Rules Committee, and House leadership for working with me to clear a path for this expedited consideration.

Upon passage of this bill in the House, it will go to the Senate for approval, then to the President, where I hope he signs H.R. 5682 into law.

I want to thank Chairmen UPTON, WHITFIELD, SHUSTER, SESSIONS, and HASTINGS for their work on this important legislation.

I particularly want to thank the American people for sending a signal in this last election that they want us in Washington, D.C., to work together to accomplish commonsense legislation that will create jobs for families which are struggling now, but because of legislation like this, we will have more opportunity and a better future. This is a perfect example of what the American people have asked us to do.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in approving the Keystone XL pipeline to finally provide 40,000 promised jobs to the American people.

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

Today, we are voting once again to grant special treatment to TransCanada's Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. This is the third time this Congress and the eighth time since Republicans took control of the House.

Instead of helping families deal with pressing problems, we are helping Canadian tar sands producers and pipeline builders. We are spending our time trying to exempt a foreign company from the rules that every other company in America has to follow.

This bill is not an energy policy. It is about a single pipeline that will allow Canadian tar sands to flow across our country for export to other countries. That is oil going through the United States but not to the United States.

We don't need this oil. We have our own sources of oil, and we are using less oil because of our efficiency in new cars getting better mileage.

This bill will not lower gasoline prices by a single penny. It may even raise them in some places. It will, at most, create just a few dozen permanent jobs. There will be some temporary jobs for construction. Once they are gone, they are gone.

This bill is a regulatory earmark. It will waive applicable environmental review requirements and risk our farmlands and our water supplies. In fact, it even exempts the Keystone pipeline from paying into the oil spill fund that other oil companies have to contribute to.

That means if there is a problem with that pipeline, well, there is no payment by Keystone XL to that fund to make those who are hurt whole. That means that if there is a spill, there won't be the money to clean it up.

The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is a terrible deal for America. We get all the risks while the oil companies reap the rewards. But even if you support it, this bill is a harmful and unnecessary piece of legislation.

The State Department is carrying out their review of this highly controversial project. They have got millions of comments, and the Federal

agencies are reviewing these comments.

H.R. 5682 would approve the pipeline by fiat, lock out the public, eliminate the President's authority to balance competing interests, and stop Federal agencies from ensuring that if the project does go forward, we do it as safely as possible.

Forget about those comments. We will just pass a bill and make it happen rather than consider all the other issues that would be appropriate to look at in approving or disproving this pipeline.

I oppose this legislation for all these reasons. There is one more important reason why I oppose the bill. The tar sands pipeline will worsen climate change. Keystone XL would create a dependence on tar sands crude, reversing the carbon pollution reductions we have been working so hard to accomplish.

According to some experts, building the Keystone XL pipeline will triple production of the tar sands. That is totally inconsistent with any future scenario for avoiding catastrophic climate.

Just this week, the United States and China agreed to mutual pledges to fight climate change, and I commend President Obama and President Xi for that accomplishment.

This is a really important development. For the last two decades, antagonisms between the United States and China have stymied efforts to reach a global climate agreement. Those days, we hope, are finally over. The U.S. and China are now both pledging strong joint action. The world has been waiting decades for the U.S. and China to reach an understanding on climate.

Now that moment has finally arrived; yet instead of working on a real energy policy, one that would move us toward a new, low carbon energy future, instead of working on a clean energy future that would create lots of new jobs, real jobs, permanent jobs, and keep pace with China's clean energy investments, instead of trying to protect our irreplaceable environment and our drinking water supplies, Republicans have set their sights on passing a special law for a special interest.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip and member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a strong leader for energy independence for America.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WHITFIELD for yielding, and I especially want to thank my colleague from Louisiana, Congressman CASSIDY, for the leadership that he had in fighting hard to get this bill brought to the floor so we can finally get the Keystone pipeline built.

If you look at this issue, this is all about jobs, and it is all about Amer-

ican energy security, Mr. Speaker. What does the Keystone pipeline mean for America? According to the Obama administration, 40,000 jobs will be created here in America, good jobs that our economy needs.

In fact, this is not a partisan issue; this is a very bipartisan issue. Republicans and Democrats alike have come together and said, "Build the Keystone pipeline." Even the labor unions have said, "Build the Keystone pipeline."

Unfortunately, just a small group of radical environmental extremists have held this project hostage, and President Obama has hidden behind studies and subterfuge to say, "Don't do it."

Now, Congress can come together in a bipartisan way and say, "Let's get this thing done." Let's actually work with Canada, who is a friend, Mr. Speaker, and bring almost a million barrels a day of oil from Canada that we will no longer need to get from countries who don't like us. This isn't about a million new barrels coming into America; it is about deciding who we are going to do business with.

When we trade with Canada, we get about 80 cents on the dollar back. When we send billions of dollars to Middle Eastern countries, sometimes that money is used against us, against our troops, and we get less than 50 cents on the dollar back.

Everything about this says do it, says "yes." Stop staying "no" to American jobs. Stop saying "no" to American energy security.

□ 1830

This is an issue that brings people together, and there was a message that the American people sent last week. They don't want a go-alone President. They want a Washington that can work for them. This is a classic example of how Republicans and Democrats can come together and say "yes" to a project that creates good jobs for our country and creates American energy security for our Nation.

The time for studies is over. This has been studied to death for 6 years. Everybody that looks at this says, "You have got to do it." All we are saying is let the United States agree with Canada to cross the border. They still have to get the permits from each State that this pipeline would go through and all those great jobs that would come with that pipeline and the billions of dollars of private investment.

The time for studying is over, Mr. Speaker. It is time for action. It is time for those great American jobs. It is time to say "yes" to the Keystone pipeline. I urge approval from my colleagues for this bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the last gentleman that spoke said everybody is for this.

Well, everybody in Louisiana is clearly for it. The Senator from Louisiana has been a strong supporter of it, and the would-be replacement Senator is strongly for it. The Republican whip from Louisiana is strongly for it. The oil companies are strongly for it.

But to say that those who oppose it are radical environmental extremists seems to me quite a stretch. There are a lot of very responsible people against this legislation, even some who support the pipeline, because they would argue this is not the way to make a decision: put a bill on the floor, to ignore all the comments, all the evaluations, all the considerations.

The people in Nebraska are not going to be happy about that. Maybe in Louisiana, they will be, but other places would like to know that pipelines are safe and their aquifers for drinking water are not going to be jeopardized.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), a distinguished member of our committee who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to begin by thanking the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. WAXMAN, for his outstanding leadership on this and other matters that have come before the Energy and Commerce Committee. I want to say to him that his leadership has been inspiring on so many issues.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with the process that the majority's side has undertaken in order to hastily bring H.R. 5682 to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Keystone pipeline is not key to America's energy future. If we just disregard the merits or the lack thereof of the Keystone pipeline itself, the majority just recently in the past couple of weeks has made promises to the American people that it will return to regular order for bills to be brought to the floor of this Congress. Mr. Speaker, here we are once again: promises made, promises broken. This bill was brought to this floor after 1 hour—1 measly hour—of debate and without the ability for the minority side to bring forth any amendments. Not one amendment can we bring to this bill. Where is the promise of bipartisanship of the other side on this particular matter regarding this bill?

Promises made to the American people equals promises broken by the majority.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will automatically approve the Keystone XL pipeline even though this pipeline has no legal route through the State of Nebraska, where there is a case pending in a court before a local judge regarding some of the siting issues that surround this illegal pipeline. Why can't the people of Nebraska, the citizens of Nebraska, have the time and the consideration just to make sure that this pipeline is safe for them and their aquifers and also for their environment? There are other States that this pipeline is going to be traveling through.

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

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, as President Obama pointed out, there is an independent process taking place, and this

bill shortcuts the approval process and would allow, Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow a foreign company to preemptively seize property from American people, from the landowners, particularly those in Nebraska.

Additionally, this bill seeks to usurp the President's ability and authority to ultimately approve or reject the project and instead uses this pipeline as a political football to score some elective advantages.

Mr. Speaker, eight times we have brought this bill or a version of this bill to the floor. Eight times. Don't we get it. As the popular TV series used to pronounce to us all, "eight is enough." Eight is enough.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, this week the House will pass a bill to complete the Keystone pipeline system. The first pipeline in the system is known only as Keystone. That pipeline has been sending 600,000 barrels a day from Canada to Patoka, Illinois. It has been 4 years and counting, and the water in Nebraska is still clean.

The second pipeline in this system is called the Keystone XL. It sends the same oil into America as the Keystone does but on a slightly longer and different route.

Secretary Clinton twice has approved Keystone XL. Secretary Kerry has approved it once. And yet the Politician in Chief has threatened to veto the Keystone XL pipeline.

Canada will export their oil. Either it comes to America or it goes to China. President Obama has a simple choice: oil for America or oil for China. Oil for America or oil for China.

Please join Congress in choosing America.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WHITFIELD.

Mr. Speaker, for years I and Members of this body have come to the floor in support of the Keystone pipeline project, asking for the Senate and the White House to put politics aside in favor of this critical project.

With bipartisan support, the House has passed eight separate pieces of legislation to clear the way for the approval of the most studied pipeline in American history. Yet each time these measures were blocked in the Senate and condemned by a President crippled

by indecision on a project that would put tens of thousands of Americans to work. So once again I rise in support of the Keystone XL pipeline, joining my colleagues in both parties in backing H.R. 5682, which would immediately certify the Secretary of State's final environmental impact statement from nearly a year ago and truly put our Nation on a course toward American energy independence.

Sadly, while the House has continued to take definitive bipartisan action to advance this critical goal, it appears the Senate has waited only until it is politically advantageous to do so, even as it enjoys majority support in that Chamber.

While I am pleased about the Senate's newfound interest in the wide-ranging benefits of this commonsense project which will grow our economy and strengthen our national security, it is a shame that it took election-year politics and not the best interests of American workers and the families that they represent for Senate leaders to act.

This pipeline is a vital piece of a plan that creates better jobs and more opportunity. I encourage the Senate and President to deliver on the promise of embracing an all-of-the-above energy strategy that works for the American people.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for so much, including his voice and his leadership on this issue.

There are three numbers that we all ought to know as we consider this bill approving the Keystone XL:

2 degrees Celsius—the amount the Earth can warm before climate change becomes truly catastrophic and irreversible;

565 gigatons—the amount of carbon dioxide that can be emitted before we reach irreversible global warming;

240 gigatons—the amount of carbon that would be emitted if the Alberta tar sands are fully developed, nearly half of all the carbon the world can burn.

Keystone XL is the fastest and perhaps the only way to fully develop the Alberta tar sands.

Keystone XL would move almost 1 million barrels per day of the dirtiest oil on Earth directly through the middle of our country. It would pass through some of our Nation's most important land and water sources, including the Ogallala Aquifer, which supplies 30 percent of the United States' irrigation and drinking water to millions of Americans.

And those who claim there is no serious risk of a spill have a very short memory. There were 12 spills in the first year of operation of the original Keystone pipeline, and there have been 30 spills in just over 4 years.

So what I am saying today is that this is dangerous, and it is also not the

best way to create jobs. Three times as many jobs are created for every dollar invested in renewable energies over the pipeline. And so if we want jobs, if we want clean energy, we want a good environment, we should vote down this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers and I think I have the right to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

This legislation is very likely going to be approved, and that is sad for a number of reasons.

□ 1845

Let me just declare here what I declare in my district and anywhere else. I believe in earmarks because I think it is constitutional. I think it is almost politically obscene to give what the Constitution says is our responsibility to the White House no matter who is there. That is why I have some serious concerns about this 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.

This is an earmark for TransCanada. Maybe the worst abuse in this legislation is that it exempts TransCanada from all Federal permitting requirements and other Federal environmental laws. Other U.S. companies will have to abide by laws that we will exempt for TransCanada. It exempts TransCanada from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which helps the government respond to oil spills.

Now, this particular company already has had major oil spills. We will have oil spills. So what we are saying when we approve this legislation are these things:

One, we are going to give an earmark to TransCanada. It is okay give it an earmark, special interest earmark, but we just can't do it here in the United States;

Number two, we are saying that TransCanada will have the ability to bypass environmental laws that Americans cannot bypass;

And number three, we are saying that this company does not have to pay one penny into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which means that the people who are watching this debate tonight will pay when an oil spill occurs, and I think that is obscene.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how many minutes I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining.

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

I would like to, first of all, thank Mr. WAXMAN of California for the many

contributions that he has made while a Member of the House of Representatives. I have had the opportunity to serve with him on the Energy and Commerce Committee for many years. He has very strong beliefs; he is committed; and I just want to wish him the very best in his future endeavors. I know that he won't be retiring. He'll be very active in some worthwhile cause, and I just want to tell him how much we admire and respect the work that he did. Although I personally didn't agree philosophically with some of it, as I am sure you do not agree with many of mine, I do wish you the very best, Mr. WAXMAN, as you move forward.

In conclusion, on this important debate, I would like to say this is not a new piece of legislation. It has passed the House of Representatives on eight separate occasions, and we really did not plan to bring it up in this lame-duck session except that Senator REID, the leader of the Senate, the Democratic leader of the Senate, changed his mind and decided to bring it up on the Senate side. So when we found out about that, Mr. CASSIDY introduced this legislation, which mirrors the bill on the Senate side, and we are thrilled that we have an opportunity to pass this legislation, and I expect that we will pass it.

I might add that it has been studied for over 6 years. There have been four complete environmental studies completed. The Secretary of State's office on more than one occasion—two occasions, three occasions—has said it would have a negligible environmental impact. In fact, in one place they said they would be better off to build this pipeline than not to build it because the environmental degree of moving it by pipeline would be better than the alternative in which it is being moved today. So I think it is a win-win-win situation for America.

Many people have said, well, they are simply bringing this oil through the United States and then it is going to be exported. We have had many hearings. Some of it will be exported, but some of it will be refined right here in the U.S. It will be 850,000 barrels of oil a day, which is about half of what we are importing from the Middle East. It will make us less dependent. Some labor unions support this legislation. The Governor of Nebraska supports this legislation. So I think it is a win-win-win for everyone.

There are additional safety requirements on this pipeline that are not required on other pipelines. I think there are going to be adequate safeguards. We have had so many hearings on this. I would urge the body, the House of Representatives, to pass this legislation and give us the opportunity to send it down to the White House for the President's consideration.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to today's legislation to grant auto-

matic approval of the Keystone XL pipeline, bypassing the legal review process.

Today's bill grants immediate authority to Canadian company TransCanada to "construct, connect, operate, and maintain" the pipeline as described in their 2012 application to the State Department. However, as the bill itself acknowledges, there are still outstanding issues with that application. Notably, there is no legal route through Nebraska due to an ongoing court case over private property rights and eminent domain. This bill does nothing to resolve that case. It gives blanket approval without knowing what the pipeline route will look like in Nebraska.

I am also deeply concerned that tar sands oil, which would be transported in the pipeline, is exempt from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund that is used to respond to leaks and accidents. If there is an accident along this pipeline, taxpayers will be on the hook for cleanup. We need to close that loophole and ensure that the American public is not bearing the risks for TransCanada's pipeline.

The State Department continues to review the 2.5 million comments it has received on this project and is awaiting a final route from Nebraska to make its determination on whether this project is in the best interest of the American people. We should allow that process to continue.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5682, a bill to approve the northern portion of Keystone XL pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because I support North American energy development.

But I also rise in support of the bill because the Keystone XL pipeline has become an obstacle created by indecision and inaction.

Keystone XL is not the first cross-border pipeline project built in North America.

But if some opponents had their way, Keystone XL pipeline would be the last pipeline we built in North America.

Today, the United States, Canada and Mexico are revolutionizing the world and the world of energy.

These three North American partners are reshaping the geo-political balance of the entire world.

Between the three countries, we can satisfy our own energy needs for the first time in memory.

But to accomplish this feat, we must be able to move products to market.

My colleagues who oppose Keystone XL have forgotten that just because there isn't a pipeline doesn't mean the products aren't moving.

In fact, they are moving just as rapidly as ever.

Unfortunately, the products are moving to market at the expense of other commodities and even at the expense of people's schedules.

Opponents cannot deny that pipelines are the safest, most effective way to move products to market.

Opponents cannot say the State Department has failed to consider the environmental consequences of the pipeline.

Opponents cannot say this project hasn't been reviewed by the proper authorities.

If they do, they are incorrect.

The Keystone XL pipeline is the most scrutinized project in as long as I can remember.

If we built railroads, the way we built KXL, we wouldn't have a rail system.

If we built roads, the way we built KXL, we wouldn't have a highway system.

As we face the 114th Congress, we have real problems we need to address.

Keystone XL pipeline is good for the United States, it's good for North America and we should support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 748, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5682 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT THAT TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. PAY FOR ANY OIL SPILL CLEANUP ON AMERICAN SOIL.

In the approval process authorized under this Act, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall certify to the President that diluted bitumen and other materials derived from tar sands or oil sands that are transported through the Keystone XL pipeline will be treated as crude oil for the purposes of determining contributions that fund the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the final—and only—amendment to this bill. Passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it is adopted, my amendment will simply be incorporated into the bill and the bill will be immediately voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that we are still primarily dependent on oil and other fossil fuels for our energy needs. This dependence does have the effect of polluting our planet, harming public health, and threatening our national security. Recent advances in clean, renewable energy technologies have demonstrated that it doesn't have to be this way. But rather than pursuing this sustainable energy future we know we need, H.R. 5682 and the Keystone pipeline double down on fossil fuels and

push us further down this destructive path.

No matter if you support or oppose Keystone XL, we can all agree that drilling and transporting oil has serious risks. It only takes one small crack, one small mistake, to cause a major oil spill and catastrophic, irreparable harm to the surrounding communities.

In 1969, my home district experienced one of the worst oil spills in U.S. history. I saw firsthand the devastating damage to our local economy, to human health, property, and natural resources. We have seen this happen far too many times since then in communities around the country. The Deepwater Horizon disaster cost 11 lives, billions of dollars in economic damages, and untold devastation to the delicate ecosystem of the gulf.

That very same year, we saw a terrible spill in Kalamazoo, Michigan. This spill was particularly noteworthy because it involved tar sands oil, which is the same type of oil that would flow through the Keystone pipeline. Tar sands is much harder to clean up than standard crude, which is one of the reasons that spill took nearly \$1 billion and several years to fully clean up.

Mr. Speaker, history has shown us that there is simply no such thing as a spill-proof well or pipeline. Accidents do happen. In fact, accidents have already happened 14 times on the existing Keystone pipeline. Despite numerous assurances that Keystone XL will be safer and that spill risks will be minimal, safer simply does not equate to safe.

That is why we have the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which is funded by an 8-cents-per-barrel excise fee on crude oil and petroleum products. This fund ensures that the oil companies that create these messes also pay to clean them up. But TransCanada is currently exempt from contributing to the trust fund for Keystone because tar sands oil is not considered crude oil for purposes of the program.

If Keystone XL is approved, the pipeline's tar sands oil will literally get a free ride through the United States. If there is a spill, taxpayers and local communities—not those responsible—could be stuck with the cleanup bill. This makes no sense. TransCanada and all tar sands oil companies should have to pay into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund just like every other oil company.

That is why I am offering this very straightforward amendment. My amendment would simply require TransCanada to certify that it will pay the same per-barrel fee for its tar sands oil as it does for its regular crude. It would ensure that TransCanada—and not our taxpayers—would pay to clean up its own mess in the event of a spill.

Mr. Speaker, if we as a Nation—and these are our natural resources as taxpayers—if we as a Nation are going to bear 100 percent of the spill risk, the least we can do is to ensure that those

responsible pay to clean it up. This is a commonsense idea that should have bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment to protect American taxpayers and ensure that oil companies pay what is only their fair share, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman's motion.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentlewoman that President Obama, through a regulation, decided that diluted bitumen is not crude oil for the purposes of the trust fund tax, so the problem was created by President Obama and the IRS.

We are in the process of trying to address that issue. It is under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. In their tax reform package, that is an issue that they are looking at. But if we try to change that now in this bill, we would be treating TransCanada differently than all other pipelines are being treated bringing bitumen into the United States.

I would also point out this pipeline's greater safety characteristics. It has more safety characteristics than any other pipeline built. We would think you would want to incentivize its use and not punish it with further taxation.

So, in my opinion, while I have great respect for the gentlewoman from California, this is simply a ruse to kill the bill.

I would respectfully ask our Members to oppose this motion to recommit and pass H.R. 5682. The Senate has said—Senator REID has said—that they will take it up in the Senate. That is precisely what we would like to see.

I urge defeat of the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5682 is postponed.

D.C. ASKS CONGRESS TO RESPECT THEIR LOCAL MARIJUANA INITIATIVE

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, thank you to the two Democratic Representatives, BLUMENAUER and POLIS, and Republican Representative ROHRBACHER who stood with the District of Colum-

bia for letting our marijuana reform bill stand today.

Although Blacks and Whites smoke pot at the same rate, the majority of those convicted of possession of small amounts in the District of Columbia and nationwide are Black. Your State may not be counted among the 58 percent of Americans who want cannabis legalized. D.C. doesn't ask you to support marijuana. D.C. asks only that the Congress respect our local marijuana initiative, which is every bit as much a local control matter as the decision made by four other States on this very same issue.

□ 1900

THE PASSING OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN LANE EVANS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise on Veterans Day Week to pay tribute to our dear friend and longtime former colleague, Congressman Lane Evans.

An honorable man and Marine Corps Vietnam veteran, Lane was elected in November 1982, and sworn in January 1983 as a member of a large freshman class that comprised the 98th Congress. He hailed from a working-class district and was a son of the working class. So few Members are grounded in that heritage. He was intelligent, committed, a true gentleman, and a patriot.

The economy and social benefit programs consumed the attention of that Congress. Very high unemployment levels hung over our Nation, mired in the aftermath of a very deep recession following the first Arab oil embargo and economic policies of the Reagan administration that did not relieve the dire circumstances of unemployed workers. Extending unemployment benefits occupied that Congress as a lifeline to millions of workers that saw their livelihoods evaporate almost instantaneously. In the spring of 1983, Congress passed the historic refinancing of the Social Security program to assure the system would be sound for generations to come. Lane had fought to be a Member to fight for that, and he was a "yes" vote on that historic measure.

During the first decade of Lane's service, we served together on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. After an extended fight, legislation was passed to allow Agent Orange-affected Vietnam veterans to receive benefits as a moral obligation to these veterans who had served. Today, Lane's legacy lives on as we continue to build on the foundation he laid.

During his distinguished career, Mr. Evans led the effort to fight for veterans returning home with PTSD and TBI. His efforts in Congress laid the groundwork for a new chapter in the way American cares for those suffering from mental illness and the stress-related conditions of battle.