

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. "Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. "Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Amendment XXVI:

Section 1:

"The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Section 2:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Amendment XXVII:

"No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to revise and extend remarks and insert omitted material in the RECORD during the reading of the Constitution.

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

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 70-770, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 95-277, as amended by the appropriate provisions of Public Law 102-246, and in consultation with the Majority Leader, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a five year term:

George Marcus of California, vice Elaine Wynn.

#### 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 10 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1104

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.

#### KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 19, I call up the bill (H.R. 3) 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 19, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3

*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 "Keystone XL Pipeline Act".

#### SEC. 2. 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) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency 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 (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) 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 enthusiastically rise today to support H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. And for those who have not heard, according to the administration, the

final hurdle has been removed, and that is that the Nebraska Supreme Court this morning has approved the pathway for the pipeline, the routing of the pipeline, the Keystone XL pipeline.

Again, the administration has said that was the major hurdle. It has fallen. So I hope the President is not going to establish another hurdle, that being himself.

America is undergoing an energy renaissance, and the prospect of securing North American energy independence is in sight. However, to achieve our goal of energy security, we need to make sure we have the infrastructure in place to keep pace with the changing energy landscape. Keystone will be a critical addition to the Nation's pipeline network, increasing our supply of oil and helping to reduce its cost.

The State Department completed its environmental analysis a year ago. However, there has still been no action by the administration on the pipeline.

There is simply no reason to delay this important project. As I mentioned, the President's main argument in this premature veto threat is that the bill would authorize the pipeline despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska. Well, that uncertainty has ended this morning, and the Supreme Court of Nebraska has allowed the planned route to go forward in Nebraska. Again, there is simply no reason to delay. In fact, the southern leg of the pipeline has already been built.

In March 2012, in Oklahoma, the President expressed his support for expediting construction for the southern leg of the Keystone pipeline, and I agree with the President when he stated at that ceremony that he was directing his administration to cut through red tape, break through bureaucratic hurdles, and make this project a priority to go ahead and get it done. It was the right thing to do then, it is the right thing to do now, and it is exactly what this bill does.

We should move forward because this pipeline will be a tremendous boon to the economic development and one that doesn't require a single Federal dollar. The very nature of infrastructure improvement creates jobs, and Keystone is no exception.

I know my colleagues have made the argument that it is only temporary, but every infrastructure job is a temporary job. When a road is completed, when a bridge is completed, when a pipeline is completed, those construction workers move on to hopefully other construction jobs.

Indeed, five unions representing over 3 million workers—and I repeat that to my Democratic colleagues, five unions representing 3 million hardworking Americans—support this project, and I would like to submit their letter in the RECORD for support of this project.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD  
OF TEAMSTERS,

Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to express the support of the International Brotherhood of

Teamsters for S. 2280, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. The Keystone XL Pipeline project has been subjected to over six and one-half years of scrutiny, including review by 10 federal agencies, as well as numerous state and local agency reviews. We believe that it is time to end the delay and to move forward with the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. We ask you to support S. 2280 when it comes to the Senate floor this week.

The Teamsters Union believes that the Keystone XL Pipeline will contribute to enhanced energy security, economic prosperity and, of critical importance, the creation of good paying jobs. Unemployment in the building and construction workforce remains too high. Construction of the pipeline will provide much needed and good paying jobs for this workforce. The utilization of a project labor agreement will enhance the safety, technical performance, reliability and quality of the project as well as maximize employment opportunities for local residents along the proposed corridor. Further, the fifty-seven special conditions agreed to for the project will provide an even greater degree of safety than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline.

If the pipeline is not built, important socioeconomic benefits will not be realized—the positive impacts of local, state and federal revenue, spending by construction workers, and spending on construction goods and services. Building the Keystone XL Pipeline will enhance U.S. energy and economic security. It is time to move forward without further delay.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,  
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF  
OPERATING ENGINEERS,  
Washington, DC, September 17, 2013.

Hon. JOHN HOEVEN,  
Russell Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. MARY L. LANDRIEU,  
Hart Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS HOEVEN AND LANDRIEU: The International Union of Operating Engineers supports your amendment to energy-efficiency legislation, S. 1392, which simply expresses congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) represents approximately 400,000 skilled American and Canadian heavy-equipment operators and other craftworkers, including thousands of members who hope to build the Keystone XL pipeline. The IUOE is one of four unions signatory to the National Pipeline Agreement.

To create jobs and improve American energy independence, the Keystone XL pipeline should become a key part of America's energy infrastructure. The economic benefits of the project are dramatic and undisputable. The State Department's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) says that approximately 10,000 construction workers would be employed building the pipeline, including thousands of Operating Engineers. A total of 42,100 jobs throughout the United States would be supported by the project, generating over \$2 billion in total earnings. All told, this pipeline project would contribute approximately \$3.4 billion to America's Gross Domestic Product.

The Keystone XL will also be one of the safest pipelines ever built. According to the EIS, the fifty-seven special conditions developed by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and voluntarily agreed to by TransCanada "... would have a degree of safety greater than any typically

constructed domestic oil pipeline system under current regulations." In addition, the Operating Engineers and other union construction trades tasked with building the 1,179 mile pipeline possess the highest safety and skill levels in the pipeline sector.

Operating Engineers have waited over five years to build this essential piece North American energy infrastructure. Every state along the pipeline route has approved the project. Over 80 percent of Americans believe it's in our national interest to build it. Now it's time for the federal government to approve the project. Congress can send a strong message by supporting your amendment.

The IUOE endorses the Hoeven-Landrieu amendment in support of Keystone XL, and looks forward to working with you to see it passed into law.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,  
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF  
OPERATING ENGINEERS,  
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The International Union of Operating Engineers supports the passage of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and respectfully requests that you vote for the legislation on Friday when it will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

After five different Environmental Impact Statements and over six years of evaluation, the Keystone XL pipeline has been the most exhaustively reviewed pipeline in history. All of the federal studies have reached the same conclusion: The Keystone XL pipeline merits approval. It is time for Congress to act and approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

As you know, the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. Members on both sides of the border hope to build the Keystone XL. Members of the Operating Engineers, through the collective bargaining process, will earn roughly \$35 an hour on their checks as they build the Keystone XL. The project is expected to generate approximately 3,000 job-years for Operating Engineers alone. With congressional approval of the pipeline, you can unleash this massive economic activity—at no cost to taxpayers.

The misguided criticism of the pipeline by the environmental community does not change the facts. Virtually the whole critique depends on a fundamental misunderstanding of the oil-transportation industry and its economics. Despite the conclusion of five different environmental studies, critics of the project refuse to accept that Keystone XL has little or no effect on the extraction rate of oil sands. Alternative transportation methods will step in to move the commodity, irrespective of the Keystone XL decision. The oil and gas industry possesses too much operational flexibility to allow one pipeline to limit the extraction rates of oil sands in Western Canada. Rail and other pipeline alternatives are ready to move oil sands and Bakken crude.

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has ensured that Keystone XL will be safer than any other domestic oil pipeline system built under current

code as a result of its required 59 Special Conditions. These conditions usually accompany pipeline requirements in a "High-Consequence Area"—steep slope, for example. Yet these conditions will apply across the entirety of the Keystone XL pipeline. The conditions relate to everything from manufacturing specifications of pipe, to construction techniques, to post-construction monitoring.

This \$5 billion privately-funded pipeline will move an essential North American commodity more safely than other alternatives. It will also grow the economy by putting thousands of Operating Engineers and other construction workers back on the job.

The International Union of Operating Engineers respectfully requests your support for H.R. 3, legislation to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,  
*General President.*

Mr. SHUSTER. I want to name them off. It is the Teamsters; it is the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; it is the Laborers' International Union of North America; it is the Operating Engineers; it is the pipefitters of the United States and Canada all supporting this project. Again, they see it as positive economic impact.

When these jobs are completed, they will move on to other, hopefully, construction jobs; but what is left behind will have a positive impact to our economy, to job creation for a generation.

Our energy renaissance is helping make North America more secure and energy independent, and, in fact, I want to quote the President:

In this time of significant political uncertainty in key oil-producing countries and regions, and in the context of a difficult economic situation, non-OPEC Canada crude oil supplies advance the energy security of the United States.

Now, I wish he would have said that about this pipeline, but he didn't. He said it in 2009 about the Enbridge pipeline, which started transferring oil sands from Canada to the gulf coast last month. The President, 5 years ago, supported this type of thing. He should support it now. So other than politics, I don't understand why he hasn't approved this project as he did with Enbridge. It is time to build.

Ladies and gentlemen, I especially look to my Democratic colleagues. Let's put down our gloves. Let's do something positive for America, for those 3 million union workers that are out there supporting this. Let's do what is good for the environment. Let's do what is good for energy independence.

Finally, let's be fair to our greatest friends in the world, our Canadian neighbors. They allowed us to build a pipeline across their land. We should allow them to do the same in ours. They are our best allies. They are our greatest friends. They are a great neighbor. So let us, today, pass this bill and build the Keystone pipeline.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Well, it is Groundhog Day come early to the floor of the House. It is cold enough I guess for Groundhog Day, but this will be the 10th time in the last 4 years that the House of Representatives has moved this bill with the assertion that somehow it leads us to energy independence, energy security, lower prices at the pump.

Well, the reality is a Canadian corporation is going to build a pipeline from Canada to Texas. They are going to be exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, unlike most other projects in this country, because of a stupid ruling by the IRS—but that is nothing new—regarding tar sands. So they will be exempt from paying into that. So if this thing bursts, there is an accident, the taxpayers of the United States get the bill, not the taxpayers of Canada. They don't get the bill. The taxpayers of the United States get the bill. Now, that is one of a number of problems regarding this project.

It is somewhat unprecedented, I believe. This may have happened at some other time in American history, but I do find it particularly ironic today, when we had the reading of the Constitution, that the effect of passing this bill, if it were to become law—and the President has already said he will veto it. But if this were to become law, the effect would be to give a foreign corporation the right to take private property from American citizens.

I am not aware of any other time in the history of the Union where we have given a foreign corporation the right to take Americans' private property. And, yes, some people were happy to sell the rights, but many others weren't, including some in Nebraska and some in Texas. It has been quite contentious among landowners who are just having this corporation come.

I would like to put in the RECORD a letter from TransCanada. We have blacked out the name of the recipient of the letter, but it is a true copy of a letter to a person who will have their private property taken by eminent domain by a foreign corporation, and the foreign corporation informs them that they will begin proceedings this month. I guess because of the anticipated Republican action, to take their private property away.

TRANSCANADA,

Omaha, NE, December 8, 2014

Re Keystone XL Project Update.

DEAR LANDOWNER: While we continue to wait for decisions from the Nebraska Supreme Court and from the U.S. Department of State regarding our proposed Keystone XL Pipeline, I would like to provide you with an update on our project.

To date, Nebraska landowners have voluntarily granted us easements representing 84 percent of the required right-of-way for the Keystone XL Pipeline Project. We continue to work to acquire the remaining land rights. In Montana and South Dakota, we have acquired easements for 100 percent of the privately owned right-of-way.

Between September 2008 and earlier this year, five successive sets of extensive public comments were taken and five successive

independent environmental assessments were published by the State Department. Each review confirmed the safety and environmental soundness of the project. The State Department is continuing its review of our Presidential Permit application and will ultimately make a determination whether the project is in the national interest. The State Department has not announced a definitive timeline for reaching that decision.

In addition, reviews have been completed separately by the States of Montana, Nebraska and South Dakota. As with the federal reviews, these state reviews included extensive public input. Each resulted in state approval of the project.

In South Dakota, the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission approved the project in 2010. Because construction did not begin within four years, we must certify that the pipeline continues to meet the conditions upon which the permit was issued. We have initiated the certification process and we expect a decision in 2015.

The State of Nebraska enacted legislation in 2011 and in 2012 requiring state review of the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline route. The Governor approved the route in January 2013, after a year-long public review process overseen by the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality. Following a legal challenge of the new law, a lower court determined that the law was not valid and that the review should have been overseen by the Nebraska Public Service Commission. The Nebraska Attorney General appealed the lower court ruling to the Nebraska Supreme Court and the Court is expected to make a ruling later this year or early next year.

Pending a decision on the appeal, the law remains in effect as does the resulting Keystone XL route. In the event that the Nebraska Supreme Court affirms the lower court ruling invalidating the new law, we would expect a second Nebraska review to be required, this time by the Nebraska Public Service Commission.

If instead, the Nebraska Supreme Court reverses the lower court ruling, affirming the validity of the existing state review, we expect that other aspects of that law would remain in effect as well. One of those aspects affects the timing available to complete negotiations to acquire remaining property rights in Nebraska. If parties ultimately are not able to reach voluntary agreement on acquisition of necessary land rights for the project, we are required to commence the legal process of eminent domain to obtain those rights within two years of the January 2013 Nebraska approval.

We recognize that the Supreme Court ruling may not be issued before we are required to take action in preparation for the existing January 2015 deadline. While we would prefer not to initiate the process to acquire outstanding land rights while there is uncertainty, we are bound by that deadline in order to meet our responsibility to continue to prepare to build the pipeline necessary to safely transport North American energy.

Regardless of your perspective on the project, we would welcome the opportunity to address your questions and concerns and discuss property-specific details for pipeline construction. When we are able to work with landowners to achieve mutual agreement where possible, we are better able to minimize potential effects of construction on land and operations.

A member of my land team will follow-up with you or your legal counsel. If you have not heard from us or if you have questions, you are welcome to contact me. If you would like to see an operating pipeline, please let us know and we'd be happy to arrange for a

tour of a pump station on the operating Keystone line in Nebraska.

Sincerely,

ANDREW CRAIG,  
Manager—Land, Keystone Projects,  
TransCanada Pipelines, USA.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Now, that is a bit ironic, again, on the day we read the Constitution and also of the party of individual rights for property owners. So that is also of concern.

Yes, there will be construction jobs, and I am the first to admit we need more jobs in America. In fact, I voted against the President's so-called stimulus bill because it didn't invest enough in building infrastructure in this country. Instead, it did a whole bunch of stupid tax cuts because of Larry Summers, a highly acclaimed hack economist, and we didn't put a lot of people back to work. Seven percent went to infrastructure, that created jobs; 42 percent went to tax cuts, didn't create jobs. But that is another agenda the Republicans are pursuing is tax cuts to create jobs, but we won't get into that here today.

So, yes, that will happen, but there are a lot of other investments we should, could, and I believe the chairman supports making that will create significant construction and infrastructure jobs.

Now, were this just in isolation and it didn't involve the total destruction of the boreal forests of Canada, if I were Canadian I would be pretty upset about that; and perhaps the dirtiest, most environmentally problematic way of extracting fossil fuels from the ground to get these oil sands, the construction jobs might carry the day, but sometimes you have to draw a line.

In this case, we also hear it is going to lead somehow to energy security. Well, that is interesting because the crude, tar sand oil, or whatever you want to call it, is going to come down to Texas without paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund—creating a potential problem for the future taxpayers of the United States—go to a refinery in an export zone in Texas, and, yes, it will be refined and then it will be exported.

We are exporting millions of gallons of fuel every day, so to somehow say this is going to lead to lower prices at the pump in America—maybe it is lower prices at the pump in China or I don't know where else, Japan or someplace, but it isn't going to be here because the product is ultimately going to be exported. So it is also not going to do anything for our energy security, and at the moment we have kind of a surfeit because of fracking and other things of fuels, and prices are down considerably.

□ 1115

So those are just a few of the problems.

And by passing this bill, the House of Representatives will attempt to preempt the executive authority of the President in this matter because this pipeline crosses an international bor-

der. The President has authority, and the State Department has been considering it.

And even with the Supreme Court of Nebraska refusing to make a judgment, they didn't uphold the law of the Nebraska legislature. In fact, four out of seven judges—normally a majority in most places—said it was unconstitutional, but Nebraska has a peculiarity that if the other three judges take a walk—which they did—then even though a majority found it unconstitutional, it is not found unconstitutional, and that is the end of the proceeding.

So that is the big news out of Nebraska. They need a little work on their constitution, I think. So it hasn't received a stamp of approval there. There are still aggrieved landowners in Nebraska who object to the route and who are going to have their private property taken by a foreign corporation. So other than that, it is a great idea.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I just want to remind my Democratic colleagues that, first of all, I am from Pennsylvania. Punxsutawney is several miles outside of my district. That is where Punxsutawney Phil resides. So I am somewhat knowledgeable on Groundhog Day. And I just want to point out to my Democratic colleagues that in the movie "Groundhog Day," Bill Murray learned from his mistakes the day before and improved his situation each day. So hopefully today, your references to your learning from yesterday and how we can move forward—I think the Nebraska situation improves the whole situation for all of us. And I certainly don't question the wisdom of the Nebraska Supreme Court.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill as vice chair of the Pipeline Subcommittee.

Pipelines are the single safest way to transport liquids—safer than rail, safer than trucks. The State Department says Keystone would have a minimal impact on the environment.

President Obama and his administration have confirmed that Keystone will create thousands of construction jobs. These are men and women's livelihoods.

Respectfully, I would remind the administration, but by their nature, all construction jobs are temporary. And it is insulting to marginalize the value of these jobs or the people who might hold them.

Keystone is supported by many unions, including mine, Local 545, the Operating Engineers, where I have been for almost 35 years.

Prime Minister Stephen Harper of Canada said, and I agree, that Keystone is in both of our nations' interests and that "the logic here is overwhelming."

Keystone will help us stop sending billions and billions of dollars overseas to our enemies, many of whom would harm us.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to start building this Keystone pipeline.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how much time remains of the 15 minutes that I had?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Each side has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to what can only be described as an earmark for a Canadian corporation. It speaks volumes about the Republican agenda, as this new Congress convenes, that the first order of business in the House and Senate is to rubberstamp the Keystone XL pipeline.

We have not dealt with unemployment benefits that the American people need that have lapsed for more than a year. Millions of Americans are suffering from a low minimum wage and income disparity, but we are not helping them. Women in this country still only earn 77 cents to every dollar their male counterparts earn, but we are not trying to end that disparity.

Instead, they are forcing Keystone through without the proper approval process. Building a pipeline clear across the United States so that TransCanada can sell its dirty tar sands oil to the highest bidder—namely China—is not in the American people's best interests.

We take on the risk to our lands, the American people face threats to their health, and TransCanada gets to reap the rewards. That is not a winning formula for our country or the economy. In fact, it is a sham.

And yet the Keystone XL pipeline continues to be sold to the American people on blatantly false pretenses. We are told by proponents that this is about job creation, yet not a single independent analysis supports these claims.

The burden of proof is on the GOP. They pull fantastic claims out of thin air, and yet they refuse to back them up. Instead, we are told to take their assertions at face value.

Here is what we actually know. These are the facts that can actually be substantiated:

The State Department found in its supplemental environmental impact study of the Keystone pipeline that it will generate less than 2,000 jobs a year for 2 years and only during the period of construction. Once the pipeline is built, these jobs will disappear, leaving a mere 35 permanent jobs that will result from this project—35. To put that in context, under President Obama, 353,000 jobs were generated in November and a total of 2.9 million in 2014.

There is also the claim that it is going to lower gas prices for the American people. Please. Gas prices have been dropping for more than 100 straight days and are at the lowest level in more than 5½ years. They won't go any lower by allowing oil to be piped across our country just to be sold abroad.

In contrast to fantasy impacts on gas prices, the potential impacts on our environment are very real. Not only will burning these tar sands add to global climate change, but any leak, failure, or, God forbid, explosion will have disastrous impacts on our environment. And because tar sands importers are exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, the American taxpayers will have to bear the cost of cleaning up any spills.

The public needs to know these facts, and that is why allowing 1 hour of debate with not a single, solitary amendment today robs the American people of a full debate and discussion.

On top of all that, this bill is being pushed through despite the fact that it violates not one but two treaties with American Indian nations.

What does this say about the GOP's respect for the rule of law?

If the Republicans truly want to generate jobs for the American people, they should fully fund the highway trust fund and support the GROW AMERICA Act to invest in the crumbling infrastructure all across this country, not help Canadians build a superhighway for their dirty tar sands oil.

We would be supporting not just 2,000 jobs per year for 2 years but millions of jobs for American families, across every congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have a chance to take an important stand today early in this Congress on behalf of taxpayers, the environment, Native American communities, and the rule of law by supporting President Obama's veto and rejecting this toxic giveaway to foreign corporate oil interests.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I just want to say that there have been 15 hearings on the Keystone pipeline. This is the 10th time we have debated it on the floor. This, quite possibly, could be the most debated piece of legislation in the history of Congress. I don't know that for sure. But I do know that it has been out there for 2,303 days, and 60 percent of the American people support it, while 20 percent don't support it. So I think the American people are fully aware of what is going on here. They understand it, and they do support it.

With that, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keystone pipeline, which will safely move 300 million barrels annually, strengthen our economy, continue

to decrease our dependence on Mideast oil, and support thousands of jobs.

This body has shown tremendous leadership on this issue and last year passed bipartisan legislation to approve Keystone for the ninth time. Today, with strong support from unions, businesses, and the American people, we must pass it again.

I am grateful for Representative CRAMER, Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman UPTON, and the leadership for their work on this vital legislation.

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

The gentleman just referenced safely transport. Of course that is a hypothetical. And let me give a real example:

In 2010, a Canadian company, Enbridge, had a pipeline burst in Marshall, Michigan, spilling 1 million gallons of tar sands oil.

Now, here is the thing. All oil has viscosity and other characteristics. The thing about tar sands oil is, it doesn't float. It goes right to the bottom. They are still dredging Canadian tar sands oil out of the bottom of the Kalamazoo River 4 years later. And so far, claims of \$53 million have been made, which will have to be paid by American taxpayers against the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and not by Enbridge, the Canadian corporation.

Which is what we are setting up here: an even greater transshipment by a foreign corporation, exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, creating even bigger potential for spills with this oil, which has unique characteristics which are much more difficult to clean up if it comes in contact with water and, God forbid, it gets into the aquifer in one of the States that are being transected.

The chairman did reference the 15 hearings. We have a difference in counting. But let's say 15 hearings. Three were in the Rules Committee. Those aren't hearings. That is sort of a little star chamber where you take things before you bring them to the floor of the House. You don't discuss substance there. One was in the Senate. There were 10 in the House, but not a single one of those hearings was in the principal committee of jurisdiction, which would be the Transportation Committee. And of course the bill that was marked up by the Transportation Committee in the first session of the last Congress was very different than the bill that is being advocated for today, which has not been marked up.

And we heard a lot about regular order, read the bill, and all that stuff. It is fine to say, gee, we have voted on this a lot of times before. With 61 new Members of the House, gas prices are down by almost 50 percent, a lot of things have changed. I would even wonder about the viability of this project.

I did just recently learn that the Koch brothers, though, have a significant investment in tar sands in Canada. But that probably has nothing to

do with an attempt to expedite this project.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would just like to remind the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation Committee, arguably the most knowledgeable man in Congress when it comes to transportation issues, with many years of service plus an intellect that is very sharp—I would never presume to tell him—I just want to remind him that the safest way to move product, to move oil is by pipeline. And I think the gentleman knows that, but I just wanted to remind him of that.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard a word that is almost hard to believe. We have been accused of expediting this process. Ladies and gentlemen, this is day 2,303 of this process. It is time now.

It is time because it is good for job creation. It is time because it is good for the environment. It is not just the safest way, as the chairman said; the most environmentally sound way to move tar sands oil is in a pipeline. It is good for national security. It is good for economic security. It is good because 62.8 percent of labor force participation is the lowest since 1978. It creates jobs. And it is for these reasons that not only does the majority of the United States House and the majority of the United States Senate support it, but it is because of these reasons that the vast majority of the people of the United States support it, including the people of Nebraska. And for those reasons, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3.

Mr. DEFAZIO. At this moment, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

□ 1130

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the permitting for the Keystone pipeline has taken longer than it took for the United States to win World War II. Isn't that lovely?

The pipeline will bring oil to my home State of Texas. Pipelines are the safest way to transport oil. The Keystone will deliver as much oil as we get from Saudi Arabia. The United States should work more with our neighbors—our normal neighbors—Canada and Mexico to develop our national resources and compete with OPEC.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national security and energy security issue. We can make the Middle East, its politics, its oil, and its turmoil irrelevant. It is time to pick a horse and ride it.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

In response to the transport, yes, pipelines are generally safer, but the

consequences—look at the case in Michigan—when a pipeline goes are generally much greater, much greater volumes.

Even in the horrific train accidents we have had, the volumes were relatively small that were spilled, even though the consequences—particularly in the one in Canada—were very, very damaging. Minimally, you should have added to the bill requiring them to pay into the oil spill liability trust fund. That would make that slightly less objectionable.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. This bill is based on the Cassidy Keystone bill which passed the House last Congress on a bipartisan vote of 252–161.

As Chairman SHUSTER noted, this pipeline will create jobs, enhance our energy independence, and strengthen our national security.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that makes numerous project benefits a reality. According to the Department of Energy, the pipeline will transport over 800,000 barrels per day of oil from Canada to the gulf coast, which will help reduce reliance on more hostile nations.

Some have argued that the oil will just be exported, but the administration's own environmental analysis denies that that will ever occur. It will also create good-paying jobs now, while promoting the growth of our energy economy for the future.

This is the most studied pipeline in our history. In the history of our Nation, we have never studied a pipeline like this. There is no need to continue to stall its approval. This project will be safe.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, America currently has 2.6 million miles of pipeline providing an extremely safe way to transport energy products.

The Keystone pipeline will be the safest ever built, with 95 special mitigation measures, including nearly 60 recommended by the Department of Transportation. It is time to approve this project.

We can't afford any more delays. The American public deserves these jobs, and we deserve to be energy independent.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Ranking Member.

Mr. Speaker, we know that building the Keystone pipeline will create some jobs, and it can even help lower consumers' prices, but many of these jobs are temporary, which is true in most

capital cases anyway. The price of oil has already fallen below \$50 a barrel for the first time since 2009.

We really got some good news about jobs today again. We added 252,000 jobs, and the unemployment rate is the lowest since 2008—I think May or June of that year.

While we are going in the right direction, we need some serious creation of jobs and at least a reach-out to the administration, “Hey, you are doing a pretty good job on this, on oil prices, on gasoline prices,” just a little bit of encouragement. We all roll on the same ship, come on.

You boost our energy security, and you save consumers money at the pump, but the debate over Keystone has become a symbolic issue. Come on, let's admit it. It is clear that this fight is vastly greater than the economic, environmental, or energy impact. It is the end of the world if you listen to the extremes of both sides.

I could support the construction of this pipeline but do not believe Congress should circumvent the administrative view.

Mr. Speaker, let me just recommend something perhaps through you to the Chair. I believe that the reason why we have this problem is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has nothing to say about oil lines. They do on gas lines, but not oil lines.

I think we could have saved a lot of time if we used the same situation. I am going to vote “no” on this, but I think there is some good things that need to be done and could be worked out.

Mr. SHUSTER. It is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a Nebraskan.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, as you all know, a major portion of the Keystone XL pipeline will run through Nebraska's Third District. Nebraskans overwhelmingly support this project to improve access to North American energy and decrease the strain on our overwhelmed infrastructure system.

As we all now know, the Nebraska Supreme Court has upheld the process as established by the elected Nebraska officials.

I urge my colleagues to support approval of this project, and I urge the President to sign off on the pipeline as a needed step to encourage private investment in infrastructure.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK.)

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL pipeline. This bill is about good-paying jobs and energy security.

Republicans and many Democrats agree on this, as well as the unique coalition of unions like the Teamsters,

LIUNA, the Tea Party, as well as the Chamber of Commerce.

Listen to what the president of LIUNA said:

To the tens and thousands of men and women in the construction industry, this isn't just a pipeline; it is their mortgages, college tuitions, car payments, and food on the table. And for our country, this isn't just a pipeline; it's a lifeline to family security, energy security, and national security.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for the passage of this critical, bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to authorize the building of the Keystone pipeline. It is time. Enough is enough. We agree, thousands of jobs would be created by this pipeline.

This will improve consumer prices. This will bring stability to oil markets around the world. This will contribute to protecting us here on American soil rather than relying on energy sources from hostile nations of the world. It doesn't cure all the problems, but it is a step in the right direction.

Our constituents sent us here, Mr. Speaker, to solve problems. This is part of the solution. I rise in support of the Keystone pipeline and ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reaffirm the bipartisan message of the last Congress and approve this legislation today.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Keystone XL pipeline, the most studied pipeline in American history.

After 6 years and 22,000 pages of review, the President's own State Department tells us that construction of this pipeline will support over 42,000 good-paying jobs and do nothing to harm the environment. Pipelines have been shown to be the safest way to transport oil.

Keystone has bipartisan, widespread support—Democrats, Republicans, industry leaders, and labor. Unfortunately, the President issued a veto threat, putting the wishes of environmental activists ahead of creating jobs for the American public.

Mr. Speaker, let's say “yes” to much-needed jobs and approve the Keystone pipeline without any further delays.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are exporting more than 60 percent of the oil that we produce every day either as refined or even as crude product. In this case, Canadian oil, exempt from a tax, will flow



through the United States to a refinery.

It will be processed and exported overseas. Somehow, that is going to lower prices further at the pump. Somehow, that is going to lead to American energy security.

You have to blow the dust off those arguments. They are a little dated, so we have raised a number of concerns here today.

Minimally—minimally—the Republicans should require this Canadian corporation to pay the same tax that most U.S. corporations pay when they transport products through pipelines and not put American taxpayers at risk.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the final hurdle has been removed. The Nebraska Supreme Court has said that the Keystone pipeline can move forward. That should be enough for my Democratic colleagues.

But there is more. It is safe. It is the safest way to transport this oil, this natural resource. It is the most studied pipeline. It is going to be safe and environmentally sound. It will protect the environment. It creates jobs. Don't listen to me; listen to the five unions that represent 3 million workers. Three million union workers say the Keystone pipeline should be built.

Mr. Speaker, it provides energy security for us, it is good for our economy, and it helps our allies—it strengthens our allies, and it weakens our enemies.

The last point is it is fair to our best friends in the world, the Canadians, who have allowed us to build a pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48. We ought to return the favor to our best friend—our best ally—and say: “Yes, you can build a safe pipeline, you can build a pipeline that will help all of North America, that will help all of our allies around the world and weaken our enemies.”

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on H.R. 3, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Commerce Committee has shared jurisdiction over this issue with T&I, and we have a number of members that would like to speak on the issue as well.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, do you like cheap oil? Most Americans would say “yes,” and a number of us have strongly pursued a North American energy independence plan for years, and our friend, Canada, is a big part of that.

In August of 2009, President Obama signed off on a new pipeline called the Alberta Clipper. Guess what? It brings 400,000 barrels of oil a day from western Canada to the United States.

We have been waiting for the approval of the Keystone XL pipeline for years—over 6 in fact. I remember well

when President Obama promised to do whatever it takes to create American jobs. That was followed by a so-called year of action; yet here we are, 6 years later, and nothing has happened.

By the administration's own estimates, tens of thousands of jobs will be supported by this landmark project. Bringing oil from Canada to the U.S. displaces imports from Venezuela and the Middle East. Isn't that a good thing?

I also note that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton signaled that she was inclined to support the project, and that was way back in 2010.

In fact, in the summer of 2011, the White House issued its first veto threat against congressional action on the Keystone XL, claiming that legislation was unnecessary because their process was working and a decision would be reached by the end of that year. Since then, we have upgraded new oil and gas pipeline standards, and Keystone will exceed those, Mr. President, as it should.

We used to be a nation of big ideas and big dreams. We imagined building the Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge and accomplished both in far less time than it has taken the President to muster the courage to simply say “yes” or “no.” We can do better.

The election, Mr. President, is over. There has been broad, bipartisan support for this project from the very first day. The President has been hiding behind the Nebraska court case to block the critical jobs project called Keystone XL, and with that contrived roadblock cleared, the White House is now out of excuses. Vote “yes.”

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, a bill to approve the application for the construction of Keystone XL pipeline.

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

Today, the Nebraska Supreme Court affirmed that Keystone XL should be built.

Keystone XL pipeline 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.

Energy prices are at their lowest point in the last decade.

Energy imports from partners like Canada and Mexico, and domestic production, have put more than \$900 a year in the pockets of the American people.

Keystone XL will continue this success in a time of struggle.

The United States still imports approximately 40 percent of the oil we use domestically.

The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has decided to directly challenge the new North American energy

market by maintaining, and in some cases, increasing production.

This is a direct affront to North American producers and an all-out price war.

This, however, is a struggle we can win, with the help of our North American partners.

Breakeven prices for North American crude, including Canadian oil sands and United States shale oil, are as low as \$40 per barrel.

Our producers can support our domestic demand while further driving out more expensive competitors.

Unfortunately, our domestic producers cannot win without cost-effective and environmentally sound transportation.

Keystone XL offers that advantage and I support it, although I do not believe H.R. 3 is the perfect legislation.

I believe that oil sands should be subject to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Almost every other source of crude oil that transits the United States is subject to the Trust Fund tax and oil sands should be as well.

It makes fiscal sense, it makes environmental sense and it makes competitive sense.

Oil sands should not be favored over any other sources in our country.

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

As we face the 114th Congress, we have real problems that require answers.

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

□ 1145

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are voting once again to grant special treatment—and I stress “special treatment”—to TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline. It is the 10th time since Republicans took control of the House.

American families face many pressing problems, and they want us to use this new Congress to work together to solve them. Unfortunately, we will begin this new year with a bill crafted solely to help the Canadian tar sands industry. The administration issued a statement in opposition to this legislation and indicated that the President will veto the bill. I heard my Republican colleagues talk about the action or inaction, whatever it was, by the Nebraska Supreme Court today; but I would stress that the White House press office still says in a statement that regardless of the Nebraska ruling today, the House bill still conflicts with longstanding executive branch procedures regarding the authority of the President and prevents the thorough consideration of complex issues that could bear on U.S. national interests, and if presented to the President he will veto the bill. So the bill will still be vetoed by the President, which is another indication why we are wasting our time today.

Mr. Speaker, oil prices are at their lowest level in more than 5 years. Gas prices are now below \$2 a gallon. Domestic U.S. oil production is skyrocketing. Tar sands are among the dirtiest and most carbon-intensive of

all fossil fuels. Approving the Keystone XL pipeline will 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, and that is totally inconsistent with any future scenario for avoiding catastrophic climate change.

We don't need this oil. Approving and constructing this pipeline won't lower gas prices for Americans. In some areas, it may even raise prices. This pipeline is a terrible deal for the United States. We get all of the risk while the oil companies will reap all of the rewards.

I was at the Rules Committee the other night and all I kept hearing was how wonderful Canada is, how we have to help Canadian companies. This is all about Canada. Frankly, I don't know why we are so worried about a Canadian corporation. It wasn't clear during the Rules Committee hearing, based on the conversations and debate we had with the Republican side, that this pipeline would even ever be built. And yet here we are rushing to basically say to the President: We don't care what you or the State Department or the Department of the Interior says what is in the national interest; we are just going to do this because of some Canadian interest.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new year and a new Congress. We have new Members who will vote on this bill without the benefit of any hearings or markups or floor amendments, without the benefit of learning how our changing energy picture alters the need for this pipeline, and without considering whether our time might be better spent on efforts to promote other cleaner energy sources.

We need sound energy policy in these challenging times. As the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I am anxious to begin working with all of my colleagues on pragmatic energy policy; but we need a balanced energy policy, one that takes into account current circumstances, one that takes into account our need to combat climate change, and one that works with the President rather than against the President to actually deliver legislation that the President can sign rather than veto. This legislation doesn't meet any of these criteria, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman and friend.

Mr. Speaker, I speak today as a former naval aviator who flew alongside Canadian Armed Forces as we won the cold war. We have no greater ally than our neighbor to the north—Canada. We were attacked on September 11

and went to war in Afghanistan; they went with us. To date, nearly 200 of their precious sons have come home in coffins. That is a true ally.

When Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans in August 2005, within 3 days our neighbor to the north authorized three military vessels, a Coast Guard vessel, numerous planes, 25 military divers, and tons of tents, blankets, beds, water, and medical supplies. That is a true ally.

And yet this strong alliance is being weakened dramatically because President Obama has chosen to listen to a small group of wealthy radicals who want no drop of oil coming from our neighbor to the north—Canada.

In November, I met with officials from Canada, officials from all over, from Leeds-Grenville and Nova Scotia. They were dismayed because we are telling them: We don't want your oil; don't help us.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSON. It is a bad world, Mr. President, with terrorists in Paris, and ISIS. Terrorists hit our country from North Korea. We need strong allies.

Today, pick up two things, Mr. President:

Pick up the phone, dial Mr. HARPER and say: I am going to approve this pipeline;

After it passes in the Senate, pick up that pen and sign this bill into law.

Let's have a strong alliance with Canada forever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Energy and Power Subcommittee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill, and I strongly disagree with this abhorrent process that the majority side has undertaken in order to hastily bring H.R. 3 to the floor after only 1 hour of debate and denying the minority the ability to offer one single, solitary amendment.

Truth be told, Mr. Speaker, it is unclear how this legislation would actually be of benefit to the American people. A 2014 report by the State Department concluded that the Keystone pipeline would create 35 permanent, full-time domestic jobs, which is roughly the same amount of jobs that would be created by opening a new corner fast-food burger joint, albeit with more risk to the American environment.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this bill is unnecessary because there is already an independent process that is taking place at this very moment, and H.R. 3 short-circuits this approval process.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, let it be fully understood by all Members of this

House, the President has indicated that he would veto this bill. This bill is dead on arrival if it ever reaches the President's desk.

The State Department has already released its final supplemental environmental impact statement and has begun the review period to determine whether the pipeline is in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, more than 2.5 million Americans have contributed comments on how this foolhardy project would impact the national interest, and their voices, the voices of 2.5 million Americans, deserve to be heard.

I have said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I say it again: this bill is about seizing power away from the American people.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. RUSH. This bill is about seizing power away from the American people by seizing power away from our duly-elected President. It will prevent the thorough, sober consideration of complex issues that could have serious security, safety, environmental, and other ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to vote "no." The Keystone XL pipeline is a Republican pipe dream.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the floor debating a bill to approve the Keystone pipeline, we all need to admit that we shouldn't be doing this. We should not have to be here today.

It is 2,303 days after the application for Keystone was first submitted to the State Department. We shouldn't be debating it; we should be building it.

For years, approval has been stuck in the Senate. Well, now the Senate is open. The Senate is changed. It moved through committee.

Mr. Speaker, for the longest time, the President hid behind the lengthy and delayed review process saying he wanted to wait to make a decision. He said he was waiting because of environmental and legal considerations. But Keystone won't harm the environment; it will help protect it. The people know that. Mr. Speaker, the President knows that.

Mr. Speaker, the President, before we even started the debate today, has submitted a threat of a veto. I take these seriously as a majority leader, so I wanted to read it. Mr. Speaker, one of the rationales why the President wants to veto it is because this bill also authorizes the project, despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska. Well, hallelujah. We have good news for the President, Mr. Speaker. The Nebraska Supreme Court solved that problem for him today.

So we should move forward just as we have done before on a bipartisan basis.



Why? Because of 42,000 jobs. Those are American jobs created here, an economy continuing to move forward.

And rest assured, the oil in Canada will be produced. The question before us today: Will that oil move down through America, refined in American refineries, built by American women and men, or will it go to a whole other continent?

We take up many issues here on this floor, but we have to look to the future and we have to build for a strong future. I want North America to be energy independent. We all know the strength of that. I want an environmentally sound way to do it. Today does it.

I listened to the President's concerns, Mr. Speaker. We have had 2,303 days. We have studied it. Our departments have studied it. They have come back and said, environmentally, we are safe. There was a legal concern. Well, the Supreme Court dealt with that.

So today we can join together, just as we have done before, in a bipartisan manner and pass this bill. There is a change in the Senate with an open process. They can pass it there, and it can go to the desk and be signed so 42,000 Americans can get back to work.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, at the heart of this issue are two questions: First, is climate change real? Is it a threat to our economy, to jobs, to our environment, and to our security?

Speaking for Vermont, climate change is real. In the past 5 years, Vermont has had 10 Federal disaster declarations from severe weather, including Tropical Storm Irene that did nearly \$1 billion worth of damage. Our farmers, ski area operators, and maple sugar producers are all trying to contend with the changing climate.

□ 1200

Also, we know that that oil is the same. This is not sweet Texas crude. Tar sands produce about 20 to 40 percent more carbon emissions than that Texas oil, and extracting it is going to produce about 27 million metric tons of carbon emissions.

The second question is this: Should Congress now or should Congress ever pass a major piece of legislation without any committee hearings, particularly when that legislation is only about oil going through our country, not to our country?

And this legislation includes a special provision that exempts a foreign corporation from contributing to an environmental cleanup fund all our domestic corporations are required to pay into.

On the issue of jobs, these are good jobs, about 2,000 jobs. But if this Congress would do its job, we would pass a surface transportation bill that would create 200,000 jobs and put those 3 million men and women in our labor

unions to work on good things that are going to rebuild this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong bill, it is passed in the wrong way, and at exactly the wrong time.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman from Kentucky for his tenacious work on this issue. This is the 10th time this has come to the floor and he has been diligent and has continued to push it, and we thank him for those efforts.

I have to tell you, listening to this debate, it just goes to show you why the American people are so tired of what they consider to be the political games that are played here in Washington.

They said they wanted us to come and get some things done. This is getting some things done. It is appropriate that we take up this bill today. And here is why: Do you realize 88 percent of all Americans support energy independence—88 percent? Sixty-five percent of all Americans think that building the Keystone pipeline is what this country should do.

Now, I have to tell you, I listen to the President and to the excuses that come out of the administration, and I think that with the Supreme Court decision in Nebraska today the President is out of excuses. He is out of excuses. He has run the gamut on it. No more excuses. It is time that we pass it, the Senate passes it, and that this legislation goes to the President's desk.

One of my colleagues said that being here on the floor today is a waste of time. I really disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. The President vetoing this legislation is a waste not only of the American people's time, but of the resources and the taxpayer money that come into the coffers for this government to function.

Create 20,000 new jobs, increase our energy supply, move us to energy independence. Pass the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to how much time is available on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a labor economics jobs bill. The American people need jobs. The labor unions who founded and built the middle class of this Nation need jobs.

But, ladies and gentlemen, nobody needs jobs like young Black men. I see this as an opportunity here today. The highest unemployment rate is with Black young men. For Black young men between the ages of 19 and 35, the

unemployment rate is 38 percent—38 percent—and in some communities it is 50 percent.

That is why I come before you today. I support the bill. But I want you all to help me support an amendment. You all know the amendment process is going on over in the Senate.

Over in the Senate, Senator McCONNELL said he is open to amendments. Here is the amendment: the amendment would just put language in this bill that would put the apprenticeship programs, what they affectionately call "earn as you learn" on-the-job training—no Federal money—and target those and guide and direct and encourage in this language that our labor union partners bring in these young African American men to learn these trade building skills. Each of the labor unions are ready. They have the apprenticeship programs, they have them there.

We need this desperately, ladies and gentlemen. Do you know that sitting in the prisons right now are 1 million Black men. Every week, thousands of our Black men are going into prison. The number one reason: they don't have jobs. This is a jobs bill. Yeah, it has got maybe, some people say, 4,000, some people say 2,000, but there will be other jobs that they can learn these skills from when we rebuild our infrastructure.

You all have seen the sign. Black lives matter, but Black lives with jobs.

Help me get this amendment in on the Senate side and let's pass this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3 and the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Part of the existing pipeline system actually supplies the Wood River Refinery in the 12th Congressional District in Illinois.

In anticipation of the construction of this pipeline, the owners have spent \$4 billion upgrading the facility and created about 2,400 jobs over a 4-year period. Construction of the Keystone XL extension would deliver similar benefits to other regions of the country, creating over 42,000 jobs in construction, manufacturing, transportation, and services industries.

It is for these reasons that a diverse coalition of businesses and labor unions in the construction and building trades industries have come out in support of H.R. 3, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, how does this one project, the Keystone XL pipeline, get so much outsized attention? We currently have a sprawling, 185,000-mile network of oil pipelines in the United States and a regulatory process to ensure that they are operating safely.

So why are we spending so much time trying to exempt a Canadian company from the environmental reviews that every other company in America has to abide by?

And the big question, Mr. Speaker: Who will pay for any future oil spills? Not Keystone. This bill exempts Keystone from contributing the same 8 cents per barrel that every other oil company is required to pay into the oil spill trust fund.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, why is this? If the authors are so certain that this pipeline does not carry any environmental risk, won't they allow the review process to run its course?

I stand with my colleagues. I want those jobs, I want them around the country. We can do this, we can do better.

I urge a "no" vote on this dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I also want to say congratulations again to my friend Congressman PALLONE for assuming the ranking position. We look forward to working with you.

Today is a great day. This pipeline should have been approved 6 years ago, like so many other transnational pipelines in our history. A pipeline is the safest way to move bulk liquid product, more than any other means. It will be from an ally, a trusted ally. More crude oil on the world market lowers prices for everybody. It is more money in the individual citizen's pocket. It actually is a very great day.

Let's just debunk this myth. This oil is going to go in refineries in my district, MIKE BOST's district, Ohio, Indiana, and in the gulf coast. We are going to get the double effort because we are going to be able to refine this, put it on the U.S. market, and lower energy prices for all our citizens. It is a great day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition.

We have been promised thousands of jobs, but the U.S. State Department estimates that this will create only 35 permanent jobs. Yes, they will be construction jobs, but they are not permanent. They are for a year, maybe 2 years.

Let's be clear about what we are getting with Keystone: a dirty and dangerous pipeline running through the heart of our country which will help Canadian oil companies export their oil, and it happens to be the filthiest possible energy form.

I would like to say that if we put the same time and energy into a transpor-

tation bill as we have to this Canadian pet project, we could upgrade our crumbling roads and bridges, expand our mass transit system, provide a huge boost to the American economy, and create jobs in almost every single congressional district in this country, thousands and thousands of permanent jobs in our good country.

We don't need another pipeline dividing our country, polluting our water, pushing us closer and closer to the climate tipping point. A transportation overhaul will actually create jobs that Americans can live off of. Keystone will not, unless what they are considering with these jobs are just the 35 permanent jobs. And maybe they are considering that there will be jobs to create the leaks and the pollution and treat the pollution and illnesses that may be associated with the pollution.

I urge a "no" vote. We should invest in American companies. We should invest in American pipelines. We should invest in American jobs that are here in America for Americans and are permanent.

Again, the State Department estimates that there will be only 35 permanent jobs. So what are we getting? No jobs and pollution from the dirtiest oil source and energy source that is on the Earth at this point.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, would you explain again the amount of time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Here we are again working to pass a bill to approve construction of the northern portion of the Keystone XL pipeline. Again, with the facts on our side. Again, with bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. And again, under threat of a veto. But with the new Republican majority in the Senate, the President just might get to make good on his veto threat this time, and we should force him to make that decision.

I urge my colleagues to support this job-creating, North American energy-producing, bipartisan, labor union- and Chamber of Commerce-supported, shovel-ready project. The American people asked for H.R. 3. We have waited long enough.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

□ 1215

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard more than one person say common sense isn't so common anymore. Boy, isn't that right? Well, today, we have a unique opportunity to pass com-

monsense legislation that will truly help the American people and strengthen America.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. It is projected this pipeline will create more than 40,000 good-paying jobs, and it will create far more good jobs indirectly by increasing our energy supply.

At a time when our families are struggling to make ends meet, it is irresponsible for the President to walk away from doing what is right for America. Building the pipeline will help us achieve energy independence. This is an opportunity to strengthen our position in the world, eliminate a key revenue source for our enemies, and strengthen our economy by lowering fuel prices even more.

I urge my colleagues in both Chambers and the President to support the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. This is an opportunity to show the American people that there is still a glimmer of hope for good old common sense.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a combat veteran, we should never have to fight for something that we can so readily produce here. Why should we put competitors in leverage over our economy and give them dollars to use against us?

We hear a lot of talk from progressives on the environment, Mr. Speaker. Imagine a life without petroleum, no cell phones, no asphalt for roads, no synthetic clothing, no plastics. On what do progressives suppose we run our magnificent Nation and lifestyle? Perhaps their answer is sweet bubble love and rainbow stew.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Keystone XL pipeline moves us in exactly the wrong direction: enabling production of the dirtiest crude oil on the planet to expand and increasing our carbon pollution for decades to come.

We still have a lot of work to do to cut our carbon pollution and avoid catastrophic carbon change. The concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere just hit 400 parts per million for the first time in human history.

Although this administration is making great progress, we are far from achieving our pollution reduction goals, and the need to act is more urgent than ever. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no." The President is going to veto this legislation. It is just a political exercise at this point.

Again, it bothers me that I hear so much from the other side about trying to help this Canadian company. We should be concerned about the United States. We should be concerned about the world and the environment that results from climate change and the continued production of greenhouse gases.

My concern and the concern of the President is that this is simply not legislation that has been proven to be, so

far, in the national interest. The President is just asking for more time to make that determination.

Vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address a couple of things.

First of all, I will place in the RECORD letters I received from the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council and Caterpillar.

JANUARY 7, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,  
Longworth Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER: The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) and our nationwide membership of business owners and entrepreneurs strongly support H.R. 3, the “Keystone XL Pipeline Act.”

Delays in approving this important project cannot be justified on any grounds. This is a critical energy supply and security issue, as well as being vital for U.S. economic growth, job creation and small business development.

This project means quality job growth, new business formation, and an increase in oil supplies from reliable sources. The building and operation of Keystone XL would benefit small businesses via affordable energy and economic growth. Small businesses within the energy sector would see growth opportunities as a result of the pipeline’s construction and operation. An underreported fact is that the U.S. energy sector is dominated by small businesses.

Consider the latest U.S. Census Bureau data:

Among oil and gas extraction businesses, 91.1 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among oil and gas pipeline and related structures construction businesses, 65.5 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

And among oil and gas field machinery and equipment manufacturing businesses, 57.6 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among support for oil and gas operations businesses, 83.3 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among drilling oil and gas wells businesses, 79.8 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

The energy business is all about small business. A new study released by SBE Council on November 13, 2014, found that small businesses are driving America’s energy renaissance. For example, from 2005–2012, construction businesses related to oil and gas pipeline and related structures grew by 12.2 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; oil and gas extraction businesses grew by 4.1 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; businesses drilling oil and gas wells grew by 7.9 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; businesses supporting oil and gas operations grew by 29.1 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; and manufacturing businesses related to oil and gas field machinery and equipment grew by 8.5 percent among firms with less than 20 workers. It is important to understand that

during this same period, the total number of small and mid-size employer firms declined, but the opposite was true in the energy sector. Construction of Keystone XL would mean increased small business growth, opportunities for entrepreneurs, and a stronger economy for America.

A vote in favor of H.R. 3 is a vote for small business and quality job creation. Thank you for considering America’s small business sector on this critical issue. SBE Council and its members look forward to House passage of H.R. 3.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,  
President & CEO.

JANUARY 8, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: On behalf of Caterpillar Inc., I write today in support of H.R. 3 the “Keystone XL Pipeline Act”, which would authorize construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Caterpillar has long supported the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline because of its significant economic and energy security benefits to North America.

As the world’s leading manufacturer of construction and mining equipment, diesel and natural gas engines, industrial gas turbines, and locomotives; along with our commitment to providing leading financial, remanufacturing, logistics and rail services, Caterpillar has been making sustainable progress possible on every continent for more than 80 years.

With energy related products and services accounting for over one-fourth of our business, Caterpillar, our dealers, and our customers are uniquely positioned to provide solutions to the world’s energy challenges. Through our core business and through new innovative technologies, Caterpillar is one of the world’s leading technology suppliers to the diverse energy market and leverages its technology and innovation to meet the world’s growing energy needs.

In the United States, the approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline would result in billions of dollars of investment, create tens of thousands of jobs, and would allow for the movement of hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil per day. Pipelines are a safe, reliable, economical, and environmentally favorable way to transport oil and petroleum products, as well as other energy liquids throughout the U.S. America already depends on thousands of miles of liquid pipelines to move the energy and raw materials our country relies on for everything from heating homes to powering manufacturing facilities. This additional pipeline capacity will help consumers and business throughout the United States and increase American competitiveness.

Caterpillar commends you for your leadership on this critical issue and looks forward to working with you on the approval of this important project.

Sincerely,

KATHRYN D. KAROL,  
Vice President.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the climate change issue because I think it is an important issue to a lot of people.

The argument that the other side makes is based on the false idea that somehow oil sands are not going to be developed without the United States. It is. Moving anything by rail is 1.9 times more the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> than moving it by pipeline. Moving it by truck cre-

ates 2.8 times the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as moving it by pipeline. Moving it by barge to China is priceless.

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

In conclusion, I would like to point out a couple of things. First of all, this was a significant issue in the last election just a couple of months ago. This is a piece of legislation about the American people, not a Canadian oil company. In polls, 72 percent of the American people say they support this legislation.

This is about jobs for people in America who need jobs. This is about increasing the energy infrastructure of our country. This is also a project that would not include one dime from the Federal Government. It is going to be at a cost of approximately \$7 billion of private funds that will create a lot of jobs and make us less dependent on foreign oil.

The application for the Keystone pipeline was filed in September of 2008. There are 2.6 million miles of pipelines in America. Most of those pipelines do not have to be approved by the President of the United States, but in this particular pipeline, since it crosses into the country from Canada to the U.S., the President must approve it.

The President has said that one reason he is not going to approve it is because of litigation in Nebraska, which ended today in favor of the Governor of Nebraska who supports this pipeline.

The second ostensible reason for the President to oppose it is CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; yet the Secretary of State’s office under Hillary Clinton and Mr. Kerry in their final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement have said on three occasions that it will have minimal impact on the environment.

Today, we want to pass this legislation once again for the American people. The U.S. Senate said that they will pass it, and we would ask the President to join us and sign this legislation.

I would urge the passage of H.R. 3, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the majority has chosen the first week of the 114th Congress to relitigate the battles of the previous two Congresses. This time, we’re here debating whether or not to approve a pipeline, through our nation’s Heartland, carrying Canadian tar sand oil.

There are many reasons why I’m opposed to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, the fact that oil produced from tar sands creates 17% more carbon emissions than other crudes; the potentially devastating impact wrought by this heavy crude should a pipeline rupture occur; or that my constituents are enjoying the best prices at the pump in several years without the completion of this pipeline due to the record glut in global oil supply.

Without even getting into the disappointing number of permanent jobs created by this project, which is 50, Mr. Speaker; the President has already clearly stated that he will veto this measure should it ever make it to his desk.

So at the end of the day Mr. Speaker, what are we really talking about here?

It would seem to me that instead of trying to score political points and refighting old battles, the 114th Congress should be using its first week to bring legislation to the floor that fosters an environment of innovation, energy diversification and an investment in clean, domestic forms of renewable energy. Policies that would create hundreds of thousands of new, permanent jobs while also ensuring energy independence for years to come.

While I understand that some of my Democratic Colleagues are in favor, I would strongly urge a "no" vote on this misguided legislation.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. For far too long, President Obama has impeded construction of the Keystone XL pipeline—costing the American people thousands of good-paying jobs and blocking an affordable source of energy. In the face of his continued obstruction, I proudly joined a strong bipartisan group of my colleagues voting to put an end to Obama's obstruction and approving the Keystone XL pipeline.

This legislation is not only good for America, but it is also uniquely important to the 36th District of Texas. The pipeline will bring an economic boost to our area through its construction and new energy supply. For six years President Obama has put politics above what is good for the American people and our local and national economy. This is an important step in putting more Americans back to work, creating opportunity to good jobs and growing our national economy.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of The Keystone XL Pipeline Act.

The Keystone Pipeline represents a critical asset in our efforts to increase energy security and reduce our dependence on Mid-East oil. It would also further lower prices at the pump for American families.

Most importantly, the Pipeline would create thousands of jobs in Texas and across the United States.

The President has threatened to veto this legislation and ignore the will of the American people. Six years of stalling is enough.

The Administration should stop standing in the way of a stronger energy future and thousands of new American jobs. Keystone must be approved immediately.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. While I welcome an open and transparent debate about whether building this pipeline is in our national interest, that is not what this legislation is about. Instead, we are being asked to circumvent the administration's permitting process and pass legislation that has been rushed to the House floor, without consideration by any committee or proceeding through regular order. This is no way to legislate.

The people of Michigan sent me to Congress to fight for our shared values. And no one knows better than the people of my state the importance of protecting our natural resources. This legislation puts those resources at risk by exempting the operators of the pipeline from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which helps the federal government respond to oil spills. It also waives all the requirements of the Endangered Species Act

and the National Environmental Policy Act, both of which contain critical environmental protections that cannot be ignored. I simply cannot support legislation which sets these landmark laws aside.

Congress needs to have a real and thoughtful debate on how we promote clean energy in the United States. I am ready to have that debate, but until then, I cannot support flawed legislation that puts our natural resources at risk.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 3.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 19, 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

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Garamendi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3 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. 3. 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. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer an 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 immediately be voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if a question is appropriate, but is this February 2? Is this Groundhog Day? I am curious. This is the 10th time this bill has been before the House, and those who are in support would argue, "Enough is enough. Let's pass it and get on with it."

Those of us in opposition would say, "Well, why haven't you written a bill

that is sufficient to the problems raised by the pipeline?"

Specifically, 10 times on this floor—and even additional times in committee—the issue of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund has been raised. We have raised that issue 10 times. It has been debated here on the floor. I have heard five, six people speak to that issue.

The chairmen of the committee are well aware that this bill has a huge loophole in it allowing one company that owns a pipeline to avoid paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Why in the world would we move a bill that allows this company, unique among all others, to not participate in a very, very important part of the protection of communities and the environment?

The Kalamazoo issue has been raised here—the spill. Over \$60 million was paid for by the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and then reimbursed by the pipeline company.

Let's do something right. This is great fun: back and forth, back and forth. We kick this thing around. We may get some political points on one side or the other. But why in the world don't we write a decent piece of legislation? Why don't we do it right? Why would we exempt one company among all of the others of hundreds of pipeline companies and allow this one Canadian company—and I love Canada, my son-in-law is a Canadian.

This is about doing what is right. This amendment would simply include this company being required to participate in the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. It is a lot of dollars. It is about \$24 million a year. That is a pretty good tax break. Who among us would not like to have that tax break? I guess we are all going to stand up because we want to have it.

The rest of the story is this: we have spent an enormous amount of time on this issue when, in fact, as has been said here many times by proponents and opponents, we ought to get on to real infrastructure.

Consider the time spent on this issue when you consider the time that has been spent on transportation bills on this floor. Consider the time that we must spend figuring out how to pay for repairing our bridges, building our highways, our ports, our airports. Consider that time.

Ten times, this bill has been here. Ten times, this House has ignored a tax break that is not warranted. It will allow to move forward to the Senate a bill that, in its very substance, provides an unwarranted, unnecessary, and grossly unequal tax break to one company among all the other pipeline companies.

This amendment simply comes to the point of making sure that this pipeline

company, like every other petroleum pipeline company in America, pays its fair share of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which is essential.

I see some of my friends from Michigan here. You know how important this is. The Kalamazoo River was a big deal—\$60 million thus far and more to come. The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund was there to provide the early money for the cleanup.

It is important, folks. My colleagues, this is important. Let's do it right. This is our 10th time. Let's do it right. Adopt this amendment. We clear up one problem in the bill. We remove one point of opposition, and we do what is right.

I ask for your "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the motion to recommit, and I would just say to all my colleagues: our side certainly views that as a procedural issue, not as a real amendment.

I would say that in the markup that we had on this bill in earlier years, I pledged to work with Mrs. CAPPS on our committee to find a solution that would be fair to the bill.

I support the concept of what the gentleman is doing, and in fact, I sent a letter in 2012 to the then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dave Camp, asking for help on this, and we were hoping that we would see comprehensive tax reform, and this would have been included as part of that.

□ 1230

But that did not happen. We didn't get tax reform.

So as this bill comes forward, a review does have to be made in terms of how to treat crude oil derived from oil sands for the purposes of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. But I have to say that really is a Ways and Means issue, now a Transportation issue, not an Energy and Commerce issue.

I know that this issue is going to be raised in the Senate with an amendment probably in the next week. I would just say to the gentleman and those that support this idea, I look forward to working with our Senate colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, as well as Republicans and Democrats in this body to, in fact, address this situation that does need to happen.

But as a motion to recommit, we shouldn't do it now. So let my Democrat friends vote "yes." I would urge my Republicans on this side to vote "no." I just want to give them the assurance that, in fact, as this bill moves into the conference, as what I expect to happen, that I certainly intend to see an understanding go forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

I am in agreement with the chairman of Energy and Commerce. This is, again, something to be dealt with on a tax bill.

Two things that are good have happened today. One, the Nebraska Supreme Court has removed the final hurdle to move this bill forward; and number two, my good friend from California and I agreed today on something—that this thing should be dealt with. But this is not the place or the time to deal with it.

Moving forward, we want to make sure that this is dealt with in the proper way, and I believe that the Ways and Means Committee will do that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much.

I have enormous respect for the two of you, and this issue has been before us many, many times. If we wait for a comprehensive tax reform, the tar sands may be totally eliminated and used up. We have an opportunity today to get it done.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, we understand that this will not be part of a comprehensive tax reform bill. We need to act earlier than that.

With the Senate now passing a bill, in all likelihood next week, likely with an amendment addressing this situation, we can deal with it as part of that conference report, and I look forward to supporting that and the inclusion of such in the final package.

I would again urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the procedural motion to recommit so that we can get to final passage.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—180

Adams  
Aguilar

Ashford  
Bass

Beatty  
Becerra

Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle (PA)  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu (CA)  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle (PA)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham

Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hastings  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu (CA)  
Lipinski  
Loeback  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Nolan  
Norcross  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Kuster  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NAYS—237

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)

Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Ellmers  
Emmer  
Farenthold  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger

Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)

King (NY) Olson  
Kinzinger (IL) Palazzo  
Kline Palmer  
Knight Paulsen  
Labrador Perry  
LaMalfa Pittenger  
Lamborn Pitts  
Lance Poe (TX)  
Latta Poliquin  
LoBiondo Pompeo  
Long Posey  
Loudermilk Price (GA)  
Love Ratcliffe  
Lucas Reed  
Luetkemeyer Reichert  
Lummis Renacci  
MacArthur Ribble  
Marchant Rice (SC)  
Marino Rigell  
Massie Roby  
McCarthy Roe (TN)  
McCauley Rogers (AL)  
McClintock Rogers (KY)  
McHenry Rohrabacher  
McKinley Rokita  
McSally Rooney (FL)  
Meadows Ros-Lehtinen  
Meehan Roskam  
Messer Ross  
Mica Rothfus  
Miller (FL) Rouzer  
Miller (MI) Royce  
Moolenaar Russell  
Mooney (WV) Ryan (WI)  
Mullin Salmon  
Mulvaney Sanford  
Murphy (PA) Scalise  
Neugebauer Schock  
Newhouse Schweikert  
Noem Scott, Austin  
Nugent Sensenbrenner  
Nunes Sessions

## NOT VOTING—12

Cárdenas Hinojosa  
Duckworth McMorris  
Duncan (TN) Rodgers  
Fincher Moore  
Gosar O'Rourke

## □ 1256

Mrs. ELLMERS, Messrs. BYRNE, HANNA, and STEWART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. DELBENE, Messrs. PAYNE, NEAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida and KAPTUR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS IN FRANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks in France.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 153, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Doyle (PA)  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Ellmers  
Emmer  
Farenthold  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith

[Roll No. 16]

## YEAS—266

Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Burgess  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce

## NAYS—153

Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano

Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu (CA)  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Grayson  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hastings  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu (CA)  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Carolyn  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moulton  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

## NOT VOTING—9

Duckworth Gosar  
Duncan (TN) Hinojosa  
Fincher Moore  
O'Rourke  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Thompson (MS)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

## □ 1305

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, myself and other members of the New York delegation were not able to be here on swearing-in day because we were attending the funeral of former Governor Mario Cuomo in New York, and we were also not here to cast a vote for Speaker of the House.

Had I been present during that vote, I would have cast my ballot for the right Honorable NANCY PELOSI of California, and I would like the RECORD to reflect my vote for Ms. PELOSI.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I was with Mr. CROWLEY attending the funeral on Monday of former Governor Mario