United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2013 No. 167

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 21, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We come to the end of a week where we have given thanks for the heroism of the brave men who served as code talkers during the world wars. They answered the call to service of their Nation at a time of great danger, and we are grateful to them.

Now we approach a week during which all Americans will gather to remember who we are: a Nation generously blessed not only by You, our God, but by courageous ancestors, faithful allies, and the best good wishes of people everywhere who long for freedom, who would glory in the difficult work of participative government, and who do not enjoy the bounty we are privileged to possess.

Bless the Members of this assembly, and us all, that we would be worthy of the call we have been given as Americans. Help us all to be truly thankful and appropriately generous in our response.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BIG WEEK FOR AMERICA'S ENERGY SUPPORTERS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over 25 years ago, Congress legislated Yucca Mountain as our national repository for nuclear waste. Sadly, the President discontinued the project in 2009 solely for political reasons. On Monday, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission ordered the Department of Energy to proceed with the review process.

This administration has failed to produce a clear plan for storing spent nuclear fuel, putting the environment at risk. South Carolinians have paid $2 billion into the program for the fees to address spent nuclear waste. Yet because of the President's party politics, a facility does not exist.

Thankfully, the judicial system sided with the American people this week and demanded the Energy Department to stop collecting these fees until a path forward is created. Yucca Mountain is clearly environmentally safe and secure and should be completed.

This is great news for the Aiken-Barnwell community and other commercial reactor sites across the country. The President should abide by the law. America is a strong Nation because we are a Nation of laws.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

I appreciate the community service of Bill and Anne West.

REMEMBERING THOSE LOST IN THE ILLINOIS TORNADO

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember those who tragically lost their lives this week in Illinois. Last weekend, tornados ripped across my State and six people were killed.

Extreme weather events are sadly becoming the norm across the country; 2012 was the second most extreme weather year to date, with 11 extreme weather events across our country.

Last year, Illinois experienced a total of 113 broken heat records, two broken snow records, 36 broken precipitation records, and one large wildfire. Clearly, this year looks to be no different.

The reality is this: stronger, more destructive storms are pounding our region with distressing regularity and with huge costs to our State, our residents, and our economy.

Our task is to aid those devastated by these events, as well as addressing the underlying cause of their increased severity and frequency—climate change.

LOSS OF COVERAGE III

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, President Obama and the Democrats who run Washington spent a lot of time telling the American people that if they like their health care plan, they can keep their health care plan.

So what would they say to the 4 million Americans who have had their insurance canceled under ObamaCare? What would they say to all the folks who have logged onto our House Republican Web site at gop.gov and told us their stories of lost coverage?

Americans need real solutions, not the political fix the President proposed last week.

The House passed our Keep Your Health Plan Act with strong bipartisan support. That is a real solution. We call on the Senate to listen to the American people and support it.

U.S. RESPONSE TO TYPHOON HAIYAN

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my condolences to the people of the Philippines following Typhoon Haiyan, which hit November 8, 2013.

I am proud to represent a vibrant Filipino community in the East Bay, and I have heard from many constituents who are concerned about loved ones overseas. Particularly this weekend, I heard from hundreds at St. Anne's Catholic Church in Union City.

The U.S. Government acted swiftly, sending monetary aid, humanitarian workers, and military personnel. Unfortunately, some people in the most remote areas are still struggling for basic human needs like food, water, and medical supplies. That is why Representative JACKIE SPEIER and I are circulating a letter to Secretary of Defense Hagel and USAID Administrator Shah, which we plan to send tomorrow supporting the use of airdrops of food and supplies to inaccessible areas.

In an ideal world, aid workers on the ground would distribute supplies to those in need, but time is of the essence. People are hungry, need medical supplies, and are thirsty right now.

I am committed to making sure the U.S. is doing everything it can to help the Filipino people as they begin to rebuild their lives following this horrific storm.

INDIANA STORMS

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on the destructive tornados and severe thunderstorms that struck Indiana and much of the Midwest this past Sunday.

On Monday, I had an opportunity to tour areas that sustained some of the worst damage. Kokomo, Indiana, was particularly hard hit, and Logansport, Lafayette, and Lebanon sustained serious damage as well.

While Hoosier lives were spared during this, some of our Illinois neighbors were not so lucky. All throughout the Midwest, people lost their homes, their possessions, and in some cases their livelihoods as businesses were destroyed.

Some of our communities and neighbors face a long, painful recovery. I encourage all Hoosiers and Americans to keep those suffering from the destruction of these storms in their thoughts and prayers.

As is often the case in our great Nation, tragedy reminds us of the goodness and generosity of our fellow citizens. In the past, I have seen Hoosiers step up in tough times to help their family, friends, neighbors, and even complete strangers in a time of need.

While touring Kokomo, I met two men who had driven all the way up from the Indianapolis suburbs just to lend a hand however they could. Shelters had opened. Charitable organizations had swung into action. Neighbors were helping neighbors.

While the Federal Government may have a role to play in the recovery efforts, Hoosiers were not sitting around waiting for their Federal Government. Individuals attacked problems, helped their neighbors, and showed great generosity and resilience.

It makes me proud to be a Hoosier, and I am humbled to represent so many people full of caring, generosity, and resilience.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND NEW JOBS ARE CREATED IN BUFFALO, NEW YORK

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, New York Governor Andrew Cuomo is in my home neighborhood of South Buffalo to announce a $225 million redevelopment of a former steelmaking plant that will bring 850 new jobs to Buffalo.

This project announcement will transform a 200-acre former Republic Steel site into a new clean energy and research campus that will breathe new life into a formerly contaminated industrial area that is situated along the Buffalo River and that has been economically dead for the past 30 years.

This announcement, along with $75 million in Federal and private investments to clean up the Buffalo River and shoreline, is creating a dynamic new economy in Buffalo, an economy marked by new waterfront development and clean-energy manufacturing.

Energy independence and hundreds of new jobs in the new economy are remaking Buffalo, New York; and this project should serve as a national model to grow the economy and for nation-building right here at home.

LOSS OF COVERAGE IV

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the last 6 weeks, every Member of Congress has heard from constituents who have been very much concerned about the cancelation of health insurance policies, primarily because someone has determined that their health insurance policy is not adequate.

We are hearing about higher premiums, and then we all know about the difficulty of getting on the Web site to select your insurance policy.

So there is a lot of confusion out there, there is a lot of anger out there, and there are a lot of people that are asking the U.S. Congress to help.

We want to hear how this ObamaCare is affecting individual Americans from coast to coast. We have developed a Web site called gop.gov. We would invite those people who are experiencing difficulty to go on gop.gov, click on ''your story,'' and tell us explicitly what experiences you are having.

This is very important and we appreciate it.

REPUBLICAN 2014 AGENDA

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Republican leader circulated his party's 2014 agenda—their vision for promoting private sector job growth, expanding the middle class, and strengthening our economy; their ideas for improving civil rights and bettering our immigration system; their path forward for ensuring our children and grandchildren inherit a better America.

Now, I would like to read to the House and to the American people the 2014 agenda by the Republican Party. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read them all in the order in which they are presented.

AMERICAN LEGION POST 1170

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation prepares for Thanksgiving, I rise to thank and honor two brothers from Boy Scout Troop 275 and the community that rallied behind them.

In the suburban Chicago district I represent, the Round Lake Area American Legion Post 1170 was showing its age. It was neither fitting nor proper for the veterans who filled its halls. Renovation was needed, but money was tight in a community hard hit by our economy.

One day, Edgar and Erik Garcia decided to restore Post 1170. With guidance from troop leader Paul Socha and Commander Steven Hall and help from fellow scouts, Erik and Edgar's idea neared reality. All they needed were supplies.

That is where Home Depot came in. Home Depot donated supplies and gift cards. They single-handedly covered 90 percent of the renovations, but they contributed far more than simply dollars and cents. Thirty Home Depot employees helped with the labor.

I am awed and inspired by Erik and Edgar's vision and determination. I am grateful for Home Depot's remarkable generosity, and I am overwhelmed by the communities' outpouring of support.

Our communities in Illinois' 10th District are close and strong and great because we care about one another. As we approach Thanksgiving, if you ever doubt our greatness, you need only visit American Legion Post 1170.

□ 0915

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANKLIN BARKER WEST

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by part of our Rules Committee family, members of the Rules Committee who would like to welcome back to our Nation's Capital a very dear friend, Celeste West. Celeste is part of our Rules Committee family who retired last July after 25 years of service. On Friday, September 6, Celeste tragically and unexpectedly lost her only son, Barker, in a car accident. Today would have been Barker's 19th birthday.

We all in the Rules Committee watched Franklin Barker West as he grew up. Barker brought a smile to everybody he met. He was a gregarious young man who had an unlimited amount of energy and zeal with an unlimited future. He was an outstanding young man who believed in himself and others.

Barker was also a fraternity brother of mine in the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity. Barker's fraternity brothers have called him a ''legend.'' As we know, lives live on despite us being in other places. His spirit is with us today.

In the wake of this tragedy, we are here today with Celeste and her family, Barker's father, Frank, and his stepmother, Suellen. We are here to celebrate Barker's short but remarkable life, a life that was part of our United States Capitol family.

As a father myself, I cannot even fathom the difficulties that the family is going through. But we want you to know, all of us here today, that the life that has been lived of Franklin Barker West was important, and is important to us.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 420 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1900.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0918

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1900) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, we have had a number of hearings over the last year, and we are all quite excited about the additional production of natural gas and oil in America. As many people know, we now are the number one producer of natural gas in the world and the number one producer of oil in the world. This has come about because of the entrepreneurial spirit of the private sector and development of these properties on private lands, primarily in Pennsylvania, North Dakota, and Texas.

So we are all excited about the opportunity for energy independence in America and certainly hopeful to reach a point where we are less dependent on oil and other products coming from the Middle East.

I want to thank MIKE POMPEO, a member from Kansas, for authoring this important legislation. Although we have become the number one producer and we have an abundance of natural gas today, we still have one key problem. To put it simply, we don't have the necessary pipeline infrastructure to move natural gas from where it is produced to where it is needed most.

I would like to just illustrate how some States are being harmed. According to the Energy Information Administration, in January this year we saw several States with residential natural gas prices way above the national average. For example, New Hampshire was 30 percent above the national average; Massachusetts was 43 percent; Maine, 67 percent; and Florida, 68 percent. Unfortunately, those living in these and many other States can expect to see higher prices once again this winter, and this is precisely why we are bringing to the floor H.R. 1900.

H.R. 1900 simply would bring certainty in agency accountability to the natural gas pipeline permitting process. It would allow natural gas pipelines to be built in a safe, responsible, and timely manner. It would also make existing natural gas pipelines safer.

During the legislative hearing on H.R. 1900, we heard testimony from industry of a corrosive natural gas pipeline that could not be replaced in a timely manner because an agency missed the deadline to issue a permit by nearly a year. The American people demand better than this.

So as we hear discussion and consider amendments to H.R. 1900, I want to thank once again the members of the subcommittee, the staff, and Representative POMPEO for all the work on this important legislation.

I respectfully reserve the balance of my time.

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

We are told that the Pompeo bill seeks to speed up the approval of interstate natural gas pipelines. In fact, it would have the opposite effect, delaying and disrupting a pipeline approval process that is working. The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office has concluded that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission pipeline permitting is predictable and consistent and gets pipelines built. The pipeline companies testified that the process is ''generally very good'' and that the ''sector enjoys a favorable legal and regulatory framework for the approval of new infrastructure.'' In short, this is a government program that works well.

H.R. 1900 would disrupt this functioning permitting process by arbitrarily limiting the time that FERC and other agencies have to review pipeline applications. When faced with these time limits, one of two things

will happen. Agencies can conduct inadequate environmental reviews and rush to approve permits that do not comply with our Nation's health, safety, and environmental laws. This would be a terrible outcome because the public won't be protected and pipeline permits will be legally vulnerable. Alternatively, the agencies can deny the permits when the time limits prevent them from completing legally mandated pipeline reviews, and this would be a bad result as well because needed pipeline capacity would not get constructed.

The career director at the Office of Energy Projects at FERC testified that he didn't believe that this bill would result in faster permitting. He explained that the bill would actually result in slower permitting if agencies had no choice but to deny applications because of the arbitrary deadlines established by this bill.

With this bill, we will get rushed decisions and more project denials. No one benefits from that, not even, or especially not, the pipeline companies.

But the problem with this bill doesn't end there. The Pompeo bill automatically grants environmental permits for a pipeline project if an agency does not make a decision on a permit within 90 days of the issuance of FERC's environmental analysis. This provision would sacrifice public health and environmental protections in favor of an arbitrary deadline. And no one can explain how this provision can actually be implemented.

These permits are detailed documents that include emission limits, technology or operating requirements, and conditions to ensure the environment is protected. Agencies need to figure out all of these details and then actually draft the permits. Complex permits might not even be written, but somehow they would be required to magically take effect.

In an effort to cobble together a solution to the mystery of how incomplete permits could be automatically issued, the bill transforms FERC into a ''superpermitting'' agency. If an agency misses the 90-day deadline, the bill apparently requires FERC to write and issue the permit itself.

Under this approach, FERC will be issuing BLM rights-of-way through Federal lands. FERC will be figuring out water discharge limits. FERC will be determining which technologies should be employed to reduce air pollution emissions. FERC will be issuing permits to protect wetlands and even bald eagles. These are jobs that FERC doesn't have the expertise or resources to carry out. They are ordinarily conducted by other agencies. But in this bill, because of the deadline, FERC will be required to take on those responsibilities.

There are going to be real environmental and safety impacts if permits automatically go into effect without the responsible agencies completing the necessary analysis. The Army Corps of Engineers and EPA raised concerns that automatic permitting could lead to permits that are inconsistent with the requirements of the Clean Water Act and Clean Air Act, and this could result in harmful water or air pollution.

This unworkable bill won't speed up pipeline permitting, but it will have adverse health, safety, and environmental impacts, and it will undermine the public's acceptance of interstate natural gas pipelines going through their communities. That is why it is opposed by the Pipeline Safety Trust and the public interest environmental groups, and that is why the administration has announced that it would veto this bill if it ever made it to the President's desk.

This is a bad bill. The consequences have not been thought through, and I urge all Members to oppose the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), the author of this bill.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WHITFIELD and Chairman UPTON for helping me work this bill through our committee. It is great to have it on the floor today. We now have a bipartisan piece of legislation aimed at making simple, commonsense reforms to the natural gas pipeline permitting process.

Rather than eliminating environmental regulations and permits, H.R. 1900 takes a very reasonable approach by requiring agencies involved in the permitting of natural gas pipelines, simply requesting that they finish their work in a timely manner.

□ 0930

The legislation builds off reforms made in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which placed the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the lead agency for interstate natural gas pipelines.

As we have heard this morning, natural gas is becoming a dominant force in the electricity generation and manufacturing sectors. It is critical that pipeline construction can take place through a modernized permitting process, and that is what this bill aims to do.

The current interstate natural gas pipeline permitting process, established in 2005, is already in need of updating because of the enormous shale gas boom. H.R. 1900 makes changes to the interstate natural gas pipeline permitting process by simply putting in place statutory deadlines for each of the permitting agencies to complete their work. This is pretty reasonable. We are simply asking agencies to do what the law requires them to do. They can say ''yes'' to a permit, they can deny the permit, but they can't sit on it. They have to do their homework. They have to get the job done.

FERC is already the lead agency for coordinating environmental review of interstate natural gas pipelines, and as FERC testified in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee earlier this year, the deadlines imposed by H.R. 1900 are reasonable. In fact, FERC asked for a couple of changes in the legislation, and in each case we made those changes at their request.

If, after H.R. 1900 were to become law, an agency doesn't complete its work, the permit would automatically be approved by statute. I have heard others say this is unprecedented, but that is simply not the case. There are numbers of examples all throughout the Federal code where statutory approvals of environmental permits are deemed approved in the absence of the agency saying to the contrary.

I can't imagine anyone saying that this legislation is radical or unprecedented. More importantly, I can't see that they could claim that it is unnecessary. To my left you can see the impact of the absence of natural gas infrastructure all across the country. Frankly, in Kansas, we are in pretty good shape, but on the east coast, here in the Northeast where I am standing today, and on the west coast, you see enormously high natural gas costs: 24 percent above the national average in New York; 20 percent above the national average in Arizona; 67 percent above the national average in Maine; and 68 percent above the national average for the cost of natural gas in the State of Florida. We are seeing these prices rise because we don't have infrastructure development adequate to meet the needs of manufacturers and consumers in these places.

The New York Times, that bastion of conservatism, wrote the following, saying that FERC was ''concerned about increasing reliance on natural gas-fuel generators at times when there is an increasingly tight availability of pipeline capacity to deliver natural gas from the south and the west to New England.''

The Boston Globe, writing about pipeline projects in New England, said that the projects come ''as New England struggles to address growing demand for natural gas and supply constraints created by tight pipeline capacity. Those constraints have led to shortages and price spikes during the peak demand periods, such as extended winter cold snaps, helping to drive the region's already high energy costs even higher.''

The New York Times and the Boston Globe recognize the need for H.R. 1900.

This is not a manufactured crisis or bill in search of a problem. This is a real issue with real consequences for jobs in America and for average working families all across our country. The bill will give certainty to natural gas pipeline developers that invest in projects which could transport affordable energy to consumers all across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1900 and address a very real issue impacting consumers and manufacturers all across the country.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I do that in order to respond to the concerns that have been raised about natural gas prices in the Northeast. This is a real issue. New England is using more natural gas to generate electricity and more natural gas for heating homes than in the past. On the coldest winter days, when natural gas is needed for both heating and electricity, there is more demand than can be met by the existing pipeline capacity, and that, of course, can result in price spikes.

This bill does nothing to solve that problem. The problem in New England isn't caused by pipeline applications taking too long to get approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The problem is that the pipeline companies aren't even submitting the applications because they haven't figured out who will pay for these new pipelines. The pipeline companies haven't been satisfied that there is a sufficient year-round demand to justify and finance these pipelines.

That is an issue that FERC is actively looking at and has been holding stakeholder conferences about. But this has nothing do with Mr. POMPEO's bill. Cutting corners on the permitting process isn't going to help get additional pipeline capacity built for the Northeast. I don't think we ought to be blaming government for every problem. The reality is that FERC and the government didn't create this problem. It is a problem of the economics of it all, and the faster we understand that, the faster we can try to find real solutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1900, a commonsense, bipartisan bill that is going to help build the architecture of abundance that we need to fully realize the benefits of our American energy boom.

Until a few years ago, our Nation was facing a very critical shortage of natural gas, and I will remind us that policymakers in the seventies, eighties, and nineties never envisioned shale gas. Today, technological innovations like horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing have made the U.S. the number one gas-producing nation in the world.

Our overall energy landscape has changed dramatically in just a short period of time. It is not only rewriting the economic outlook that we have as a Nation but also beginning to change the geopolitical nature of global energy, as we have heard from nations around the world seeking access to United States supplies to help wean them off of regions like Russia and the Middle East.

Today, we face a new challenge: how to overcome government-imposed roadblocks to building the infrastructure and unleashing the innovation necessary to harness our new energy abundance. As energy production grows across the U.S., building the infrastructure to move these supplies to consumers is emerging as the real challenge of this century. With all of our abundance in natural gas, it is simply unacceptable that there are still regions in the country where lower prices are being constrained by a lack of pipelines because of regulatory delays. America's rich natural gas resources should continue fueling both job creation and economic growth, but we cannot fulfill that potential unless we ensure businesses and manufacturers have access to this affordable and reliable clean energy.

I commend Representative POMPEO for introducing H.R. 1900 as a remedy for this problem.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. UPTON. Setting enforceable deadlines to improve natural gas pipeline projects will build upon the bipartisan reforms that we made with our Energy Policy Act of 2005 while preserving critical environmental review. If other nations, including Canada, Australia, and many other EU member nations, can hold their agencies to real, accountable deadlines, it is not unreasonable to ask ours to do the same.

Congress should be doing everything possible to reduce red tape and delays in building safe and efficient natural gas pipelines to bring our infrastructure up to modern times to reflect that energy abundance. This bill is a very important step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 1990, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, legislation that will help bring America closer to energy independence and security.

The United States is blessed with God-given natural gas resources that many experts believe exceed the reserves in places like Saudi Arabia.

In eastern and southeastern Ohio, we are blessed with the Marcellus Shale and Utica Shale deposits that are beginning to produce never before seen volumes of natural gas and natural gas liquids.

This part of rural Ohio, a region of the country that is often forgotten by elected officials in the capital cities of Columbus and Washington, D.C., a region that sorely needs economic growth, is seeing billions of dollars of private sector investment in domestic energy production, and even more is in the planning stages.

But we have a major challenge to overcome. You see, we can't always get the natural gas from the drilling site to the end-users because there is a lack of pipeline networks. Pipeline companies are working 24/7 to remedy this problem, but they often face procedural roadblocks from Federal agencies that slow down progress and hamper job creation. H.R. 1900 would give production companies the confidence and certainty that if they invest the millions of dollars to drill wells, they will have a way to get the natural gas to market.

This legislation could decide whether or not my constituents have a job, but I was disappointed that the administration is opposed to it. From the President on down, the administration has acknowledged that hydraulic fracturing is environmentally safe. Just yesterday, Secretary of State John Kerry mentioned the importance of natural gas to America. But with their opposition to this legislation, I guess they aren't really serious about America's energy independence and energy future. It seems they would rather leave Ohio's natural gas in the ground than let all hardworking Americans benefit from its production.

I urge my colleagues to support this important job-creating legislation, and I urge the Senate to take it up immediately.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I understand that proponents of this bill want a one-size-fits-all Washington, D.C., solution to the timeframes required for pipeline reviews. The problem is that there isn't some magic number of days that works for all pipelines in all circumstances.

There are 10-mile pipelines far from population centers that cross no rivers, and there are pipelines hundreds of miles long that cross multiple rivers and run through backyards. These are very different projects. It should come as no surprise that they take different amounts of time to review.

When reviewing a project, FERC doesn't just have to do an environmental review. It also has to conduct an engineering review. FERC must evaluate, approve, and in many cases alter a pipeline's route to address environmental, engineering, and community concerns. FERC must determine a pipeline's tariffs and rates. These are steps that take time.

For longer and more complex pipelines, these steps take longer, and they should. FERC decides 92 percent of all pipeline applications within 12 months. Let me repeat that: 92 percent of all the applications are approved within 12 months.

The fact that 8 percent of the projects take longer isn't a problem. It reflects the reality that a small number of projects are more complex and impact more people. If you have constituents in the paths of these proposed pipelines, you should want the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and other agencies to protect your constituents by completing the necessary

reviews. Your constituents don't want a one-size-fits-all Washington solution for all problems that are not the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I applaud my colleague and fellow subcommittee chairman on Energy and Commerce for helping bringing H.R. 1900 to the floor. This legislation will help ensure that the key elements of our critical infrastructure will be improved and constructed on a timely and predictable basis. This is a goal we all can and should support.

On a closely related subject, I too wanted to associate myself with Chairman WHITFIELD's recent statement regarding the growing tendency among certain States to engage in obstructionist tactics aimed at key infrastructure projects. In some cases, States have even used federally delegated authority to block federally approved projects. Let me say again that States have used federally delegated authority to block federally approved projects.

□ 0945

The most prominent example is the use of the Clean Water Act to deny otherwise routine permits and approvals. As my colleague suggested, we have legislated on that issue previously, but our clear intent in doing so was frustrated in the court system. It may well be that we may need to address this issue further, and I stand ready to work with my colleague to do so.

In other instances, States have tried to use their authority under the Coastal Zone Management Act to impose consistency requirements on federally approved projects, even when those projects have already been found to be consistent with the States' Coastal Management Plan. This is clearly taking a second bite at the apple.

The law is abundantly clear that a State has no authority to review an existing project a second time if it underwent a previous consistency review. Only in the event that there is an applicable program change or a significant alteration in the nature of the facility would a State ever be entitled to render a second consistency determination.

For this reason, I see no need to legislate on that subject at this time, but I am well aware that even the clearest of statutory provisions can sometimes be distorted by determined States, so I will join with my colleague, Chairman WHITFIELD, to keep a watchful eye on this situation.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I support passage of H.R. 1900.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at this time to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a very important member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member WAXMAN for yielding the time.

Colleagues, we are dealing with a bill here, H.R. 1900, that relates to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

FERC is an independent agency that reviews electric transmission lines that go across States, interstate electric transmission lines. They also review interstate oil pipelines, and they also review the interstate natural gas pipelines. This is a very important subject.

Now, this bill relates only to the natural gas pipeline authority of FERC. The country right now is in a natural gas revolution. It has been remarkable. The United States is now a net exporter of petroleum. This has happened very quickly, and FERC has responded very well over time on the expansion of the natural gas market. That is why it is so confounding as to why we need this new bill that is going to short-circuit FERC's review power.

Right now, FERC grants over 90 percent of the interstate natural gas pipelines across the country. This bill really is an unnecessary piece of legislation in search of a problem. In committee, the bill was panned by the FERC professional staff. The administration strongly opposes it.

Instead of expediting expansion of natural gas pipelines across the country, it would disrupt FERC's natural gas permitting process which, right now, is already getting thousands of miles of pipelines permitted in a timely manner, like I said, over 90 percent of the applications.

Instead, the bill establishes arbitrary and inflexible deadlines for FERC and other agencies to issue permits; and there are several major problems with the bill, particularly short-circuiting the permitting process for the most complex projects.

The bill says we have a 12-month deadline, no matter what kind of project is proposed. FERC currently decides 90 percent of the permit applications within that 12-month period; and in July, the Pipeline Trade Association testified that FERC's existing permitting process is generally very good.

Second, in addition to this arbitrary 12-month deadline for all applications, it would rush environmental reviews for complex projects. The bill's rigid deadline applies to every pipeline project, regardless of complexity.

It doesn't make sense to apply the same 12-month deadline to, say, a 30-mile interstate pipeline that doesn't cross any rivers, doesn't have environmental concerns, doesn't go through population areas, and then apply the same 12-month deadline to the most complex, multi-state, interstate pipeline initiative that goes across environmentally-sensitive areas, maybe across rivers, through highly populated areas.

Third, the bill also will lead to unnecessary permit denial. What we heard from FERC is that, instead of speeding up the permitting process for natural gas pipelines, it is very likely that this bill will slow down permitting. If FERC can't finish its analysis by the required deadline, they may have no choice but to deny an application that otherwise could have been granted.

Now, before I came to Congress, I practiced environmental law, and what I learned during that time is for those complex projects there is a lot of give and take that needs to happen. You have to discuss mitigation. You have to discuss are there any alternatives.

Oftentimes, these business owners, it is in their interest to have a little more time to figure out the right path for a pipeline or a transmission line or something like that. You get input from local governments, local communities, neighborhood associations, environmental groups; and you wind up with a better project.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Another serious problem with the bill is that it transforms FERC into a super-permitting agency. Now that sounds pretty scary, but that is what it does.

It says that the bill provides for permits to automatically go into effect if an agency does not approve or deny them by the bill's arbitrary 90-day deadline. So FERC would be issuing Clean Air Act permits, Clean Water Act permits, even BLM right-of-way through Federal land permits.

These are functions that FERC does not have the expertise or resources to carry out. This is an unworkable provision that could result in permits being issued that are inconsistent with the Nation's environmental laws.

Finally, I know many people on both sides of the aisle are very concerned about eminent domain and when we give power to government to condemn lands. Well, here is a reminder for everyone. We should all remember that when FERC issues a certificate of public convenience and necessity, it gives a pipeline company the power of eminent domain. The power to take someone's property should not be conferred without FERC taking the time it needs for a thorough analysis and thoughtful decisionmaking.

So for all of those reasons, I urge opposition to the bill.

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

I might just make one comment. As the gentlelady from Florida indicated, the Obama administration has indicated their opposition to this bill. But I will tell you, we have large groups, the National Rural Electric Co-Ops, supporting this bill; the Public Power Association is supporting this bill.

And the New England Ratepayers Association wrote a letter to us saying, currently, New England ratepayers suffer from the highest electricity rates of

any region in the country. A significant reason for this is the limited capacity of natural gas pipeline which the electricity generators throughout New England rely on.

So we are trying to respond to the needs of people, and we recognize that the economy has been weak, and there are not a lot of pipelines being built right now, although there is one in my home State of Kentucky.

But we want to set the framework so that when the time comes, these pipeline companies are able to move and move quickly with adequate protections.

At this time, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our distinguished whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1900 and in support of the work this Chamber has accomplished this week.

This was an important week in the House. We will have passed three bills that further the energy revolution that has propelled the U.S. to the forefront of the world's energy producers.

So to hear a few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle disparage this work, even so much as refer to it as egregious, is disappointing.

First, we passed legislation that reduced bureaucratic delays on energy products on Federal lands that are providing resources to power our economy. As America, we will soon become the largest energy producer in the world. It is astonishing that this occurred while energy production on Federal lands has actually decreased.

We guaranteed that energy production from hydraulic fracturing on Federal lands is overseen by the regulator with the best track record, the States.

And today we are ensuring that, once harnessed, the energy resources will reach end-users in the safest, most efficient and reliable manner.

In its lifecycle, the quality of all Americans improves; and there is no better example than, at the start of this month, November 1, the first pipeline to enter New York City in 40 years opened. That was 40 years that it took.

What happened once it entered New York City? The price dropped. The price fell by 17 percent. Do you realize if you buy gas in New York City, it is cheaper than in Louisiana? But 40 years that it took. To me, that was egregious.

The savings extend far beyond New York City. In 2012, affordable energy added $1,200 of disposal income to the average U.S. household. That will go to $2,700 by 2020 and $3,500 by 2025. That is real savings.

Today we have an opportunity. We have an opportunity to streamline, to protect, and to lower the costs for all Americans, to actually be able to produce and create more jobs in America. That is why you see a very diverse group of support for this legislation, from unions, to associations, to Americans that want to keep more of what they earn, create more American jobs, and then, again, stop any egregious falsity that it takes 40 years to build a pipeline.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I know of no union supporting this bill, nor do I think the Northeast ratepayers said in their letter where they expressed their concern about the supplies where there is a very cold spell, that they want this bill either.

I am pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a distinguished subcommittee ranking member on one of the energy subcommittees.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we are addressing before the House simply does not address the problems with pipeline approvals because the committee has not identified any problems with them.

The natural gas pipeline approval process works well. The Government Accountability Office's recent review found that FERC's consideration of the vast majority of these projects is completed within a year of receiving a complete application.

The network of over 2 million miles of gas pipeline spread across this country ensures that natural gas can be delivered where it is needed. We do have some areas where additional infrastructure is required, but the failure to fill those needs is not due to the permit approval process at FERC. It is due to economic decisions being made by those in the private sector.

We do have some problems with pipelines. Accidents resulting in explosions have severely damaged property and, in some cases, claimed lives. We should be doing more to prevent these accidents.

The 10 percent of project approvals that are not completed within a 1-year period are those that are more complex. They extend for many miles, traverse densely populated areas, and cross sensitive or valuable resources such as farm lands or water bodies.

A project with these characteristics may need more than 1 year to ensure that the pipeline that is ultimately constructed is not going to place people, their communities, other businesses or valuable resources at risk.

Whenever a regulatory agency is poised to act under the law to defend the health and safety of our citizens, there is a hue and cry about the necessity of doing extensive analyses of all aspects of the proposed regulation to determine its potential impact on businesses and the economy.

Many of these analyses take years and delay commonsense protections that will, indeed, save thousands of our citizens from illnesses or death.

Apparently, protecting public health or the environment can wait, but the oil and gas companies cannot.

We need energy, but we need other things also. FERC's process weighs all these considerations before approving pipelines, and that is how it should be.

Pipeline projects should be evaluated in a timely fashion; but the imposition of a hard, 12-month deadline for all projects, regardless of their length or complexity, is bad policy. We should devote our time to solving problems, not creating them.

H.R. 1900 should be rejected. It will do nothing to improve the pipeline approval process.

□ 1000

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time remains for both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, a couple of points are worth noting to make sure that everybody understands exactly what we are up against.

There has been some suggestion that this is unnecessary, and maybe in the eyes of some in Washington, some political officials, it is unnecessary; but the people who this matters to—consumers, manufacturers all across the country—know that this is a necessary piece of legislation. The National Association of Manufacturers has said that this is something that would be important to creating manufacturing jobs for families all across the country. The Chamber of Commerce has similarly made this comment.

It was earlier stated that some folks were unaware of union support for this legislation. I want to make sure that everyone is fully aware that the Laborers' International Union of North America, the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, and the operating engineers have all been supportive of H.R. 1900 and the importance of energy infrastructure expanding all across our country.

Finally, there has been this idea that FERC approves 90 percent of the permits. It has been repeated time and time again. It is just factually incomplete. It is like, if you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it. Technically perhaps true in the most narrow sense, but in reality, it is not the case that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approves 90 percent of all permits or that they are all approved. FERC is but one of many, many agencies that has the authority to approve and deny permits. So this 90 percent number that continues to be thrown around is just false. We don't have 90 percent of all folks seeking to build pipelines being able to build those pipelines in a timely fashion. They are being delayed.

There is real demand for this. There is demand from the New England Ratepayers Association. There is demand in States like Florida, where the natural gas rates are 60 percent higher than the national average. This is a real need. This is a real challenge.

And if we do this, if we get H.R. 1900 passed, all we are simply saying is do your job. Finish the process. If you decide that the permit shouldn't be built, any of these agencies can deny that permit being built. That seems fine. We are not denying any agency the capacity to deny a permit. But do the work. Tell these folks that, No, you are not going to get it, and then allow the process to move forward.

These unions, these associations, these real hardworking families need natural gas at an affordable price to be delivered to them, and H.R. 1900 will help achieve that objective.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, we are not arguing whether we should have an infrastructure of pipelines to take natural gas from one place to another. That is not the issue. And that is a false premise that, for some reason, that may be an area of disagreement. It is not.

The area of disagreement is whether, in letting a pipeline be built, we are going to shortchange the ability of the agencies to review the pipeline. And if we do that, there may not be time to look at BLM issues or safe water issues or clean air issues because FERC will be told, if you don't do your job within a certain period of time, this permit is going to be approved, and these other agencies aren't going to have time to do any review.

Well, FERC doesn't have the ability to do other agencies' jobs; and those other agencies ought to be able to do their job, and FERC should do its job in a timely manner. But ''a timely manner'' doesn't mean a certain amount of time and no more—not another month, not another 2 months, not another 3 months.

I want to close by sharing some of the comments made by others. The White House said they will veto this bill. The President and his administration are against it. They say the bill provides for the automatic approval of natural gas pipeline permits if applications are not decided within ''rigid, unworkable time frames.'' The administration also notes that the bill could cause confusion and increase litigation risk, and further, the bill ''may actually delay projects or lead to more project denials, undermining the intent of the legislation.''

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Let's say they needed a couple more months but that 12-month period is right there. Well, they will either have to approve it without those extra few months of review or deny it, which could mean longer periods of time before the pipeline is approved. It is counter to what the proponents say that they expect.

The Pipeline Safety Trust and other public interest organizations said about this bill: ''H.R. 1900 will needlessly put at risk the well-being of the people and environment where natural gas pipelines are built while making it easier for pipeline companies to use Federal eminent domain authority to take private land without a thorough review.''

This is going to allow eminent domain authority by a private company to take away people's land. Is that something that Members of Congress want to vote for, your constituents' land could be seized by a private company when there had not been a thorough review that would allow this kind of power over private property? That shouldn't be the result of a rushed, incomplete process. We wouldn't want a rushed, incomplete process of taking away liberty. We shouldn't allow a rushed, incomplete process to take away private property.

The Pipeline Safety Trust also explains that ''rushed or incomplete reviews resulting in automatic approvals pose a threat to public safety and the environment,'' and they characterize the bill's transformation of FERC into a ''superpermitting'' agency that issues other agencies' permits as ''bizarre.'' And they are right that it ''effectively places control over key environment and public health statutes in the hands of an agency primarily tasked with regulating the economics of natural gas and electricity.'' They don't have the expertise, they don't have the personnel, they don't have the budget, and now we are giving them that kind of a job.

And the last quote I have is from the natural gas pipeline industry. Now, I realize the industry would always like the permitting to go faster, but the industry told us over and over that the existing process works well. In May, the CEO of Dominion Energy testified on behalf of the pipeline companies. He told the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, ''The interstate natural gas pipeline sector enjoys a favorable legal and regulatory framework for the approval of new infrastructure,'' and his conclusion was that ''the natural gas model works.''

Conservatives used to say, if it works, don't fix it, and yet they want to fix it with a lot of uncertain results, perhaps unintended consequences. Mr. Chairman, this bill would cause a lot of problems without speeding up the permitting process, which is currently getting thousands of miles of new pipeline built in a timely manner. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. In my concluding remarks, I would simply say that this act is commonsense reform aimed at providing greater certainty for interstate natural gas pipeline projects at a time when we see great revitalization in the production of natural gas. We have an opportunity to export some natural gas, we have the opportunity to help lower electricity rates, and I would urge all the Members to support H.R. 1900.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. In my state of Pennsylvania, the Marcellus Shale boom has reinvigorated our economy and created thousands of jobs. American energy production is booming, and we need the infrastructure to keep up with demand and transport the gas from well to market.

I have seen in my own state the frustration and delays in getting gas from well to market due to unnecessarily long permitting processes. These delays keep gas from flowing, hold up royalty payments to my constituents, and prevent tax revenue from making it into the state and local coffers.

While we must ensure that pipelines are constructed safely, many times these delays have nothing to do with safety and everything to do with politics. We've seen President Obama and the EPA do everything they can to delay natural gas production and destroy the energy industry in this country in order to appease the radical environmentalist left.

We must not allow this to happen. Congress must take action to ensure that our domestic energy production thrives and the United States can be energy independent. The Natural gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act will expedites the federal review process for applications for natural gas pipeline certificates, allowing us to build this much needed infrastructure efficiently and safely.

I support passage of H.R. 1900 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1900, the ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Act.''

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated this week as this House has debated the other energy bills, I am not anti-energy exploration. I am not pro- or anti-fracking. I am, however, strongly ''pro-jobs,'' ''pro-economic growth,'' and ''pro-sustainable environment.''

As a Member of Congress from Houston I have always been mindful of the importance of, and have strongly advocated for, national energy policies that will make our nation energy independent, preserve and create jobs, and keep our nation's economy strong.

That is why I carefully consider each energy legislative proposal brought to the floor on its individual merits and support them when they are sound, balanced, fair, and promote the national interest.

Where they fall short, I believe in working across the aisle to improve them if possible by offering constructive amendments.

Although I believe the nation would benefit by increased pipeline capacity to transport our abundant supplies of natural gas, the legislation before contains several provisions that are of great concern to me.

Pursuant to Section 2, paragraph (4) of the bill, a permit or license for a natural gas pipeline project is ''deemed'' approved if the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission (FERC) or other federal agencies do not issue the permit or license within 90–120 days.

I have three concerns with this regulatory scheme.

First, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have a problem with ''deeming'' something done that has not been done in fact.

Thus, the provision is unwise.

Second, the provision is unnecessary because FERC has, since fiscal year 2009, completed action on 92 percent (504 out of 548)

of all pipeline applications that it has received within one year of receipt. And the remaining 8% of decisions that have taken longer than one year involve complex proposals that merit additional review and consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the process may not be perfect or as quick as we would like but it is working well and administered by hardworking individuals who carefully and meticulously consider permits and license applications for natural gas pipelines on a case-by-case basis—as they should.

The approval process for a pipeline is not like deciding to grow a garden in the backyard of your home—given the inherently dangerous nature of the activity, the review and approval process takes time and requires careful attention—as it should be.

In short, the bill before us is a remedy in search of a problem. There is no lengthy or intolerable backlog of neglected natural gas pipeline projects awaiting action by FERC.

Third, the provision is irresponsible because it would require FERC and other agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

Compounding the problem is that the fact that FERC, like virtually every federal agency, is operating under the onerous and draconian provisions of the disastrous sequestration which has caused so much misery and disruption across the nation and to our economy.

FERC, for example, with a budget of $306 million faces a $15 million reduction in spending authority this fiscal year, according to OMB. That sum amounts to 5% of FERC's budget.

So the likely impact of this bill if passed is to put FERC in the position of having to work faster to issue decisions with fewer experienced employees and a reduction in resources.

Thus, because of sequestration the legislation would achieve the opposite effect intended by proponents.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

Mr. Chairman, given the inherent dangers involved in the construction and operation of a natural gas pipeline, does anyone doubt that were this bill to become law FERC will be more likely to err on the side of caution and deny applications that may otherwise have been approved if it had more time and more resources to carry out its responsibilities?

Mr. Chairman, we should not take that chance. An amendment I offered, and which was made in order by the Rules Committee, avoids this outcome by conditioning the effective date of this bill upon the termination of sequestration.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in recognizing how detrimental sequestration has been to our fiscal policy and to the economy.

Earlier this week, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, joined by the 12 Subcommittee chairs, wrote a letter to the Budget Conferees in which they call upon the Budget conference to reach an agreement as soon as possible because among other things: "the current sequester and the upcoming 'Second Sequester' in January would result in more indiscriminate across the board reductions that could have negative consequences on critically important federal programs".

The Appropriators go on to state that: "The American people deserve a detailed budget blueprint that makes rational and intelligent choices on funding by their elected representatives, not by a meat ax."

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with Chairman ROGERS and the Subcommittee chairs.

Sequestration is bad fiscal policy. It results in unwanted and unintended legislative consequences. It is bad for the economy. It is unfair to the American people and they know it.

According to an analysis conducted by Regional Economic Models, Inc. and Third Way, the damage to the economy caused by sequestration is substantial.

Sequestration has cost the United States $179.4 billion in lost economic activity and more than 1.88 million jobs, which means the economy grew by −1.04% less than it would have otherwise.

The corresponding figures for my home state of Texas are $15.2 billion in lost economic activity and 153,541 jobs.

The human toll of the sequestration is even greater.

Texas, for example, will lose approximately $67.8 million for primary and secondary education, putting around 930 teacher and aide jobs at risk.

In addition about 172,000 fewer students would be served and approximately 280 fewer schools would receive funding.

Texas will lose approximately $51 million for about 620 teachers, aides, and staff who help children with disabilities.

Head Start and Early Head Start services would be eliminated for approximately 4,800 children in Texas, reducing access to critical early education.

Approximately 52,000 civilian Department of Defense employees in Texas may be furloughed, reducing gross pay by around $274.8 million in total.

Texas will lose about $1,103,000 in Justice Assistance Grants that support law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

More than 83,000 fewer Texans will get the help and skills they need to find employment because Texas will lose about $2,263,000 for job search assistance, referral, and placement, meaning.

Up to 2300 disadvantaged and vulnerable children could lose access to child care, which is also essential for working parents to hold down a job.

Because of sequestration, 9,730 fewer children in Texas will receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and Hepatitis B due to reduced funding for vaccinations.

Texas could lose up to $543,000 to provide services to victims of domestic violence, resulting in up to 2,100 fewer victims being served.

Texas will lose approximately $2,402,000 to help upgrade its ability to respond to public health threats including infectious diseases, natural disasters, and biological, chemical, nuclear, and radiological events.

In addition, Texas will lose about $6,750,000 in grants to help prevent and treat substance abuse, resulting in around 2,800 fewer admissions to substance abuse programs. And the Texas State Department of Public Health will lose about $1,146,000 resulting in around 28,600 fewer HIV tests.

Mr. Chairman, I join with Chairman ROGERS and the Subcommittee chairs in calling upon the Budget conference "to reach an agreement on the FY 2014 and 2015 spending caps as soon as possible to allow the appropriations process to move forward to completion by the January 15 expiration of the current short-term Continuing Resolution."

I agree with them that if an agreement is not reached and sequestration remains in place, "the likely alternatives could have extremely damaging repercussions."

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us compounds the damage already being done by sequestration. It is for this reason that I urge all Members to join me in voting against H.R. 1900 as an unwise, unnecessary, and irresponsible measure.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1900, which would place new, arbitrary deadlines on the pipeline permitting process at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and related agencies.

H.R. 1900 attempts to solve a problem that simply doesn't exist. The Government Accountability Office has given FERC's permitting process good marks, saying that it is predictable and consistent for applicants. Under this bill, FERC would have a year to consider any project, no matter how many miles it may cover or how complex it may be. Other agencies, like the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, would have to issue decisions on licenses or permits related to the project within 90 days of FERC's issuance of its final environmental document, even if the project applicant does not actually apply for a permit or submit the required information within that time frame. If the agency failed to meet this deadline, the permit or license would be "deemed approved" and FERC would be permitted to overrule any conditions the agency requests.

By needlessly short-circuiting the review process, this bill jeopardizes the environment and public health. While we all support timely review, we should provide adequate time for analysis of complex projects. A one-size-fits-all process with arbitrary deadlines prevents federal agencies from doing their job to protect taxpayers and communities. I urge a no vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, ninety percent of pipeline projects are approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission within twelve months; the other ten percent take longer because they are bigger and more complicated projects. The Natural Gas Pipeline Trade Association said in July 2013 that FERC's existing permitting process is "generally very good."

By creating a rushed application process and limiting the ability of other agents to provide commentary to FERC, the H.R. 1900 limits FERC's ability to understand the impacts of a pipeline on a local community, the public's health, our national infrastructure, and our environment. These are serious decisions about our local communities—they deserve thoughtful and comprehensive analysis. H.R. 1900 takes something that is not a problem, and creates one.

I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–25. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1900

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 ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act''.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY APPROVAL OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS.

Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i)(1) The Commission shall approve or deny an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a prefiled project not later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed, as defined by the Commission by regulation.

''(2) The agency responsible for issuing any license, permit, or approval required under Federal law in connection with a prefiled project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is sought under this Act shall approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval not later than 90 days after the Commission issues its final environmental document relating to the project.

''(3) The Commission may extend the time period under paragraph (2) by 30 days if an agency demonstrates that it cannot otherwise complete the process required to approve or deny the license, permit, or approval, and therefor will be compelled to deny the license, permit, or approval. In granting an extension under this paragraph, the Commission may offer technical assistance to the agency as necessary to address conditions preventing the completion of the review of the application for the license, permit, or approval.

''(4) If an agency described in paragraph (2) does not approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval within the time period specified under paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable, such license, permit, or approval shall take effect upon the expiration of 30 days after the end of such period. The Commission shall incorporate into the terms of such license, permit, or approval any conditions proffered by the agency described in paragraph (2) that the Commission does not find are inconsistent with the final environmental document.

''(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'prefiled project' means a project for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a natural gas pipeline with respect to which a prefiling docket number has been assigned by the Commission pursuant to a prefiling process established by the Commission for the purpose of facilitating the formal application process for obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity.''.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–272. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–272.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In the quoted subsection (i)(1), insert ''For purposes of the deadline established in this paragraph, an application shall not be considered complete unless the application includes sufficient information to demonstrate that the pipeline project will utilize available designs, systems, and practices to minimize methane emissions to the extent practicable.'' after ''by regulation.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1900 attempts to solve a problem that simply doesn't exist.

The bill seeks to change FERC's process even though the pipeline companies have testified that the permitting process is ''generally very good.'' Thousands of miles of natural gas pipelines are being approved under the current system. We have real energy challenges in this country and should be seeking real solutions to these challenges, not spending our time on problems that don't exist.

My amendment addresses a real problem—the dangers of climate change and the contributions of natural gas infrastructure to this growing threat—and it prevents waste by ensuring that we use it and don't lose it.

Climate change is the most urgent energy challenge that we face today. If the global average temperature continues to increase, we will face even more serious impacts, including flooding of coastal cities, increased risks to our food supply, unprecedented heat waves, exacerbated water scarcity in many regions, increased frequency of high-intensity tropical cyclones such as Hurricane Sandy and the recent supertyphoon in the Philippines, and an irreversible loss of plants and animals that share this planet with us.

Our behavior is driving these changes. We must take responsibility for the situation and work to halt it. We should not leave this task to our children and grandchildren and condemn them to a more uncertain and unsafe world.

Many hope that natural gas, or methane, will serve as a critical bridge fuel as we work to reduce our carbon pollution, but natural gas poses its own challenges. Although natural gas emits less carbon dioxide than coal or oil when burned, the development and transportation of natural gas results in releases of methane, which is a potent greenhouse gas 25 times more damaging to the climate than carbon dioxide. This is a serious concern.

According to a study by the World Resources Institute, leaks from natural gas systems ''represent a significant source of global warming pollution in the U.S.'' The study further found that methane leaks occur at every stage of the natural gas life cycle—at the wellhead, from compression facilities, and from pipelines. These fugitive methane emissions can reduce or even negate the net climate benefits of using natural gas as a substitute for coal and oil.

The good news is that we can reduce methane emissions by applying proven, cost-effective technologies throughout the natural gas system. My amendment will ensure that new pipelines incorporate designs, systems, and practices that minimize leaks, thereby conserving gas and reducing pollution. We will still need to address problems with existing infrastructure and other sources within the natural gas system, but this would be a very important start. It is precisely what we should expect and require of energy infrastructure that will be around for decades.

By including this requirement in the law, the applicants are informed before they begin their application of the requirement for this information and would have ample time to include it in permit applications. Encouraging the prevention and monitoring of leaks would have the added benefit of increasing pipeline safety.

The language does not require an applicant to wait for the development of something new. These technologies exist today and only need to be applied ''to the extent applicable.'' This makes both economic and environmental sense. By reducing pipeline leaks, the amendment ensures that more of our domestic energy resources will be used and fewer of these resources will be wasted.

□ 1015

The amendment doesn't fix the core problems with H.R. 1900, including the bill's arbitrary and harmful deadlines, but it does ensure that the bill addresses an energy problem that actually exists.

If we are going to revisit the law governing the permitting of natural gas pipelines, this is the kind of commonsense step that we should be discussing.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the EPA already asserts that it has authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions—and methane is defined as a greenhouse gas.

The EPA's New Source Performance Standards capture GHG emissions above a certain threshold. Permits are already required for facilities whose emissions are anticipated to be above that threshold. The EPA's permitting process should be the forum for this decisionmaking.

FERC's primary role, rather, should be as an economic regulator—the same way that it is today, and the same way it would be after H.R. 1900 would become law. It would want to defer environmental matters like this to the appropriate agency, which would be the EPA.

The amendment is structured such that the determination would have to be made before the NEPA analysis would begin. In other words, when the FERC ''complete'' application is filed and FERC is put into the role of determining methane ''best practices'' rather than EPA. This puts the cart before the horse. Such decisions on methane emissions should be made as part of the EPA permitting process.

Regarding methane emissions in general, the industry has every incentive to control methane leaks. Escaping methane is escaping product—something they do not want to happen. That means losses for their businesses.

This amendment would add unnecessary requirements to a problem that is already being addressed. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Tonko amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–272.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike paragraph (4) (and redesignate accordingly).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, under H.R. 1900, if an agency cannot complete its review of a gas pipeline permit application by the bill's arbitrary 90-day or, in some cases, 120-day deadline, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, is required to automatically issue the permit.

This permitting provision broadly applies to the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and rights-of-way through Federal lands.

It simply goes too far, is completely unreasonable, and it runs counter to the author's intent. The intent of the author is to speed the approval of interstate natural gas pipelines. Instead, what this provision will do, if my amendment is not adopted, is create greater delays and, I believe, greater likelihood of litigation that will delay our important natural gas infrastructure in this country.

So my amendment is straightforward. It simply strikes this provision that requires FERC to automatically issue other agencies' permits.

You heard Mr. WAXMAN say—and I said the same thing—that what this bill does is turns FERC, whose jurisdiction is limited to reviewing interstate electric transmission lines, natural gas pipelines, and oil pipelines, into a superpermitting agency. It goes and grabs EPA's jurisdiction and authority, the Interior Department's, the Army Corps of Engineers', and other agencies', and settles into FERC this superpermitting authority that really is completely unreasonable.

Right now, these permits are typically detailed documents that include safety requirements, emission limits, technology and operator requirements, and conditions to ensure that communities are protected and the water, wetlands, and other environmental resources are considered, especially when you have a complex interstate natural gas pipeline coming through your communities.

Agencies need the ability and time to analyze all of these details and then draft appropriate permit conditions to protect our communities back home, protect the health and safety, protect landowner rights, and propose cleanup requirements in case there is an accident.

Under H.R. 1900, FERC acts as a superpermitting agency. If an agency cannot meet the strict deadlines, FERC apparently will write and issue the permit itself. This is a recipe for natural gas pipeline delays, and that is why so many are fearful of the consequences of this bill. After all, FERC now already grants 90 percent of the natural gas interstate pipeline applications that come before it.

So it makes no sense to have FERC issuing permits for other agencies. FERC doesn't have the expertise to grant land management rights-of-way through Federal land or to set water pollution discharge limits. That is not a workable solution. It is a recipe for greater litigation and delay.

Besides litigation, delays, and other complications, there are going to be real environmental and safety impacts if permits automatically go into effect without the responsible agencies completing the necessary analysis. It could result in permits being issued that are inconsistent with the requirements of the Nation's environmental laws. That is why the Pipeline Safety Trust and numerous environmental organizations strongly oppose the bill.

The Army Corps of Engineers and EPA also express concern that automatic permitting could lead to permits that do not meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act. This could result in harmful water pollution and air pollution.

So in addition to delays, lawsuits, and environmental harm, automatically issuing permits without an agency confirming the legal requirements is going to undermine the public's acceptance of interstate natural gas pipelines going through our communities. That is the last thing you want to happen.

We are undergoing a national gas revolution in this country that, generally, is very positive. So why would you try to pass this bill that would lead to greater litigation delays, uncertainty, and that the industry itself says may not be necessary?

Agencies should act expeditiously on pipeline applications, but they also need time to conduct the necessary environmental and safety reviews. In some cases, it will take longer than a 90- or 120-day environmental review. Some of these pipelines are very complex and they go over hundreds of miles through environmentally, sensitive areas. People need time and the businesses need time to work through the conditions.

So we should not sacrifice these protections when the pipeline permitting process is already working well, nor should we take critical health, safety, and environmental functions away from the agencies.

My amendment doesn't fix all the problems, but it eliminates an unworkable provision. If you do not want to complicate the interstate natural gas pipeline process that the industry says is generally very good, then I urge you to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment from the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, there has been reference that Ms. CASTOR presented relating to what the industry wants that says this will actually mess it up. It will make pipeline permitting take longer.

Let me read for you what was written in a letter to me on November 14 of this year from that industry association. This is a letter from INGAA, signed by Mr. Santa, the president and CEO, who said:

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 attempted to coordinate the permitting of new natural gas pipelines by designating FERC as the lead agency under NEPA and granting FERC the authority to set deadlines for permitting agencies to act on pipeline actions. EPAct

2005, however, did not confer upon FERC the authority to enforce such deadlines. As a result, permitting agencies routinely ignore them.

It is critical that pipeline expansion keep pace with demand in such regions as New England. A clear, timely review of permits associated with proposed pipeline projects is critical to meeting these goals.

The industry is full-throatedly in support of making sure that H.R. 1900 becomes law, and this amendment would prevent the key provisions of that from happening.

We know we are seeing skyrocketing prices. The worst residential price increases in the country are in the gentlewoman's home State of Florida, where natural gas is now $15.43 an mcf—68 percent above the natural average in the home State of the gentlelady who has offered this amendment.

Part of this enormous price increase in Florida and in other States is a direct result of insufficient pipeline capacity to keep up with production and demand inside the State of Florida—and that is great. I am glad there is demand in Florida. We now just simply need to get them affordable energy so they can continue to grow jobs for Florida families.

In July of this year, the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1900, where multiple stakeholders testified, including NextEra Energy, a Florida-based energy company which, in addition to being the largest wind company in North America, is also one of the Nation's largest purchasers and consumers of natural gas power for electric power generation.

Regarding the possibility that an agency might ultimately choose to deny an application because of H.R. 1900, something that this amendment is offered to make sure doesn't happen, ostensibly, NextEra stated the following in its testimony:

In infrastructure development, a timely ''no'' is much preferable to an interminable ''maybe.''

That is, we have folks who just simply need certainty. They need answers.

The gentlewoman from Florida talked about increased litigation. I am thrilled to see folks on the other side of the aisle finally worried about the plaintiffs' bar and excessive delays that the plaintiffs' bar throws into the regulatory process. I promise my cooperation full-throatedly to work across the aisle to make sure that H.R. 1900 doesn't add a single job in the plaintiffs' bar anywhere in the United States of America.

Finally, Ms. CASTOR's amendment was offered because they are concerned about the idea that a permit would be deemed approved after a certain time, claiming in some cases that this has been unprecedented. Yet in the Clean Water Act, within 45 days of receipt of an application, under 33 U.S.C. 129, if no ruling has been issued, a permit ''shall be deemed approved.''

Under TSCA, section 5, again, a company seeking an application must submit a notice of commencement to EPA within 30 days, after which the chemical is considered an existing chemical. That is, the request is deemed approved.

This is not unprecedented.

The idea that this provision is extreme or unprecedented is simply not supported by the facts, and the precedent for applications being approved if a governing agency fails to act is very common in our Federal law.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Castor amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–272.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, after paragraph (5), insert the following new paragraph:

''(6) This subsection shall not apply to a project unless the Commission has considered and responded to applicable State and local objections or concerns about approval of the project.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, the majority earlier said that this measure is just common sense. So I have a question: Is it common sense not to consider the interests of State and local governments in allowing FERC to have this permitting process?

My amendment is quite simple. The concerns of State and local communities must be considered in any natural gas pipeline permitting process and should not be disadvantaged by a permit approval process that weighs heavily in favor of the pipeline industry and could deem approved a permit that tramples the concerns of communities that are affected.

This issue I know all too well.

Three years ago, a pipeline exploded in my district. I don't want that to happen to any of you. Let me tell you what happened in my district.

First of all, when it exploded, no one knew that there was a pipeline running in the middle of a densely populated area. The fire department didn't know, the police department didn't know, the city manager didn't know, and the city council didn't know.

It took over an hour and a half for the local gas operator to go to another destination, pick up a key, come back to the community, and open the gate so they could turn off the valve.

Meanwhile, what happened?

There were 8 lives lost; 38 homes totally destroyed, with just a concrete pad left; and 45 other homes badly damaged. Three people were considered missing for more than 2 weeks because there was so little DNA left from the intense fire to positively identify them.

□ 1030

There are people in that community today 3 years later who are still shell shocked, and the city's fathers and mothers are very concerned about making sure that pipeline safety includes notifying local communities.

One of the truly frightening lessons of the San Bruno tragedy was that the many pipeline operators don't even fully know the conditions of their own pipelines. I can tell you that my communities are much more aware and engaged in natural gas pipeline safety and location decisions.

The concerns and objections of State and local officials must be adequately considered and taken into account in the decisionmaking process on where to place potentially dangerous natural gas transmission lines. The consequences of these decisions to local communities cannot be overstated. They have a fundamental stake in these decisions on whether to permit a new pipeline project in their communities.

I ask you to support my amendment, which would ensure that, at the very least, FERC considers and responds to local and State concerns or objections submitted as part of the FERC permit process before a natural gas pipeline permit is approved or potentially deemed approved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MEADOWS). The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would like to say to the gentlelady from California that all of us certainly have great sympathy and were shocked by the events in San Bruno. I know it was a horrific incident and that many people lost their lives and homes and that it certainly disrupted the community.

Mr. Chairman, in response to that accident, Congress reenacted a reauthorization of the Pipeline Safety Act in late 2011. That bill included provisions on requiring the verification of maximum allowable operating pressures for pipelines constructed before 1970 and an expansion of the current Pipeline Integrity Management Program to cover more miles of pipe and, therefore, require more inspections. The accident investigation in San Bruno determined that the natural gas pipeline

that failed had been installed in the mid-1950s, using incorrect materials and welding, incorrect even given the standards of the day. Fortunately, that legislation passed unanimously in the House and in the Senate.

I would also note that, under the Natural Gas Act, FERC, when reviewing a proposed natural gas pipeline, must find that it meets the public convenience and necessity, in other words, the public interest. The Commission does have mechanisms in place to listen to the concerns of landowners, of communities, and they balance that with the need for energy infrastructure that meets national needs for a broad number of citizens. The FERC process, under section VII of the Natural Gas Act, is open, fair, and it invites participation by local communities and landowners already, and that has been in place for 70 years.

So I think all of us understand where the gentlelady from California is coming from. We do genuinely believe that the existing process certainly considers local communities and the input from those communities. Because of that, I would respectfully ask that we not agree to the amendment of the gentlelady of California.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–272.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until such time as there is no Presidential order issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I offer an amendment that responds, I believe, to the importance of the issue and also to the purpose of the underlying bill, and it deals with safety.

My amendment delays the date upon which the bill can be implemented until such time that the Federal Government is no longer operating under a budget dictated by the sequester, which some would call a ''meat-ax,'' that is dipping into and diving into the works of the Federal Government, such as agencies like FERC.

The likely impact of this bill, if passed, is to put FERC in a position of having to work faster, to issue decisions with fewer experienced employees, and to have a reduction in resources, thereby impacting safety and security, if I might say, because FERC, like virtually every other Federal agency, is operating under the onerous and draconian provisions of the disastrous sequestration which has caused so much misery and disruption across the Nation and to our economy. I might add, Mr. Chairman, the important aspect of this is that the ultimate results will be, FERC, if you don't do your work, if you are not thoughtful, if you are not deliberative, we deem the approval.

There is no evidence that FERC is backlogged. This has nothing to do with the Keystone pipeline, the procedures of which are in another agency altogether. So you would ask: What problem is this bill solving? None. Absolutely none. With a budget of $306 million—because of sequestration—and with a $15 million reduction in spending, 5 percent of FERC's budget is impacted. This is a bill seeking a solution to a problem that does not exist, and it is dangerous to have legislation that deems approval when the agency which has jurisdiction has not completed its investigation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Since I am the only one who will be speaking, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, sequestration is not only impacting the whole of the work of FERC's; but, in actuality, sequestration is undermining the economy of the United States of America.

In my State alone, we have lost 153,000 jobs. The United States has lost 1 million jobs. It is so devastating that I offer to submit a letter for the RECORD from the Republican cardinals, dated November 18, 2013, calling upon the Budget Committee to rid us of the disastrous sequestration.

It indicates that we have a severe problem in sequestration. This legislation to expedite the approval of needed gas pipelines is, again, an initiative looking for a solution. Since fiscal year 2009, FERC has completed action on 92 percent of their pipeline applications. Mr. Chairman, there is no problem. There is no backlog. The idea that sequestration's impact is overstated is not true. According to an analysis conducted by Regional Economic Models and Third Way, the damage to the economy caused by sequestration is substantial.

I would also like to offer a personal story that deals with the impact far-reaching. It is the fact that pediatricians today are seeing babies who are malnourished. Because of these horrible cuts and the cuts in SNAP, mothers are putting water in the formula. It may be a far reach; but because we are under these horrible caps of sequestration, it is impacting the far reaches of government. Even babies are suffering and are malnourished because of sequestration.

So, if this bill passes today, my desire is—if it even goes anywhere, if it finds a problem that it is trying to solve—that it should not be implemented at all; but if it is implemented, it certainly should not burden an agency that has proven to do its work timely 92 percent of the time. It should not burden that agency by insisting that it goes into implementation right away. It should not be in until we have moved forward and have gotten rid of sequestration.

In conclusion, there are enormous amounts of human toll impact through social safety net and health education: 600,000 women and children thrown off WIC; 807,000 fewer hospitals for Native Americans; the national security impact of the U.S.'s ''let's prepare for WMD incidents.''

So I ask my colleagues not to support the underlying bill, but to support the Jackson Lee amendment—no action until sequestration is gone.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple, straightforward, and practical. It simply postpones the effective date of the bill until the end of sequestration.

Although I share many of the concerns of my colleagues and the administration regarding the wisdom of this legislation, my amendment does not effect any change in the bill's regulatory scheme.

Because of sequestration the legislation would achieve the opposite effect intended by proponents.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

My amendment avoids this outcome by conditioning the effective date of this bill upon the termination of sequestration.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in recognizing how detrimental sequestration has been to our fiscal policy and to the economy.

Earlier this week, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, joined by the 12 subcommittee chairs, wrote a letter to the budget conferees in which they call upon the budget conference to reach an agreement as soon as possible because, among other things: "the current sequester and the upcoming 'Second Sequester' in January would result in more indiscriminate across the board reductions that could have negative consequences on critically important federal programs".

The appropriators go on to state that: "The American people deserve a detailed budget blueprint that makes rational and intelligent choices on funding by their elected representatives, not by a meat ax."

Rather, my amendment merely delays the date upon which the bill can be implemented until such time as the Federal Government is no longer operating under a budget dictated by the "meat ax," instead of a balanced plan of needful investment and deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 2, paragraph (4) of the bill, a permit or license for a natural gas pipeline project is "deemed" approved if the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) or other federal agencies do not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

The likely impact of this bill if passed is to put FERC in the position of having to work faster to issue decisions with fewer experienced employees and a reduction in resources.

This is because FERC, like virtually every federal agency, is operating under the onerous and draconian provisions of the disastrous sequestration which has caused so much misery and disruption across the Nation and to our economy.

FERC, for example, with a budget of $306 million faces a $15 million reduction in spending authority this fiscal year according to OMB. That sum amounts to 5% of FERC's budget.

So if H.R. 1900 were to become law the most likely outcome is that FERC and other agencies would be required to make decisions based on incomplete information, or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with Chairman ROGERS and the subcommittee chairs.

Sequestration is bad fiscal policy. It results in unwanted and unintended legislative consequences. It is bad for the economy. It is unfair to the American people.

I urge support of the Jackson Lee Amendment because it will prevent the bill before us from yielding unwanted and unintended results.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Budget Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,
Ranking Member, Budget Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
Chairwoman, Budget Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JEFF SESSIONS,
Ranking Member, Budget Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN, CHAIRWOMAN MURRAY, RANKING MEMBER SESSIONS, AND RANKING MEMBER VAN HOLLEN: We call on the Budget conference to reach an agreement on the FY 2014 and 2015 spending caps as soon as possible to allow the appropriations process to move forward to completion by the January 15 expiration of the current short-term Continuing Resolution. We urge you to redouble your efforts toward that end and report common, topline levels for both the House and Senate before the Thanksgiving recess, or by December 2 at the latest.

If a timely agreement is not reached, the likely alternatives could have extremely damaging repercussions. First, the failure to reach a budget deal to allow Appropriations to assemble funding for FY 2014 will reopen the specter of another government shutdown. Second, it will reopen the probability of governance by continuing resolution, based on prior year outdated spending needs and priorities, dismissing in one fell swoop all of the work done by the Congress to enact appropriations bills for FY 2014 that reflect the will of Congress and the people we represent. Third, the current sequester and the upcoming ''Second Sequester'' in January would result in more indiscriminate across the board reductions that could have negative consequences on critically important federal programs, especially our national defense.

In addition, failure to agree on a common spending cap for FY 2015 will guarantee another year of confusion.

The American people deserve a detailed budget blueprint that makes rational and intelligent choices on funding by their elected representatives, not by a meat ax. We urge you to come together and decide on a common discretionary spending topline for both FY 2014 and FY 2015 as quickly as possible to empower our Committee, and the Congress as a whole, to make the responsible spending decisions that we have been elected to make.

Sincerely,

Harold Rogers, Chairman, Committee on Appropriations; Jack Kingston, Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies; Tom Latham, Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies; Kay Granger, Chairwoman, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies; John Abney Culberson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies; John R. Carter, Chairman, Subcommittee on Homeland Security; Tom Cole, Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch; Frank R. Wolf, Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies; Rodney Frelinghuysen, Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense; Robert B. Aderholt, Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies; Michael K. Simpson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies; Ander Crenshaw, Chairman, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government; Ken Calvert, Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

SEQUESTRATION: ECONOMIC IMPACT BY STATE, 2014

	Full Sequester				Non-Defense Sequester Only				Defense Sequester Only			
	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss
Alabama	−$2.7	−1.25%	−31,467	−1.20%	−$1.6	−0.76%	−19,502	−0.74%	−$1.1	−0.50%	−11,997	−0.46%
Alaska	−$0.6	−1.22%	−6,242	−1.32%	−$0.4	−0.76%	−3,808	−0.81%	−$0.2	−0.46%	−2,439	−0.52%
Arizona	−$3.7	−1.18%	−39,624	−1.15%	−$2.0	−0.63%	−22,794	−0.66%	−$1.7	−0.55%	−16,876	−0.49%
Arkansas	−$1.2	−0.97%	−15,244	−0.93%	−$0.7	−0.58%	−9,275	−0.57%	−$0.5	−0.39%	−5,985	−0.37%
California	−$22.0	−1.02%	−211,777	−1.00%	−$11.0	−0.51%	−112,422	−0.53%	−$11.1	−0.52%	−99,590	−0.47%
Colorado	−$3.6	−1.08%	−37,589	−1.09%	−$2.0	−0.61%	−21,569	−0.63%	−$1.6	−0.48%	−16,062	−0.47%
Connecticut	−$2.5	−1.08%	−23,200	−1.01%	−$1.1	−0.47%	−11,012	−0.48%	−$1.4	−0.61%	−12,212	−0.53%
Delaware	−$0.6	−1.02%	−5,662	−1.01%	−$0.3	−0.64%	−3,606	−0.65%	−$0.2	−0.39%	−2,062	−0.37%
DC	−$3.4	−3.02%	−25,180	−2.96%	−$3.2	−2.81%	−23,278	−2.74%	−$0.2	−0.22%	−1,905	−0.22%
Florida	−$9.0	−0.95%	−101,912	−0.96%	−$5.6	−0.59%	−65,104	−0.61%	−$3.4	−0.36%	−36,933	−0.35%
Georgia	−$5.6	−1.09%	−62,276	−1.11%	−$3.3	−0.64%	−37,371	−0.66%	−$2.3	−0.45%	−24,969	−0.44%
Hawaii	−$1.1	−1.48%	−13,702	−1.60%	−$0.7	−0.92%	−8,276	−0.97%	−$0.4	−0.56%	−5,437	−0.63%
Idaho	−$0.7	−1.02%	−9,205	−0.96%	−$0.4	−0.59%	−5,654	−0.59%	−$0.3	−0.43%	−3,561	−0.37%
Illinois	−$6.4	−0.83%	−63,703	−0.82%	−$4.0	−0.52%	−40,931	−0.53%	−$2.4	−0.31%	−22,847	−0.29%
Indiana	−$3.0	−0.94%	−33,551	−0.89%	−$1.8	−0.55%	−20,614	−0.55%	−$1.2	−0.39%	−12,979	−0.34%
Iowa	−$1.4	−0.89%	−17,087	−0.83%	−$0.8	−0.51%	−10,171	−0.49%	−$0.6	−0.38%	−6,937	−0.34%
Kansas	−$1.9	−1.22%	−21,412	−1.12%	−$0.9	−0.54%	−10,417	−0.55%	−$1.1	−0.68%	−11,017	−0.58%
Kentucky	−$2.0	−0.97%	−24,006	−0.97%	−$1.2	−0.59%	−14,621	−0.59%	−$0.8	−0.38%	−9,410	−0.38%
Louisiana	−$2.5	−1.04%	−28,651	−1.05%	−$1.3	−0.54%	−15,110	−0.56%	−$1.2	−0.50%	−13,571	−0.50%
Maine	−$0.8	−1.27%	−10,014	−1.18%	−$0.4	−0.67%	−5,448	−0.64%	−$0.4	−0.60%	−4,576	−0.54%
Maryland	−$6.5	−1.85%	−64,522	−1.82%	−$5.0	−1.42%	−49,758	−1.40%	−$1.5	−0.43%	−14,803	−0.42%
Massachusetts	−$4.4	−0.98%	−40,626	−0.91%	−$2.4	−0.52%	−23,079	−0.52%	−$2.1	−0.46%	−17,589	−0.39%
Michigan	−$4.0	−0.85%	−43,903	−0.82%	−$2.6	−0.55%	−29,5581	−0.55%	−$1.4	−0.30%	−14,3991	−0.27%
Minnesota	−$3.1	−0.88%	−30,295	−0.82%	−$1.6	−0.46%	−16,772	−0.46%	−$1.5	−0.43%	−13,555	−0.37%
Mississippi	−$1.5	−1.32%	−19,568	−1.25%	−$0.8	−0.65%	−9,925	−0.63%	−$0.8	−0.67%	−9,663	−0.62%
Missouri	−$3.2	−1.02%	−35,958	−0.97%	−$1.9	−0.60%	−22,045	−0.59%	−$1.3	−0.42%	−13,951	−0.38%
Montana	−$0.5	−1.03%	−6,634	−0.99%	−$0.3	−0.72%	−4,631	−0.69%	−$0.1	−0.31%	−2,010	−0.30%
Nebraska	−$0.9	−0.90%	−11,240	−0.87%	−$0.6	−0.55%	−6,897	−0.53%	−$0.4	−0.36%	−4,356	−0.34%
Nevada	−$1.3	−0.83%	−14,243	−0.86%	−$0.8	−0.51%	−8,797	−0.53%	−$0.5	−0.32%	−5,464	−0.33%
New Hampshire	−$0.8	−1.05%	−8,560	−0.97%	−$0.4	−0.53%	−4,573	−0.52%	−$0.4	−0.52%	−3,997	−0.45%
New Jersey	−$4.7	−0.87%	−45,215	−0.86%	−$3.1	−0.56%	−30,141	−0.57%	−$1.7	−0.31%	−15,126	−0.29%
New Mexico	−$1.1	−1.26%	−13,800	−1.22%	−$0.8	−0.90%	−9,978	−0.89%	−$0.3	−0.35%	−3,833	−0.34%
New York	−$9.7	−0.78%	−88,297	−0.76%	−$6.3	−0.51%	−59,715	−0.52%	−$3.4	−0.28%	−28,688	−0.25%
North Carolina	−$5.0	−1.03%	−58,211	−1.06%	−$2.8	−0.58%	−32,886	−0.60%	−$2.2	−0.45%	−25,389	−0.46%
North Dakota	−$0.4	−0.96%	−4,957	−0.92%	−$0.2	−0.58%	−3,004	−0.56%	−$0.2	−0.38%	−1,958	−0.37%
Ohio	−$5.5	−0.92%	−60,106	−0.88%	−$3.4	−0.57%	−38,840	−0.57%	−$2.1	−0.35%	−21,341	−0.31%
Oklahoma	−$2.0	−1.05%	−23,440	−1.05%	−$1.3	−0.67%	−15,064	−0.68%	−$0.7	−0.38%	−8,397	−0.38%
Oregon	−$2.1	−1.05%	−23,295	−0.97%	−$1.1	−0.54%	−12,853	−0.54%	−$1.0	−0.51%	−10,471	−0.44%
Pennsylvania	−$6.6	−0.99%	−71,014	−0.94%	−$4.3	−0.65%	−48,035	−0.64%	−$2.3	−0.34%	−23,056	−0.31%
Rhode Island	−$0.6	−1.13%	−6,560	−1.05%	−$0.3	−0.62%	−3,633	−0.58%	−$0.3	−0.51%	−2,934	−0.47%

SEQUESTRATION: ECONOMIC IMPACT BY STATE, 2014—Continued

	Full Sequester				Non-Defense Sequester Only				Defense Sequester Only			
	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss	State GDP gain/loss (billions)	State GDP percent gain/loss	Jobs gain/loss	Jobs percent gain/loss
South Carolina	−$2.2	−1.04%	−27,294	−1.06%	−$1.3	−0.60%	−16,074	−0.63%	−$0.9	−0.44%	−11,251	−0.44%
South Dakota	−$0.4	−0.98%	−5,432	−0.92%	−$0.3	−0.64%	−3,514	−0.59%	−$0.1	−0.35%	−1,923	−0.32%
Tennessee	−$3.1	−0.99%	−36,334	−0.96%	−$2.0	−0.64%	−23,664	−0.62%	−$1.1	−0.35%	−12,717	−0.33%
Texas	−$15.2	−0.99%	−153,541	−1.00%	−$8.3	−0.54%	−87,003	−0.57%	−$6.9	−0.45%	−66,702	−0.43%
Utah	−$1.8	−1.19%	−20,932	−1.17%	−$1.01	−0.70%	−12,736	−0.71%	−$0.7	−0.50%	−8,219	−0.46%
Vermont	−$0.3	−0.99%	−4,151	−0.92%	−$0.2	−0.59%	−2,553	−0.57%	−$0.1	−0.40%	−1,602	−0.36%
Virginia	−$8.3	−1.67%	−85,776	−1.71%	−$5.5	−1.12%	−56,965	−1.13%	−$2.7	−0.55%	−28,867	−0.57%
Washington	−$5.6	−1.37%	−54,359	−1.31%	−$2.3	−0.56%	−24,332	−0.59%	−$3.3	−0.81%	−30,084	−0.72%
West Virginia	−$0.9	−1.17%	−10,673	−1.12%	−$0.6	−0.82%	−7,638	−0.80%	−$0.3	−0.35%	−3,046	−0.32%
Wisconsin	−$2.6	−0.86%	−29,312	−0.80%	−$1.4	−0.48%	−17,097	−0.47%	−$1.1	−0.38%	−12,249	−0.34%
Wyoming	−$0.4	−0.96%	−4,072	−0.98%	−$0.2	−0.60%	−2,594	−0.62%	−$0.1	−0.36%	−1,482	−0.36%
U.S. TOTAL	−$179.4	−1.04%	−1,883,824	−1.02%	$105.7	−0.61%	−1,145,337	−0.62%	−$73.9	−0.43%	−740,487	−0.40%

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady from Texas does have a reputation of being very innovative in her legislative strategy. While I would agree with her—and many of us would agree—that I am frustrated with the budget process and that many of us don't think the budget process works, she is, with this amendment, trying to bring to a conclusion sequestration.

I would simply say that we do not believe it is appropriate to, nor do we think that we are equipped to, debate the sequestration issue, which is a budget issue. Today, we are simply trying to expedite the building of additional natural gas pipelines to streamline the permitting process in order to help people throughout America have lower electricity rates and, perhaps, to increase our exports. So I would oppose her amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–272.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. GAO STUDY.

Not later than May 1, 2014, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(1) assesses the extent to which the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is expected to experience delays in issuing certificates of public convenience and necessity for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline project;

(2) assesses the extent to which other Federal, State, or local permitting authorities are expected to experience delays in issuing permits required under Federal law in connection with the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is required; and

(3) examines the effect of anticipated Congressional appropriations or other resources on the ability of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and other Federal agencies to review applications for certificates and permits described in paragraphs (1) and (2) in a timely manner.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a solution desperately searching for a problem.

In July of 2013, before the committee, Commissioner Moeller said that 90 percent of permit applications to FERC are already approved within 12 months and that the delays on the remaining 10 percent are due to either the complexities of the proposed projects or incomplete applications, something which indicates there is hardly a need for the amendment. In addition to that statement, there has been no record of any backlog of permit applications that justifies the need to overhaul pipeline permitting regulations.

There is an old saying, If it ain't broke, don't fix it. I am curious as to why it is we are trying to fix something here that is not broken.

I am worried that, if this legislation were to somehow become law, we would already see that the agencies and the courts, in their consideration, would rush around to try and figure out what it was the Congress intended and how these matters could or should be proceeded upon more expeditiously. That, according to the government agencies that appeared before the committee, is completely unnecessary.

Having said these things, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues here that the amendment that I offer today simply directs the GAO to take another look at the permitting process and to take into consideration these issues to tell us what it is that needs to be done to better expedite the process.

□ 1045

Why this? The reason is very simple. The committee had one day of hearing, had very little support for the legislation, no explanation of why it was needed, the agencies appearing before the committee said it really wasn't necessary, and other witnesses testified that it wasn't needed.

The report of the GAO will identify the problems which exist, and we can then use the oversight authority of the committee and the Congress to fix such problems as might be found and have an intelligent record as to what can, or should, be done to make this a step which, in fact, will help us move forward on pipeline permitting.

Now, I want to make it very clear I am not opposed to natural gas pipelines, nor am I opposed to moving forward speedily and intelligently. The system is working, the Congress has devised a system of permitting that works, sees to it that safety is properly attended to, and has given proper oversight, including legislation recently to ensure that proper behavior and proper safety of the pipelines do take place.

I urge the committee to support my amendment. It gives us a bill of which we can be proud, instead of a bill about which people are going to scratch their heads and wonder what was the Congress doing when they foisted this miserable thing upon us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), which would strike the entire piece of legislation and replace it with a GAO study.

The GAO back in February of this year issued a report detailing what they called the ''complex'' natural gas pipeline permitting process. This amendment would simply ask the GAO to duplicate many of those same findings that were done in a report issued less than a year ago, and there is simply no need for that.

I understand the gentleman from Michigan thinks this legislation is unnecessary, but I respectfully disagree. I

will give one example of where the claims regarding the approval timelines for natural gas permit pipelines have been dubious.

It has been erroneously repeated by opponents of this legislation that FERC testified in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee that 90 percent of the permits are being done on time. This is simply not the case. This is not what FERC stated in their testimony. It stated that 90 percent of the certificates are being completed within 12 months. There is an awful lot of difference between a certificate and a permit.

FERC is in control of only the certificate process, but they are at the mercy of other agencies with respect to the permit approval process. This is the main reason for the need for this legislation, because FERC has absolutely no enforcement authority over the other agencies to process permits on schedule. This brings accountability to other agencies.

Even though 90 percent of certificates are being processed by FERC in the 12-month period, it doesn't tell the full story. It would be talking about the bills that the House of Representatives passed and talking only about our naming of post offices and not talking about the substantive legislation, the important things, we do here in the House of Representatives.

I would also remind the gentleman from Michigan that the need for this legislation is so great that it garners support not just from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, but also the major electricity trade associations across the country: Edison Electric Institute, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the American Public Power Association, as well as the New England Ratepayers Association, whose members are experiencing skyrocketing natural gas prices.

This amendment would gut the bill and ignore the core problem of stubbornly high natural gas prices in certain regions across the Nation. It dismisses the need for an improved permitting process for natural gas pipeline infrastructure completely.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the gentleman's agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is unnecessary. Every witness before the committee found no reason why it had to be enacted into law. It was made very clear that there have been no incidences of egregious delay by any events before the permitting authorities. There is no need for the legislation.

The amendment is a friendly amendment offered to enable us to find out if there are, in fact, problems; and if there are, in fact, problems, then we will be able to take the necessary action to correct whatever problems might exist.

At this particular time, there is no evidence of need for the legislation. In 90 percent of the time, the permits have been granted within the 1-year period. It is only necessary to allow time for others where the permitting application was incorrectly or improperly done and only where the complexity of the situation requires more time.

What I am hearing from the other side is they feel that there is need for us to move more rapidly in these complex cases where serious mistakes can be made and we can have the danger of an unsafe pipeline resulting.

I would remind my colleagues that a pipeline explosion, only the failure of a gas pipeline, is like a nuclear event.

I urge the adoption of the amendment, and if not adopted, the rejection of the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I just reiterate there is enormous importance to this legislation. While I appreciate that the gentleman from Michigan offered his amendment in a friendly tone, it guts the legislation in its entirety.

I also want to offer that H.R. 1900 is offered in a friendly manner. It is offered friendly to places like Michigan, New York, Florida, and Arizona, places that are paying unnecessarily high prices for natural gas in their parts of the country.

With that, I would urge rejection of this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–272 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. TONKO of New York.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. DINGELL of Michigan.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TONKO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 233, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 605]

AYES—183

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

NOES—233

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford

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

NOT VOTING—14

Campbell
Castro (TX)
Garrett
Herrera Beutler
Hoyer
Huffman
Jeffries
Kingston
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
Polis
Radel
Ruiz
Rush

□ 1122

Messrs. STUTZMAN, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, STOCKMAN, CHABOT, and SCHOCK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. HINOJOSA changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 605 I was detained chairing a Financial Services Subcommittee hearing.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. ROBY). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

AYES—184

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

NOES—233

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

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Castro (TX)
Garrett
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Hoyer
Jeffries
Kingston
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Ruiz
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1128

SO THE AMENDMENT WAS REJECTED.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 606, I was detained chairing a Financial Services subcommittee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted, "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

SPEIER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 236, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 607]

AYES—183

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—236

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

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Castro (TX)
Garrett
Herrera Beutler
Hoyer
Kingston
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Ruiz
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1133

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 607 I was detained chairing a Financial Services subcommittee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 243, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]

AYES—175

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—243

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway

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

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Castro (TX)
Duncan (TN)
Herrera Beutler
Hoyer
Kingston
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Ruiz
Rush
Smith (NJ)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1138

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 239, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 609]

AYES—175

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

NOES—239

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

NOT VOTING—16

Blumenauer
Campbell
Castro (TX)
Delaney
Herrera Beutler
Hoyer
Kingston
Lofgren
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, George
Radel
Ruiz
Rush
Sires
Walberg

□ 1142

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1900) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting,

construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, and, pursuant to House Resolution 420, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

□ 1145

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. TIERNEY. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TIERNEY moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1900 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY AND COMMUNITY RIGHT TO KNOW.

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect unless the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies, determines that implementation of the Act will not—

(1) adversely impact natural gas pipeline safety; or

(2) inhibit the ability of communities to meaningfully engage in the process of siting of natural gas pipelines that affect them.

Mr. POMPEO (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, colleagues, this is the final amendment to the bill, and, as you know, it will not kill the bill. It will not send it back to committee. If this motion is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended. And I ask you to consider doing that.

Over the last several years, it is my understanding that FERC has approved 69 major natural gas pipelines. They span over 3,000 miles in 30 States with a total capacity of nearly 30 billion cubic feet per day.

The Government Accountability Office, the firm that does our research for us, has found that FERC's pipeline permitting is predictable, it is consistent, and it gets pipelines built. For some reason, the underlying bill replaces that existing natural gas permitting process with a process that appears to be arbitrary, unworkable, and a one-size-fits-all approach.

The bill would force regulatory agencies to comply with what many believe are unreasonable permitting deadlines—1 year for FERC and 3 months for other permitting agencies—to render decisions on applications no matter how complex they are and potentially before the public risks are fully understood, particularly by our local areas.

If the underlying bill didn't attempt to fix an existing permitting process that many, including the pipeline trade association, agree is not broken, then perhaps my amendment wouldn't be necessary. If the majority had supported any of the responsible amendments that were proposed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and others here a little while ago, perhaps it wouldn't be necessary. But it is necessary.

The motion states that this bill will not take effect until FERC determines its implementation will not adversely impact natural gas pipeline safety and that it will not inhibit the ability of communities to engage in the process of siting natural gas pipelines. The motion seeks to protect public safety. It seeks to ensure that our constituents continue to have a voice in the permitting process.

Madam Speaker, I don't believe that that is too much to ask. It shouldn't be. So let's, please, do the reasonable thing. Let's stand up for safety. Let's stand up for our local constituencies and communities and support this motion.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. POMPEO. I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, while we share every one of our colleagues' concerns about pipeline safety, nothing in this legislation does anything to impact the safety of pipelines all across the country. Indeed, putting in new pipelines, increasing capacity for natural gas pipelines, will actually allow the retirement of older pipelines which might present even more risk.

We all know the tragic incident that happened in San Bruno, California. This body has taken action to rectify that. There were pipeline safety bills passed with all of the Members of the House, and it passed in the Senate as well, to make sure that every pipeline built is done so in a way that is safe and responsible and with plenty of time for community input.

The motion to recommit suggests that H.R. 1900 would eliminate that time. It does nothing of that nature. In every case, for a complex pipeline, there will be nearly 2 years' time for communities and interest groups who have concerns about the pipeline going into their territory, their region, to make their voices heard and to make their concerns registered in the public place.

I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to recommit and pass the underlying legislation, H.R. 1900.

With that, 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. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 233, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 610]

YEAS—180

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—233

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

NOT VOTING—17

Campbell
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Costa
Cramer
DeLauro
Herrera Beutler
Hoyer
Kingston
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
Radel
Rogers (KY)
Ruiz
Rush
Shuster
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1155

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 18, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from the Honorable Tom Schedler, Secretary of State, State of Louisiana, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held November 16, 2013, the Honorable Vance M. McAllister was elected Representative to Congress for the Fifth Congressional District, State of Louisiana.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Baton Rouge, LA, November 18, 2013.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Saturday, November 16, 2013, for Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana show that Vance M. McAllister received 54,449 or 59.65% of the total number of votes cast for the office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Vance M. McAllister was elected as Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all parishes involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHEDLER,
Secretary of State.

□ 1200

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE VANCE M. MCALLISTER, OF LOUISIANA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable VANCE M. MCALLISTER, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Louisiana delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. VANCE M. MCALLISTER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 113th Congress.

The Chair has determined that the children in the well are 12 years and younger.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE VANCE M. MCALLISTER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Louisiana delegation, I would like to welcome Louisiana's newest Congressman, VANCE MCALLISTER, of the Fifth Congressional District.

VANCE is a resident of Swartz, Louisiana, and has been married for 15 years to Kelly. They are the proud parents of five beautiful children.

VANCE is a veteran of the United States Army and Louisiana National Guard. He is a self-made businessman and a well-regarded entrepreneur.

I look forward to serving with you, VANCE, on behalf of the people of Louisiana.

Welcome to the United States House of Representatives.

Now I would like to yield to my good friend, CEDRIC RICHMOND.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you, Mr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to welcome the newest member of the Louisiana delegation, the Representative of Louisiana's Fifth Congressional District, to Washington, D.C., and to this distinguished body. There is no doubt in my mind that he will be a welcome addition.

While he has never served in or held elective office, Mr. MCALLISTER brings with him the value of the many experiences and accomplishments he has attained through his lifetime. Like Mr. BOUSTANY said, he is a veteran, a successful businessman, and a devoted family man. He has committed himself to addressing the needs of the people of Louisiana and finding commonsense solutions to the problems that plague the Nation.

One thing that I have come to know as a Member who represents Louisiana

is that, historically, we have not had the luxury of being partisan because of the many needs of our State.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate our newest Member of the House and welcome him.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I yield to the statesman from Louisiana, Mr. VANCE M. MCALLISTER.

Mr. MCALLISTER. First, let me just say thank you. What an honor it is to be part of such an elite group, as well as the many people that walked before us in these Halls of Congress. With that comes great honor and great value.

I want to say thank you to everybody in the gallery that got me here. I wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for them, and I wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for these kids.

As I always said—and I know we are ready to get out of here—they didn't raise no dummy, I can tell you that. I didn't get here by accident.

I just want to say, let's make sure we keep this country, our politicians, and everybody in our prayers. Let's do the right thing by this country and take care of business, like we should. Let's all work together.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Louisiana, the whole number of the House is now 432.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER. 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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 165, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 611]

AYES—252

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

NOES—165

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Campbell
Capps
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Granger
Herrera Beutler
Hoyer
Kingston
Lowenthal
McCarthy (NY)
Nolan
Radel
Ruiz
Rush

□ 1213

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 610, the motion to recommit with instructions, regarding the "Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act" (H.R. 1900). Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 611, I had to miss the vote for final passage of H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act because of a previously scheduled event in my district with constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present on rollcall vote No. 611 (on passage of H.R. 1900) I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 605 on the Tonko (NY) amendment on H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to official business in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 606 on the Castor (FL) amendment on H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 607 on the Speier (CA) amendment on H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 608 on the Jackson-Lee (TX) amendment on H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 609 on the Dingell (MI) amendment on H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 610 on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 611 on Final Passage of H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND CLASSIFIED ANNEX ACCOMPANYING INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has ordered the bill, H.R. 3381, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, reported favorably to the House with amendments. The committee's report will be filed next Monday.

Mr. Speaker, the classified Schedule of Authorizations and the classified Annex accompanying the bill will be available for review by Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in room HVC–304 of the Capitol Visitors Center beginning any time after this report is filed. The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review this material prior to its consideration of the House. I anticipate that H.R. 3381 will be considered in the House in the near future.

□ 1215

I recommend that Members wishing to review the classified Annex contact the committee's Director of Security to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will ensure the availability of committee staff to assist Members who desire assistance during their review of these classified materials.

I urge interested Members to review these materials in order to better understand the committee's recommendations. The classified Annex to the committee's report contains the committee's recommendations on the intelligence budget for the fiscal year 2014 and related classified information that cannot be disclosed publicly.

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of clause 13 of House rule XXIII, which permits access to classified information by only those Members of the House who have signed the oath provided for in the rule.

If a Member has not yet signed the oath but wishes to review the classified Annex and Schedule of Authorizations, the committee staff can administer the oath and see that the executed form is sent to the Clerk's office. In addition, the committee's rules require that Members agree in writing to a nondisclosure agreement. The agreement indicates that Members have been granted access to the classified Annex and that they are familiar with the rules of the House and the committee with respect to the classified nature of the information and the limitations on the disclosure of that information.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1698

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN) be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1698.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of years ago, America was on a path to spending hundreds of billions of dollars more a year on energy imports to fulfill its energy needs—money that could otherwise be used to invest in our kids and to pay down our debt.

Today, due to shale oil and natural gas activity, the U.S. is set to leapfrog Saudi Arabia and Russia to become the world's biggest producer of oil and gas and, by 2035, capable of providing all of its own energy. This activity also contributed over 1.7 million jobs in 2012 and saved American families $100 per month in the form of lower energy bills.

These amazing strides towards greater energy independence and a better standard of living for more Americans are due to energy development taking place not on Federal lands but on State and private lands, regulated not by the Federal Government but by our States.

This week, the House acted on policies to keep us on this path to greater energy security—a future where America is less reliant on the rest of the world to fulfill its energy and power needs.

TYPHOON YOLANDA

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, today, I stand with my neighbors in Illinois and express my deepest sympathies to the victims of Typhoon Yolanda. More than 4,000 Filipinos died in this tragedy, and millions more are now in need of assistance.

While we mourn for those who suffer, I am also inspired by the resilience of the victims and of the generosity of the American people. I want the people of the Philippines to know that we stand with you.

Our brave men and women stationed in Okinawa were on the ground, evacuating victims and dispersing supplies within 2 days of the storm hitting. Local communities throughout the United States, including my district, are also helping. Motorola Solutions, based in Schaumburg, Illinois, and its employees have already donated $150,000 and emergency equipment to help with the recovery. We in the Eighth District will not forget our Filipino friends and families.

Yesterday, members of the Illinois congressional delegation and I also sent a letter to Secretary Hagel, asking that the men and women of the Illinois National Guard be allowed to fly their C–130s of supplies, collected in Illinois, to the Philippines in order to assist with the recovery. I know the dedication and professionalism of these men and women, and I am certain that their contribution will save lives.

Citizens of the world look to the United States for leadership in difficult times; and time and again our Nation has stepped forward to help those in need. I am proud that America is doing so much to help the victims of Typhoon Yolanda, but I also know that that need, that that assistance will be needed well into the future as the Philippines continue to recover.

Again, to our Filipino friends and families, we stand with you.

REALITY CHECK PROGRAM

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to a positive program that helps young people make better choices. It is called the Reality Check Program, and it was founded by Larry Lawton of West Melbourne, Florida.

In his youth, Mr. Lawton lived a life of crime, and that ultimately landed him in Federal prison for 11 hard years. Upon his release, Larry dedicated his life to helping kids everywhere make better choices by reaching at-risk young people before they make serious mistakes. Larry uses his experiences in prison to show kids the truth about where that path leads and what life in prison is really like.

The Reality Check Program has earned recognition from many in local law enforcement, from county and State judges and, of course, from families and, possibly, wayward kids. In Missouri, the Lake St. Louis Police Department enlisted Larry Lawton as an honorary deputy.

Helping kids make better choices makes for healthier families, safer communities, and a stronger Nation. I salute the program.

PANCREATIC CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, November is Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month, which is when we bring awareness to a disease that takes the lives of too many men and women.

Pancreatic cancer is the 10th most commonly diagnosed cancer in men and the ninth most in women, but it is the fourth leading cause of cancer deaths. Sadly, it is estimated this year that 73 percent of patients with this disease will die within the first year of diagnosis.

While these statistics are daunting, I believe that Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month is a time for hope. It is a time when we stand up and call attention to this disease and when we call for more research to find better methods of early detection. It is a time to share the stories of those we have lost in the hope that they will help spur action and move us closer to more effective treatments.

Mr. Speaker, pancreatic cancer patients and their families are among the countless Americans who are demanding that we fix sequestration, which has reduced funding for the National Institutes of Health and the National Cancer Institute and which has held back progress toward lifesaving medical research. It is critical that we all work together to fight this terrible disease.

IRAN STILL WANTS NUKES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the world was reminded yesterday why Iran should not get a nuclear weapon—it would be a constant threat to Israel.

In a rally in Iran, the Supreme Leader denounced Israel as ''untouchable rabid dogs.'' He then went on to talk about Iran's nuclear program.

On the same day that negotiators met in Geneva, the Supreme Leader said that Iran will not back down one iota. He vowed that Iranians would slap the aggressors in the face in a way that they would not forget.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot change the Iranians' philosophy of hate, but we can change their actions. They must be forced to stop nuclear weapon development with tougher sanctions. The Supreme Leader made it clear that he does not feel any pressure to give in.

When I met with Prime Minister Netanyahu 2 weeks ago, he reiterated that the West needs to understand that Iran's goal is to destroy Israel and the United States.

Letting up on sanctions increases the chances Iran will get nuclear weapons, and war will result. Now is not the time to appease the bully aggressor from the desert—Iran.

And that's just the way it is.

THE HASTERT RULE

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER says that the Hastert rule demands that he only allow votes on bills that are supported by a majority of his own party instead of a majority of the whole House.

Last weekend, a constituent asked me where the Hastert rule came from. I did a little research. It doesn't exist. Not a single page of this book—the House manual of rules and procedures—contains the Hastert rule. That is because bills in the House need votes from a majority of all Members, not by a majority of any party.

The Speaker, himself, knows that the Hastert rule is no rule at all. That is why, whenever extremists bring us to the brink of default or insist on a costly government shutdown, the Speaker brushes it aside and relies on support from reasonable Republicans and Democrats.

The Hastert rule is only used to prevent votes Americans actually want. They want us to pass reasonable gun laws, to pass ENDA, to protect LGBT Americans from discrimination. They want us to pass commonsense immigration reform, and they want us to pass a minimum-wage increase.

This week, the GOP reminded us that it has no agenda. Don't use the nonexistent Hastert rule to block the agenda of the American people.

CIVIC ACT

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today's elections are costing more and more each year.

According to the Center for Responsive Politics, winning candidates spent an average of $1.5 million in the 2011–2012 election cycle. More than $4 billion was contributed to campaigns during the last cycle, with 63 percent of this total coming from donors who gave more than $200.

Most would agree that the ideal way to finance political campaigns is through a broad base of donors. This is why I propose to bring back the Federal tax credit for small campaign contributions. Today, I have introduced the Citizen Involvement in Campaigns Act. Under this legislation, individuals who donate amounts up to $200 to a Federal campaign could receive a tax credit equal to that contribution.

With more and more campaign operations moving to Web sites and online resources, campaigns could tilt the playing field away from special interests and large donors and empower small donors and average Americans. This bill is a step in the right direction of encouraging greater participation in our campaigns, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

P5+1 NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

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

Mr. CONYERS. Members of the House, I rise to speak about the negotiations under way in Geneva today between the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council plus Germany.

Mr. Speaker, those negotiations have the potential to lead to a peaceful resolution to the standoff over Iran's nuclear program. If successful, these negotiations could put in place the restrictions and intrusive inspections needed to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

With a significant diplomatic breakthrough within reach, now is not the time to consider new sanctions which could derail the negotiations and strengthen the position of those in Iran who oppose a settlement with the United States.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE BOSTON RED SOX

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind all Americans that we should pay our debts.

I stand here today to pay a debt for a friendly wager I made with my colleague JOE KENNEDY, and I rise to offer my congratulations to the Boston Red Sox for winning the World Series. The Red Sox overcame a 2–1 series lead and rattled off three straight victories to capture the 2013 championship.

I certainly think that the Boston Red Sox showed the St. Louis Cardinals and the rest of the world why they are deserving of the slogan ''Boston Strong.''

However, I hope that this series win will forever erase the curse of the Bambino. Yes, Red Sox fans, no more excuses for losing.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY'S ASSASSINATION

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark 50 years since President John F. Kennedy's tragic assassination in Dallas, Texas.

As Americans pause to remember President Kennedy's legacy of public service and fight toward achieving racial equality, north Texas will host events related to the occasion, both in Dallas and Fort Worth.

A dear friend and mentor, former House Speaker Jim Wright, who accompanied the President on that fateful day, will be a special guest at the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce High Impact 50th Anniversary Breakfast at the Downtown Fort Worth Hilton. Formerly known as the Hotel Texas, it is where President Kennedy spent his last night and delivered one of his final two speeches.

President Kennedy defied a tumultuous era of racial and gender discrimination by promoting forward-thinking policies for the sake of progress. Kennedy also defined the civil rights crisis as moral, as well as constitutional and legal.

As we commemorate President Kennedy's life and the historic impact he had on the Dallas-Fort Worth area and the Nation, I call upon my colleagues to work together to ensure that the legacy that inspired a generation lives on.

RURAL HEALTH

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge National Rural Health Day.

The Third District of Nebraska spans 75 counties and contains hundreds of small towns and over 50 critical-access hospitals. The providers who serve these communities face many challenges without the heavy hand of government.

In particular, I am concerned about physician supervision regulations which may be released by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services later this month. Physicians, nurses, and ancillary staff in rural facilities are highly trained and experienced in determining the appropriate level of patient care.

Failure to allow practitioners the necessary discretion to manage care administration may actually limit the access to basic services and could further discourage physicians from seeking rural positions.

I will continue to fight to ensure our rural communities maintain access to the quality care, and I appreciate the opportunity to recognize National Rural Health Day.

TOPICS OF THE DAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, there are remaining issues of justice that this House must address.

First, let me offer my deepest sympathy to the people of the Philippines who, as you look at the landscape, 10 million people have been affected, 4,011 deaths, and 4.4 million people displaced. We must come together as a Nation and come together as a Congress and provide the resources. Let me salute the United States military and our marines who landed first who are a lifeline to those people. Let me say to them that we are with you.

Then I want to say that the Senate has addressed the justice issue ENDA for the LGBT community. How can we stand here on the precipice of honoring great leaders and not recognize that there are people who need human dignity? Pass ENDA now.

And let me pay tribute to the 50th year of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and salute him—yes, salute him—as one of the greatest leaders and visionaries—Camelot—who led this country and inspired this country to greatness and service. We owe a debt of gratitude and appreciation to the legacy of his family and to the service they have given.

To President John F. Kennedy, may he rest in peace and thank him for inspiring millions of people.

STAND UP FOR LIBERTY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, the American people are losing trust in their government. The continuous dragnet collection of data by the NSA is just one of the many reasons why.

Liberty and privacy are the foundations for which this country was established. Even though emails have replaced most handwritten letters and phone calls have replaced many face-to-face conversations, these principles still endure today.

The administration defends PRISM and similar programs by relying on ''warrants'' whose mere existence mocks the Constitution. The FISA Court proceedings where these warrants originate take place behind closed doors and cater only to the government's case for increased surveillance. In these secret, one-sided proceedings, no one is there to advocate on behalf of privacy and individual liberty. No one is there to advocate on behalf of the American people.

With no requirements for public disclosure of the Court's decision, Congress and the American people are left in the dark. This is unacceptable. Maintaining a secure Nation can be done within the bounds of the Constitution. Privacy and national security are not mutually exclusive.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the LIBERT-E Act, the USA FREEDOM Act, and the NASA Inspector General Act to help address many of these issues.

I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, to stand up for liberty.

INSPIRING A SENSE OF IDEALISM, SPIRIT OF PUBLIC SERVICE IN THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because tomorrow is the 50th anniversary of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy inspired me to get into government. I was only 14 years old when he passed. His death left an indelible mark on me and everybody of my generation who experienced that national sharing of grief that went on that weekend.

President Kennedy was a person who said that politics is an honorable profession. I believe it is, and I believe people should get involved in politics and public service.

He founded the Peace Corps and asked people to ''ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country,'' which was a call for service.

It was a great loss to our Nation. He gave a great deal to our country. I would ask everybody to watch the TV specials, to read as much as they can, and to learn what they can about an honorable gentleman who tried to inspire people to get into government and do the right thing.

I thank his family for his coming along because it inspired me. I got to see him in Memphis when he campaigned. He is my hero.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, November 22, we mark the 50th anniversary of one of the saddest days in American history.

This anniversary affords us the opportunity to remember President John F. Kennedy, who also served in this House, and to reflect on his idealism and spirit of public service that he inspired in the American people.

President Kennedy encouraged all Americans to dream big dreams, like putting a man on the Moon by the end of that decade. He reminded us that this country is capable of great feats when the American people come together with a defined mission.

As President Kennedy said in 1961:

It will not be one man going to the Moon; it will be an entire Nation. For all of us must work to put him there.

President Kennedy's goal was achieved on July 20, 1969, when Apollo 11 Commander Neil Armstrong was the first person to step on the Moon.

It is good to remember how President Kennedy inspired a Nation. The torch of freedom President Kennedy described in his inaugural speech has now been passed to yet another generation. Let this generation celebrate President Kennedy's sense of idealism and public service every day.

TYPHOON HAIYAN

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of my home State of Hawaii, I stand today to send our heartfelt condolences to the victims of Super Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

Like so many people in Hawaii and around the world, I and my family have loved ones, friends, and others who were affected by this devastation in Tacloban City and in other areas of the Philippines, and they have been at the forefront of our thoughts and prayers.

In the wake of such a horrible tragedy, the positive that we can find is the outpouring of compassion, support, and, most importantly, aloha from my State towards the people in the Philippines.

The Hawaii Air National Guard is working with the U.S. Pacific Command as we speak, which is based in Hawaii, as collectively they provide unparalleled air, maritime, and ground support to the aid efforts of the Philippines authorities. All across Hawaii, as across the world, we are seeing businesses, nonprofits, and individuals standing up individually and taking the time and energy to raise resources and to provide support to these aid efforts, to these relief efforts, and helping to reunite families and friends and communities.

I continue to pray for all those who have lost homes, family, and friends, and encourage all who are able to contribute in any way possible in this recovery effort.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the 50 years since the passing of President Kennedy, I want to reissue that thought about call for service. He struck me in his inaugural address of asking not what this country can do for you, but what you can do for the country; and I immediately responded when he created the Peace Corps. I am wearing this button today proudly as a return Peace Corps volunteer.

My thoughts are as we sort of enter into the next half century of thought about America and service, President Kennedy not only urged us to go to space; he urged us to send our people to places where no person had ever gone before, no American had ever been; to all of these remote countries in poverty situations and places where nobody had ever lived. It changed the image of America around the world so positively.

So for you young people that are thinking about the future, don't think of America as just a platform to make money. America is the platform to launch peace and understanding around the world. Join the Peace Corps, serve this country, call for service. It is honorable.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is my honor to yield to a good friend whom I have tremendous respect for, from the State of Florida, my friend, RON DESANTIS.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I am struck by having been here to witness something that I think is pretty neat. We had a newly sworn in Member take the oath of office to become a Member of this body. Part of it is neat because he got endorsed by Duck Dynasty, which I know a lot of people like; but it was neat because I think it reminds us what our duties are here. He was asked to take an oath of office right here in the well of the House. That oath was very simple. It charged him with the duty to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I think we need to have more of a reminder that that is our duty here. I am struck by reading the Constitution and how the Founding Fathers laid out separation of powers and checks and balances.

For example, article I states clearly:

All legislative powers shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Article II prescribes authority for the President and imposes a duty on him to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

I think that going back on those constitutional foundations and looking at how this particular President has made claims of his authority to essentially put aside the law or change the law should cause us great concern.

For example, with this employer mandate aspect of ObamaCare, the statute said very clearly it shall take effect this January 2014.

Well, that, obviously, would have been disastrous had they implemented that. We in the House were willing to delay it by statute. The President chose to do it by executive fiat.

□ 1245

And then most recently with the idea that ObamaCare was causing people to lose their plans, a lot of people in this body said, Look, we ought to grandfather these plans in; let people keep their plans. The President threatened to veto that, and then he issued, essentially, an executive order saying he is going to extend the grandfather clause and not enforce the ObamaCare mandate that is causing the cancelations.

So, on the one hand, ObamaCare is a holy writ that people in Congress are not allowed to touch in any way with our Article I power, but the President can essentially pick and choose which parts to enforce, which parts to delay, and who to grant waivers to. That ultimately is not sustainable, and it conflicts with the basic structure of American Government.

The American Revolution, if you read the Declaration of Independence, it was a revolt against executive power and the British King. Jefferson lists all the abuses that they were revolting against. One of the things that he mentioned was that King George III, what King George III had done wrong was for abolishing our most valuable laws and altering, fundamentally, the form of government.

Students in school throughout America are taught, Congress passes the law and the President can sign or veto the law, and the President has the duty to enforce the law. Now, there is certainly prosecutorial discretion that comes with that. If the President has a good-faith belief that a law is unconstitutional, of course they have to prefer the Constitution to the statute. But here, this President has not made any claim that ObamaCare is unconstitutional; and, indeed, he can't, because it is his signature piece of legislation.

I think the key thing to think about is the Founding Fathers did not create separation of powers, checks and balances because they thought that students would need something to study in civics class. They did it because, ultimately, that structure of government was the surest way to protect the individual liberty of the American people and to preserve and maintain the rule of law.

I think disputes that we have regarding what this particular President may do should not even be about him, per se, because that just gets lost in partisanship back and forth. I think when

we see any President taking steps that may not comport with how the structure of the government was intended to operate, we have to think about what precedent that sets, not just tomorrow, but 50 years from now. And so I have introduced a resolution that enumerates some of the instances in which the President has gone beyond using executive discretion and is essentially rewriting the law, either by failing to enforce entirely or suspending affirmatively different provisions of the law.

Much has been said recently about the failure of this core promise with respect to ObamaCare, that if you like your plan, you can keep it can. Obviously, we are seeing that is not true. We are going to continue to see that. People are going to lose doctors, and it really is a deception on a massive scale.

So I was thinking, you like your plan, you keep your plan; that obviously didn't work. Maybe we should get everyone in Congress and the White House to agree with this simple proposition: if you take an oath to the Constitution, you should keep your oath to the Constitution.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me, and I know you will be someone who will take that oath seriously.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman from Florida. What a profound novel idea: if you take the oath, you should keep it. And that doesn't even mean if you like it. It is just, if you take the oath, you should keep it.

As my friend, Mr. DESANTIS was pointing out, there are so many problems with the ObamaCare bill. And I know the President referred to the bill as ''ObamaCare'' many times and said he was proud to do so, and so I certainly don't mean any disrespect or anything like that. On the other hand, it is extremely difficult to call it the ''Affordable Care Act'' when you know it is not affordable.

And a great indication of just how affordable it is came from a lady named Jessica Sanford. I heard the President at a press conference read the letter from Jessica Sanford from Washington State. And when I heard it, I thought, well, good. At least somebody has been able to find something good from ObamaCare, because in my office we have heard from so many people who have already been adversely affected. So I thought, well, great. Three hundred-plus million people in the United States, he found one person that had a letter he could read from Jessica Sanford. Then it turns out, this article from the Daily Caller on November 19:

> Jessica Sanford received a major shout-out last month when President Barack Obama mentioned her fan letter lauding her cheap, new ObamaCare coverage. But the Washington State business owner has now been informed that she can't even afford the cheapest ObamaCare exchange plan in her State. ''I'm really terribly embarrassed,'' Sanford told the Washington State Wire. ''It has completely turned around on me. I mean, completely.''
>
> The Washington State exchange Web site Washington Healthplanfinder originally gave Sanford a quote for coverage that would insure both her and her son for $169 per month.

But after a series of corrections—and she was one of the few people who was able to get through on the Web site—she gets a quote, and it turns out that it was entirely wrong. It makes you wonder how many people got the wrong quote and won't find out and won't realize they did and will end up January 1 without insurance thinking they signed up, thinking they bought a policy they can afford only to find out they couldn't afford it.

In this case, it says the ObamaCare exchange Web site originally calculated Sanford would be eligible for a Federal ObamaCare tax credit that would lower her monthly premium total by $452 per month, prompting the effusive letter that Obama read out loud during a White House speech.

> I am a single mom, no child support, self-employed, and I haven't had health insurance for 15 years because it is too expensive. I was crying the other day when I signed up, so much stress lifted.

So the President was quick to share Ms. Sanford's gratitude and said:

> Sanford's experience is what the Affordable Care Act is all about.

He went on:

> The essence of the law, the health insurance that is available to people, is working just fine. In some cases, it actually is exceeding expectations. The prices are lower than we expected; the choice is greater than we expected.

But this article points out that Sanford was one of 8,000 people to be affected by 4,600 policies sold on the Washington exchange that had been quoted premium rates that were too low.

Ms. Sanford said:

> I was dumbfounded. I thought this was a total mistake; they're going to correct this. This isn't true.

Now she says she can't even afford the cheapest Bronze ObamaCare plan. ''I was like, forget that. I'm not going to pay.'' So she is going uninsured. Sanford now says of ObamaCare:

> You are stuck on this big treadmill of bureaucracy. And, you know, it feels very out of control.

This article from today—this afternoon, actually—from Steven Ertelt, entitled, ''ObamaCare Denies Hospital Choice for Blind Child With Rare Bone Disease,'' says:

> As The Washington Post reports, a number of the Nation's top hospitals—including the Mayo Clinic in Minnesota, Cedars-Sinai in Los Angeles, and children's hospitals in Seattle, Houston, and St. Louis—are cut out of most plans sold on the exchange. In most cases, the decision was about the cost of care.
>
> Here is how ObamaCare is hurting one family:
>
> In Seattle, the region's predominant insurer, Premera Blue Cross, decided not to include the children's hospital as an in-network provider except in cases where the service sought cannot be obtained anywhere else. ''Children's nonunique services were too expensive given the goal of providing affordable coverage for consumers,'' spokesman Eric Earling said in an email.

That brings up the point, the President wanted to provide everybody health insurance; and some of us, like me, were more concerned about getting them quality health care that was affordable. All this talk about insurance, insurance, insurance, the bigger, more important question should have been can we get them health care they can afford.

One of the biggest promises was it will lower most everybody's cost, and it turns out that was not true at all either. There are some in States, in a State like New York, where it was overpriced previously where it has come down some. But overall, when you add 18,000 new IRS agents that will not ever even apply a Band-Aid, they may cause a bunch of ulcers, but they will never provide any health care. And they are not from the U.S. Government to help you. They are there to go through all of your most important and most personal decisions with you—the IRS. Go figure.

This institution, the IRS, this agency that we find out got weaponized by the Obama administration to go after people they disagreed with. Richard Nixon had an enemy's list, but he never could do much with it. This administration has an enemy's list, and they have really gone after people and made them suffer for having a different political opinion than this administration.

This article points out:

> For example, a pediatric appendectomy at Children's costs about $23,000. At another community hospital, the cost is closer to $14,000. Melzer said his hospital often bills more than community hospitals for comparable procedures because the children it treats are often gravely ill, so even a routine tonsillectomy may be more complicated.
>
> But as a result, families like Jeffrey Blank's, which has relied on Seattle Children's since his daughter, Zoe, received a rare diagnosis of a rare bone disorder, face difficult decisions. Under some of the new law's health plans, the family would no longer be able to take Zoe to Children's for her routine checkups, or it could count as an ''out-of-network'' visit, saddling the family with huge bills.
>
> As the pro-life movement warned during its adoption in Congress, health care will be rationed and health care access will be limited when the government gets involved. These lessons have been seen for decades in nations like Canada and England, and the United States is now following suit.

It makes such a great point, because when you add 18,000 IRS agents to be even more intrusive and get into your most private decisions about health care and your own health, they not only may cause you ulcers or create problems, they don't help at all. And I have no idea what the average IRS salary will be. I would imagine the IRS' average salary will be a lot higher than $56,000. But if you just take $56,000 as the average for the 18,000 IRS agents, it means that a billion dollars next year will go for IRS agents to harass you, that will come out of money that should be going to health care, and it is not going to help you a bit.

In fact, they are playing for the other team. They are out after you, not out to help you. And then when you add in all of these millions of navigators and you add in all the tens of thousands, maybe some make over $100,000, and I am sure some of them will that are involved in this whole navigator process, not the lowest level but some surely will, and you think about all the billions of dollars over the next years that will be spent for navigators that, as we heard here in testimony from Kathleen Sebelius herself, yes, they can be convicted of a felony and we won't catch it because we are not checking on that kind of thing.

□ 1300

As a former judge who sentenced people to prison—for example, I never sent a woman to prison for felony welfare fraud when her crime was getting a job to try to get out of the hole the government lured her into by promising checks for every child she could have out of wedlock. I do believe in holding people accountable. I would sentence them, give them probation, and then do things like either max them out or come close to maxing out 800 hours of community service, but then make very clear as an incentive that if you get your GED or high school diploma, then I'll knock out 750 hours, to urge them to go forward and help themselves, which ultimately helps society. That is the kind of thing government is supposed to do.

Instead, this government, for too long, going back to the Great Society days, has incentivized things that lured people away from their God-given potential. It hasn't helped them; it has lured them away from their potential. Here we are now with ObamaCare not just luring people away from their health care, it has put a wall up between them and their health care.

I knew when I would hear our friends across the aisle here in the House and in the Senate talk about how health insurance is a right,—well, it is not in the Constitution as a right. I was more concerned about ''health care'' than ''health insurance.'' There are ways to make it affordable.

When we see disparities of $23,000 to $14,000 for the same tonsillectomy, it should be very clear that we need competition, and when you have the government running everything, there is no competition. The government screws that up royally. It prevents the thing that made America so great: entrepreneurialism, competitive advantages that people have that work hard. It destroys those kinds of incentives, and now we are seeing it destroy lives.

Here is an article from November 19. ''HHS Secretary Sebelius Visits South Florida to Meet With Health Care Navigators.'' Gee, wouldn't it be nice if we weren't paying billions of dollars for government workers that will make your health care decisions more miserable instead of giving you more freedom?

Here is an article from yesterday on foxnews.com: Second Wave of Health Plan Cancelations Looms. It says:

A new and independent analysis of ObamaCare warns of a ticking timebomb, predicting a second wave of 50 million to 100 million insurance policy cancelations next fall—right before the mid-term elections. The next round of cancelations and premium hikes is expected to hit employees, particularly of small businesses.

It goes on to say:

As reported by AEI's Scott Gottlieb, some businesses got around this by renewing their policies before the end of 2013. But the relief is temporary, and they are expected to have to offer in-compliance plans for 2015. According to Gottlieb, that means beginning in October 2014 the cancelation notices will start to go out.

So the millions of cancelations that have gone out now—people make the mistake of saying 5 million people. That is 5 million policies. That is the information I have got. There are million policies approximately so far. That is a lot more than 5 million people. That could be 15 million, 20 million people.

This article is exactly right. AEI is exactly right that come next year, a lot of people—we have heard this, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people have been renewing their policies now before the end of the year so that they don't completely lose it until next year around this time. Next fall, there will be millions and millions and millions more who will get those notices of cancelations.

As a result, this article from Marguerite Bowling points out, Obama's legacy will be more Americans than ever reject government enrolled health care. It then points out the way it has gone from 64 percent and even up to 69 percent wanting government to be responsible for their health care to now dropping to 42 percent of Americans because people have begun to see what so many of us have been talking about for a number of years: the best solution is not more government. The best solution is not having navigators and IRS agents taking away money that could be spent on health care.

I have this article from David Martosko that points out that our President had claimed that more than 100 million Americans have enrolled. Obviously, that was just a mistake in the teleprompter. It is not his fault. Here is an article from the Heritage Foundation's Morning Bell:

The American people rose up to repeal a health care law once before. They can do it again.

It goes back and points out about the bill that had been passed under a man that I greatly revere, a great President, Ronald Reagan, and he thought he was providing America with a great gift of catastrophic care for seniors, but it didn't take but a couple of years for people to see this is a disaster, this isn't a good thing. So in 1989, they stepped up and got it repealed.

An interesting CBS poll from yesterday points out that 84 percent of Democrats want ObamaCare changed or repealed. I had not seen that before, that article.

So it is important to understand just what is at stake with ObamaCare. These things are kind of worn. I have been through them so much, and I had gone through and read the bill so I would know what was in it before I voted, which is why I voted against it. There are things in here—and I will just hit a few since people are now waking up as this thing has become a reality. People are starting to wake up and realize that, wait a minute, this was not such a good idea.

When there were some who were concerned here in this room about the President representing that abortions would not be paid for under ObamaCare, some of us had read the bill—I think at that point it was the 1,000-page bill, and then the one that came out of the committee, and then somehow it magically became around 2,000 pages, and then we end up with my copy, which is just under 2,500.

At page 119, this was a comfort to some people when they read:

The services described in this clause are abortions for which the expenditure of Federal funds appropriated for the Department of Health and Human Services is not permitted based on the laws in effect at the date that is 6 months before the beginning of the plan year.

But then it does have a provision that abortions with public funding are allowed.

Then the next section:

Prohibition on Federal Funds for Abortion. Services in Community Health Insurance Option.

That is the last I can find of abortion specifically being mentioned.

What gets really clever, since we now are of the Information Age where you can go online and see bills and you can do an electronic word search, if you go online and do an electronic word search for the word ''abortion''—I didn't see it. What you have to be aware of is these are really clever people. They were clever enough as they wrote this to make sure that the Speaker's office and certain staffs would be exempted. It was really intriguing how clever some of these things were.

To avoid a word search picking this stuff up, like over here at page 122, it says, ''Assured availability of varied coverage through exchanges,'' and it says:

''The Secretary''—talking about Secretary Sebelius right now—''shall assure that with respect to qualified health plans offered in any exchange established pursuant to this title—(I) there is at least one such plan that provides coverage of services described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph B.''

Well, that surely couldn't be abortion, unless you flip back and see what (i) and (ii) of B is. Guess what? That is the abortion referenced over on page 119. That is the way you get around

people picking up those things; of course she is going to have provisions in here about that, and of course people shouldn't forget that the provision at page 429—it was a special adjustment to FMAP, determination for certain States recovering from a major disaster. This was put in there to buy the votes from Louisiana. That is why some have called it the ''Louisiana Purchase.'' So we have got special consideration in there for that.

There are all kinds of things I used to go through. Of course, AARP got special dispensation.

Also, this administration saw that Medicare Advantage was really helping some people out. Their costs were lower. There were a lot of people that were telling me they liked Medicare Advantage. So as ObamaCare would do it, it would try to destroy anything that people liked and was helpful and mandate that you couldn't have those provisions in your policy. They knew all along by putting this kind of thing in this bill, like at page 904, that people that liked their Medicare Advantage were not going to get to keep it. They sure weren't going to like it after this bill got through with them. At 904, it goes after Medicare Advantage and says: ''Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to accept any or every bid submitted by an MA organization under this subsection.''

Then the next capital C, subparagraph (ii):

> Authority to deny bids that propose significant increases in cost-sharing or decreases in benefits.

Because as the government keeps mandating more and more things, like maternity care for men that are single and may be beyond their childbearing years—well, a single man that is 70 years old may think, gee, I am beyond childbearing years. I probably won't get pregnant any time soon. Maybe I don't need maternity care. Well, maybe Secretary Sebelius thinks you do. So you are going to pay for it anyway. That is the way people end up paying more than what they really need.

That was in the second volume.

I never could understand it. I keep asking questions, and nobody will give an explanation as to why, at page 1,312 in the health care bill, to make sure that everybody got the health care they needed that we had to create the Commissioned Corps and Ready Reserve Corps for service in time of national emergency over on page 1,314. It talks about national emergencies and public health crises. It gets ''health'' in there for part of it, but not under national emergencies.

Above that, it is talking about the purpose to ''meet both routine public health and''—that is conjunctive, not disjunctive—''emergency response missions.''

Well, I wish they would put ''health'' in here, and we would be more assured that this isn't creating some kind of Presidential brownshirts or something, but we can't get an answer on who these people are, what they are being trained with, what they are being trained on. Are they being trained with weapons? Are they being trained with medical equipment? What are they being trained on?

One thing that I have learned, as both a judge and a chief justice, and now in Congress, is that if words are not specific, somebody is going to figure out to just use their plain meaning. So when something says ''national emergencies,'' like this bill, there will be times it will be called in for national emergencies rather than just health emergencies.

□ 1315

And the next section talks about public health emergencies, both foreign and domestic, but we have already learned that they didn't put the word ''health'' in the national emergency. And so it is strange.

These are commissioned officers of the Ready Reserve Corps. They will be appointed by the President. Commissioned officers of the regular Corps shall be appointed by the President, and it is subject to advice and consent of the Senate; but that is for the actual appointment.

But it makes clear over here that they are subject—it says that the Corps will be available and ready for involuntary calls to Active Duty during national emergencies and public health crises. And then below the health crisis, foreign and domestic. So that is some more.

I have insurance that has a health savings account attached to it. I think Aetna could have done better, and I was looking forward to improving my policy, except that ObamaCare came in and made sure that anybody that had a policy with a high deductible and a health savings account they liked were probably not going to be able to keep it because they took shots and terrifically restricted what you could use a health savings account for.

The goal is to get rid of them because if people get that much control over their own health savings account or, as the bill I filed back before ObamaCare ever passed, nearly a year before it passed, I say give seniors a choice. Let them choose Medicare. Let people choose Medicaid.

Or it would be cheaper for us if we just say, look, we will buy you a Cadillac, not a bronze, we will buy you the best coverage, great coverage, and it will have a high deductible now, maybe $5,000, something like that for a deductible, and we will give you the cash in a health savings account.

You get control back of your health care. You can handle it yourself. Your debit card will be coded where you can only use it for health care, but then let you make the decisions.

But this won't even let you go get your own medicine or drug unless it is prescribed. This kind of stuff is running up the costs and trying to get rid of HSAs. It is very clear.

Oh, and I love—they have got a provision in here for States, this, back 2,300 or so, they have got a provision in here that, gee, we have given out grants, but if your State has bothered to do malpractice reform, like the Federal Government hasn't done, then if you put caps on pain and suffering, for example, then you are not going to be getting the grants that other States are.

Well, there are a lot of problems with ObamaCare; and I hope that, by the end, before the election next year, people will realize that what some of us have been saying for years is true. It is in America's best interest to have health care reform, but that is not it. It is not it.

There is another issue—there are two other things I want to address very quickly. One is about Guantanamo Bay.

I had the television on when I was working at my desk in the wee hours of the morning this morning, I can't remember, maybe, 1, 2, 3 a.m., something like that, but a show where some psychologist had been, basically, corrupted by being used at Guantanamo Bay for psychological warfare. Totally false story.

I mean, there are still a lot of people walking around that don't know that no one has ever been waterboarded at Guantanamo Bay.

Having been there two or three times, you get the picture. Amnesty International comes regularly. These groups come regularly; and when you find out what is really going on there, it is really the guards that are put through all kinds of Hades. They have excrement and urine thrown on them, and they are not allowed to even get angry back.

Last time I was there, they said there had been one soldier who had responded angrily, and he was punished for it. Their instructions are when you have urine or feces thrown on you by one of the detainees at Guantanamo Bay, you just don't react. And then you get the day off so you can go clean up, change clothes.

So the inmates are constantly coming up with innovative ways to get feces and urine on our guards. That was last time. Hopefully, they have dealt with it better.

The punishment, when I was there before, they would take away some of the movie-watching time that the detainees got to have; and if it was really egregious enough, they might cut into their outdoor time a little bit.

But I was told that Amnesty International gets real upset about that, so they don't like to cut out their outdoor time, so they are more restrictive on the movie-watching time that our detainees at Guantanamo may get.

And this—what a juxtaposition. What an amazing thing.

The New York Times used to bill itself—and it is arguable that it really was accurate as the newspaper of record, but they have so corrupted their standards that they could say about an overt lie, someone misspoke.

This is not a newspaper of record. It is really just a sad day for America regarding the New York Times. But every now and then they get a story right.

But, unfortunately, now we have to sometimes go to England or other countries whose media is not overwhelmed with bias for or against a particular administration so we can get proper reporting.

But this story is from Russia Today. I mean, I was in the Soviet Union in 1973. I could read a little bit of Russian, speak a little Russian back then. I haven't had any reason to for over 30 years, so I don't remember much of anything but how to get to the bathroom.

But from Russia Today they report, and this was the first I saw, and then started looking for more information: U.S. Senate is seemingly deadlocked when dealing with the Guantanamo Bay detention facility, voting down dueling measures which would have either loosened or tightened restrictions on transferring detainees.

And then we found one, 2014, NDAA, now in the Senate, could finally mean the end of Guantanamo. More than half of Guantanamo Bay's 164 detainees have been cleared to transfer to other nations, MSNBC reports, but have remained at the prison due to congressional measures complicating the transfer protocol.

Yes, some of us are concerned that since we keep transferring people out, releasing them, and they keep killing Americans, so many of them, after they are released, I would say one is too many, but one is not near as many as have been reported going back and continuing to kill Americans.

This talks about even a good Republican who is reportedly aiding the Guantanamo Bay win for President Obama, but White House, top Senate Democrats successfully defended provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act that would loosen restrictions on transferring detainees out of Guantanamo Bay, advancing President Obama's goal of closing the facility by a margin of 55–43.

Yeah, they can vote like that because they have got enough people that aren't up for re-election next year. So they can take a vote like that.

So that caused me to go look at the law being discussed and voted on, and find this provision in there, section 1032, the authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment.

So, okay, they say, yeah, see, we have got to get them out of there sometimes for medical treatment. They have got incredibly good medical treatment at Guantanamo Bay.

This says, status while in the United States, an individual who is temporarily transferred under the authority in subsection (a) while in the United States shall be considered to be paroled into the United States temporarily pursuant to a provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

But then it goes on, under section 1033, to say that transfer for detention and trial, the Secretary of Defense may transfer a detainee described in subsection (a) to the United States for detention and trial if the Secretary determines that the transfer is in the national security interest of the United States.

And it does provide that Congress should be notified not later than 30 days before the date of proposed transfer. But if the President, with a wave of his hand, can wave off mandatory language in a bill that was passed without a single Republican vote, if they can wave off provisions of the immigration bill and just flat out change the law, unilaterally, as the Chief Executive, then it sure wouldn't be very hard to say, oh, whoops, we didn't give Congress notice; those people are in the United States because once they are in the United States, things take a big turn.

I remember my friend from across the aisle, Anthony Weiner, was so upset. He actually said he wanted these detainees brought to New York City and put on trial and executed there in New York City.

Well, having been a prosecutor, judge and chief justice, I knew he would be exhibit A for why, if they brought the detainees to New York City, they shouldn't get a trial there. They would have to transfer them somewhere else because you had people like Anthony Weiner who were not particularly capital punishment supporters, but wanted them to be executed. So that would have been exhibit A in why you couldn't get a fair trial if they were brought to New York.

Some of our friends get very confused and demand, we want these people at Guantanamo Bay to have the same rights under the Constitution that everybody else does.

Well, everybody doesn't have the same rights under the Constitution. When I was in the Army for 4 years, I didn't have the rights everybody else did. I wasn't free to assemble where I wanted. I wasn't free to say what I wanted to about the President.

I wasn't happy with Jimmy Carter. We saw Fort Benning going down and down and down. We saw our Nation attacked by an act of war in Tehran, and there was no response.

That is still being used today to recruit people to al Qaeda, to terrorism, because of how weak our response was then, how weak the response was when we were attacked in 1983 at Beirut and, certainly, the ongoing weak responses after the World Trade Center bombing in 1993, the USS *Cole*, the embassy attacks.

And I know there are people that would say to such embassy attacks in the 1990s, well, what difference does it make at this point?

Well, perhaps if it had made a difference to the Clinton administration, we would have been better prepared and people wouldn't have died in Benghazi.

But this is a disaster. Under the Constitution, nobody is promised a trial in a U.S. District Court. And people need to understand that, because in the Constitution there is no U.S. District Court.

As my old constitutional law professor at Baylor used to say, there is only one Court created in the Constitution. Every other court in America, Federal court, that is, owes its existence and continued existence and jurisdiction to the United States Congress. That is it.

So if are you an immigrant, our Constitution says you get due process at an immigration court. If you are in the military, the Constitution ensures you will get due process in a military court. And I can tell you, that is kind of tough.

When a soldier stands in front of a military jury, all wearing uniform, all appointed by the commanding officer to whom they account after that trial is over, it is a little different than a jury that you would get just picked at random from your peers.

□ 1330

They are not picked at random. The commanding officers, from platoon on up through company and all the way up to the installation, they send recommendations, and they eventually funnel their way up to the commanding general for a general court-martial. And then they are handpicked by the general. These are the people who will be on the jury.

Well, that is constitutional. It has been upheld many times. So I have a little trouble, having served in the military, understanding why someone who wants to destroy our country and kill all the Americans they can, why are they entitled to more rights under the Constitution than somebody that is giving their lives in our U.S. military? They are not. They are not given more rights than our U.S. military.

And, in fact, under international law, the way it has existed, going back as far as it has been recorded, when someone was part of a country or group that declared war on another country or group and they were captured, they were held until their group or country said they were no longer at war. Then we let go of the ones that promised not to be at war after the war was over and punished those who were guilty of war crimes.

And I also, Mr. Speaker, want to make sure people understand what we have at Guantanamo. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was the leader—people call him the mastermind—of 9/11/2001. Very unrepentant. Not only is he unrepentant, he, in 2008, in December, agreed to plead guilty and went through, I believe, at least two hearings where, through in-depth questioning by the

judge, he admitted to his role in killing Americans.

We know he filed this pleading, of which I have a copy here, that was released by Military Judge Colonel Henley, declassified so we could see what Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the 9/11 mastermind—he, himself, talked about his planning it. And he had some resources where he could translate his language into English so that he could write this whole thing. There are some idioms, perhaps, that may be misused, but anyway, he is a brilliant man. He just hates Americans and loves to kill them.

But in his pleading, he says:

In God's book, he ordered us to fight you everywhere we find you, even if you were inside the holiest of all holy cities, the mosque in Mecca, and the holy city of Mecca, and even during sacred months.

In other words, it would be perfectly fine for him or one of his buddies to kill Americans in the mosque in Mecca, but heaven help the person that causes any damage at all to the same mosque.

He said, ''In God's book''—and this is as if he had legal training. He does this quite well. He states a premise, and he follows it up with a provision from the law of the Koran. I mean, the Koran is a book, basically, of law.

In God's book, verse 9, Al-Tawbah: ''Then fight and slay the pagans wherever you find them, and seize them, and besiege them and lie in wait for them in each and every ambush.''

Further down, he says:

We do not possess your military might, not your nuclear weapons.

Of course, this President may be presiding over the United States—unless Israel protects itself, this President may be the one that sees, for the first time, a radical Islamic terrorist regime get a nuclear weapon, and that will change the world forever. We can't afford for that to happen.

But he points out, at the time he wrote this:

We do not possess your nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, we fight you with the Almighty God. So, if our act of jihad and our fighting with you caused fear and terror, then many thanks to God, because it is him that has thrown fear into your hearts, which resulted in your infidelity, paganism, and your statement that God had a son and your trinity beliefs.

And then the provision he follows that up with, from the Koran:

Soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbelievers, for that they joined companies with Allah, for which he has sent no authority. Their place will be the fire; and evil is the home of the wrongdoers.

And he misspelled ''their.'' When he said ''their place,'' he used T-H-E-R-E. But, I mean, this is amazing stuff. He is admitting: we want to destroy you.

And if you think for a moment that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or Ahmadinejad or Khamenei would not mind using a nuke to destroy what some of them believe were people descended from apes and pigs, as some in the Muslim Brotherhood say, well, you have got another thing coming. These people are not stupid, but they are insanely crazy in their desire to kill innocent people.

He went on at the end of his pleading on page 6, and says:

You will be greatly defeated in Afghanistan and Iraq, and America will fall, politically, militarily, and economically. Your end is very near, and your fall will be just as the fall of the towers on the blessed 9/11 day. We will raise from the ruins, God willing. We will leave this imprisonment with our noses raised high in dignity, as the lion emerges from his den. We shall pass over the blades of the sword into the gates of heaven.

So we ask from God to accept our contributions to the great attack, the great attack on America, and to place our 19 martyred brethren among the highest peaks in paradise.

This is a guy that some people want to bring to the United States. They have no idea how desperately wrong that would be. He is being held constitutionally right where he is, and under no circumstances should he be allowed to be brought into the United States itself.

They have the perfect courtroom set up down in Guantanamo for conducting terrorist trials. Enough bulletproof material in the middle of an area where a bombing would not do the damage that it would in Manhattan.

Israel understands the threat. They understand the danger. And it absolutely breaks my heart to find out that Israel is having to seek another ally that understands the threat of radical Islam to them and to the United States.

Now, it was Prime Minister Netanyahu who asked me, after I apologized for America putting them in a position where they have to defend not only themselves but the United States, because some people here do not understand the threat, he said, I just ask that you remind your President, the people in America, that it was your President who said the words, ''Israel must defend itself by itself.''

I didn't remember President Obama saying that. I had to go back and do a word search. It turns out, that was slipped in in a bunch of other glowing comments about what a wonderful ally and we are not going to let Iran get nukes and all this stuff. And then he slides that little sentence in there that is profound. But ''Israel must defend itself by itself.'' That is why I wasn't the only one that didn't pick up on that, because of the way in which he contextualized it.

But here is an article from The Blaze today, from Sharona Schwartz, ''How Bad Are Things Between Israel and the U.S.? Israeli Foreign Minister Says It's Time to Find New Allies.''

Israel's foreign policy for many years went in one direction toward Washington, but my policy has more directions.

This is Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman who said this. He said:

There are enough countries that we can be a help to, and, therefore, our foreign policy must be to search for allies. The Americans have a lot of problems and challenges around the world that they need to solve and they have problems at home. We need to understand them and our place in the global arena.

We need to stop demanding, complaining, moaning and, instead, seek countries that are not dependent on money from the Arab or Islamic world and who want to cooperate with us in the field of innovation.

I mean, Israel has been a leading innovator in intellectual technology. They need to be our friends. They believe in the value of life, as we do. They do not name streets and holidays for people who kill innocent women, children, innocent victims, men who never saw it coming; whereas, even in Palestine, as it is called now—it was never called that before in recent history. But it is time that we realize what a friend we have in Israel and that we could never spend enough money to create the defense system we have in Israel if we will just be supportive.

One other thing I want to address before I conclude today. There are some people that are calling attention to the President's omission of the words ''under God'' from the Gettysburg Address when he did the entire Gettysburg Address on camera. I don't know whose decision it was to leave that out. I don't know if he was just reading it, and whoever gave it to him to read in the teleprompter took it out and he didn't realize. I don't know what happened. But, Mr. Speaker, it is important that people understand, yes, there are five existing copies of the Gettysburg Address. There is only one that Abraham Lincoln signed, the Bliss copy, unless the President has removed it, like he did Winston Churchill's bust from the White House. Unless it has been removed, it is up there in the Lincoln Bedroom. This is the Bliss copy, it is called.

And actually, at the Gettysburg Foundation Web site, they have an explanation of those five copies—the Nicolay copy, the Hay copy. So you had a couple of them there. And you can see what actually was in the copy. But the Everett copy—Senator Everett was the Speaker that went 2 hours or so, and he asked for a copy, so Abraham Lincoln made sure he got a copy.

And I was talking to a brilliant historian, Stephen Mansfield, this week. He was pointing out these things, that it was thought that Lincoln had provided his secretary with his notes. And since he had interlineated, as I see people on both sides of the aisle do all the time here—making notes, scratching stuff, putting stuff in—he had interlineated ''under God.'' So when he gave the speech, ''under God'' was part of it. I don't know about anybody on this floor that wants the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to carry a copy of their speech before they made all the changes in it, just as Lincoln did.

But the last three copies, the Everett copy that Lincoln personally gave to Senator Everett, it says ''that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.'' And then the Bancroft

copy, that was one that also was requested by historian George Bancroft, and that has ''that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.''

And then the last copy, the Bliss copy that is most often used, is considered to be the most authoritative copy of what was said at Gettysburg, because this is the only copy that Abraham Lincoln signed. He didn't sign any of the others. He signed this one. And it went to Colonel Bliss, who was going to use it to auction and use the money to help wounded warriors.

This is a Nation under God. It had a new birth of freedom. And I hope and pray that God will give us wisdom to avoid destroying that freedom.

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

□ 1345

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY: HE SPEAKS TO US STILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Our topic today is a solemn one and yet a hopeful one. It is about the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He speaks to us still.

In November 1983, I submitted an op-ed piece to our local paper, the East Hartford Gazette, on President Kennedy. It is hard to believe that 30 years have passed since I submitted that document.

Most, including myself, and especially the Kennedy family, would rather not dwell on the events that transpired on November 22 and that ensuing weekend, but rather on the President's birth, and celebrate his heroic service. Indeed, May 29 should be a national day of remembrance.

I am proud to say that the entire New England delegation has dropped in a resolution today calling upon Congress to recognize May 29, the birthday of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as a day of remembrance.

President Kennedy, if we were alive, would be 96 years old. It is hard to imagine, even today, because of the image of that youthful, vigorous, witty, energetic man who we still see in TV clips and who speaks to us still. That beautiful man was taken from us in the summer of his years.

For my parents' generation, December 7, 1941, as President Roosevelt appropriately put it, would be a day that would live in infamy. For my children and so many of this current generation, myself included, September 11, 2001, will be recalled as another day of infamy. For my generation, however, it remains November 22, 1963, the day the Nation stood still in shock and disbelief.

As a New Englander, the shot heard round the world on that day was not the one fired at Lexington and Concord, but in Dallas, Texas. That shot cut down the 35th President of the United States, ended dreams of Camelot, and cut short the life of an American hero.

Almost everyone can recall where he or she was and what they were doing when they first heard the news of the assassination of John Kennedy. Fifty years after his death, the country still gropes for answers and searches to fill the void created by his departure.

It was sixth period in Mr. Desmond's French class when Mrs. Bray's voice, noticeably shaken, announced over the loud speaker at East Hartford High School that the President had been shot. An unsettling silence that was laden with anxiety fell over a perplexed and unbelieving class. Attempts to calm the class were fumbled by a visibly stunned teacher as he sought answers to a host of questions. Such an irrational act. It just couldn't be.

In what seemed to be within minutes, Mrs. Bray's tearful voice announced that the President of the United States had died. Hollow disillusionment and deep sadness engulfed not only the classroom, but the entire Nation. Despair was replaced by speculation concerning the perpetrator of such an act.

Walking home from school, conjecture of this heinous crime centered on the KGB and Castro as likely culprits, but even conjuring up these villains brought no resolve.

When I reached home, my mother, with Kleenex in hand, sat motionless next to the TV. She was glassy-eyed, shaken, and unable to comprehend the events of the day that saw the first President born in this century—and the first Catholic—struck down.

The family gathered around the TV and waited for Dad to come home. Surely, he could explain. When my father arrived, everything from the Russians to the Texans were mulled over, as he revealed various theories discussed in the shop at Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, but all with the same anguish and perplexity.

Thus began a family vigil with Walter Cronkite. But even he, the most trusted man in America, couldn't explain to the viewing public the way it was on November 22, 1963.

It was a numbing experience for our family and the rest of the country as we sat in shock, traumatized, as the first real-time media account of the sixties unfolded in our living room. In a weekend that never seemed to end, we witnessed a Nation in mourning, the apprehension and then murder of Lee Harvey Oswald, and the subsequent arrest of crime figure Jack Ruby, all unveiling and unfolding themselves on TV. The plot only seemed to become more complicated.

The complexities of American society and the very fabric of our way of life in this Nation hit home like never before.

What I most recall, and what I believe most Americans recall, from that weekend are the vivid scenes and images of that ordeal:

The distressed widow in a blood-stained pink suit, with all the dignity and strength and nobility that she could muster, being met at Andrews Air Force Base by Robert Kennedy; the long lines passing through the Rotunda to pay their last respects, including James Michael Fitzgerald from our hometown in East Hartford; the veiled face of Jacqueline Kennedy as she kneeled over the coffin, clutching the hand of her daughter, Caroline; the Kennedy brothers in silhouetted support of the First Lady and the family; those boots placed backwards in the stirrups of Black Jack, the horse following the caisson; the procession of world leaders en route to Arlington; a weekend of images culminating in John-John's final salute to his dad.

I will never forget that weekend of tragedy, wrought with emotion and dream-crushing reality. Its impact and the impact of other events in that decade perhaps won't be fully understood, though we are fixated on this.

Before I yield to our leader, to put it in perspective, I would say this. As William Manchester noted:

> In November of 1963, among the living were Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and 58,209 young men who would die in Vietnam over the next 9 years.

I yield to our leader, noting that, as we said at the outset, we prefer not to dwell on the events of the day but on the heroic nature of this President and what he meant to so many people—and continues to do so. He continues to speak to us, as does our leader, NANCY PELOSI, who knew him personally.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for calling this Special Order. Congress has adjourned for the Thanksgiving holiday, but I thank you for staying so that we can acknowledge and observe the 50th anniversary of a great loss for our country.

My colleague, Mr. LARSON, spoke so beautifully about what happened on November 22, 50 years ago, and how your mother reacted. You could have been speaking for every family in America.

Certainly, we took special ownership of President Kennedy, as the first Catholic President, but everyone who enjoys firsts understands that that pioneer action, that courage, that success that he had was not just about him being the first Catholic President, but embracing the people of our country more fully.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, tragedy struck the heart of a Nation in Dallas, Texas. Fifty years ago, President Kennedy was taken from us, suddenly and unexpectedly, and the entire Nation was shaken and mourned.

As you said, we don't want to dwell on that sad day. We want to spring from it and talk about what went before and what has come from the legacy of President John F. Kennedy.

Today, 50 years later, we rise on the floor of the House to pay tribute to

him as a leader on the anniversary of a tragedy, with a focus on many victories.

Here, in this Chamber, President Kennedy served. Can you imagine? I take great pride in the fact—all of us who serve here do—that President Kennedy began his Federal service in office in the House of Representatives. His grandfather, Honey Fitz, also served in the House. His grandnephews served in the House. So it has been a Kennedy family tradition to serve in the House of Representatives. He did so as a proud member of the Massachusetts delegation.

I rise to honor the life, legacy, inspiration, and achievements. I rise to salute an extraordinary leader for our country and the world.

I feel emotional about it, listening to Mr. LARSON describe the events of the day and the weekend that followed. The beautiful family dignity that Mrs. Kennedy and the children demonstrated have made a mark on our hearts. We are so pleased that, as the President said last night, as we are here, Caroline is drawing crowds in Tokyo.

As a student, I had the privilege of being there when President Kennedy was inaugurated. I had the privilege of meeting him as a student in high school in Baltimore, Maryland, when my father was mayor. I spent an evening with him because my mother couldn't attend a dinner. She said she couldn't attend, but it enabled me to attend in her place as the First Lady of Baltimore. So I had the privilege to be sitting with President Kennedy and to be dazzled by his presentation to the United Nations Association of Maryland Dinner honoring Jacob Blaustein, a leader in our community. My father was mayor, and I was very lucky.

□ 1400

So on other occasions during the course of his campaign, I had the privilege of being in service to that campaign in terms of, one time, we had a show called ''Senator Kennedy Answers Your Questions.'' I was in college at the time, and I was one of the people answering the phone and hearing the questions. All of the questions were about seniors and health at the time. This was before Medicare, and it was an important issue for the President.

In any event, on that happy day on January 20, 1961, I had the privilege of being there in the freezing cold to hear the President's inaugural address. His stirring address still echoes in the hearts of those who were there and in all others who heard his call to serve. He appealed to the energy, the faith and the devotion that will light our country and all who serve it, and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

What inspiring words. Perhaps the most significant of all, he ushered in a new era with a simple, yet powerful, call to start anew, declaring, ''Let us begin.''

So we began to answer the call to carry forward the torch to ask what we could do for our country. We began to get America moving again, and we began an era that would recast America's future, that would set us on course to address so many of the challenges facing us 50 years ago and still confronting our Nation today.

As I reference his ''ask not what you can do for your country,'' everybody knows that that was an important part of the President's call to action in that day:

> Citizens of America, ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.

It is memorized by students all over the world—when he delivered it, it was so stirring—but what I remember is the very next sentence.

In the very next sentence, he says:

> To the citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for mankind.

It was just so beautiful. No wonder one of his first actions would be to establish the Peace Corps, a renewed beginning in witnessing the creation of the Peace Corps—a group of Americans serving as ambassadors of goodwill worldwide. It was then started under the leadership of Sergeant Shriver's brother-in-law. To this day, each Peace Corps volunteer is a tribute to President Kennedy.

A few weeks ago, I had the privilege of being in Massachusetts under the auspices of the Kennedy Library, where we had observed the 50th anniversary of the President's signing of the Equal Pay Act into law—legislation he called a first step to ending the unconscionable practice of unequal pay, this agenda the President had imagined of equal pay for equal work for women in the workplace. He also established a commission on the status of women, headed by Eleanor Roosevelt. Its recommendations were: raise the minimum wage; equal pay for equal work; child care as an initiative, both public and with tax credits.

So forward thinking. So much of it is still left to be done 50 years later, but it is part of the vision. Again, with great women like Eleanor Roosevelt and Esther Peterson and others, they were with him as he signed the bill. Today, as I mentioned, that battle continues. If President Kennedy were here, he would certainly beckon us to do more to take the next step, which we have done.

When women succeed, America succeeds—with legislation to have respect for women's work in the workplace and to raise the minimum wage, as 62 percent of the people who get minimum wage are women. There is equal pay for equal work. There is paid sick leave and child care, which is an important part of President Obama's agenda.

As for the fight for equality even in the workplace, President Kennedy became the first President to call civil rights, above all, a moral issue, Mr. Speaker, he said, to remind us it was long time past to keep the promise of freedom. So he put forward a civil rights bill to right the wrongs of history. In his name and in the wake of his death in the years that followed, under the leadership of President Lyndon Johnson, the Congress passed the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act. Yet, still today, the march to civil rights is not finished completely; and in the time of the present, it remains our moral obligation to preserve, expand, and strengthen voting rights. That is our challenge now in the House—equality. So let us begin.

There are so many other things that we witnessed. It is hard for people to imagine now how impossible it sounded when the President said: a new beginning and bold action and exploration and of the commitment and the promise to be the first to honor. He said, if we are to honor the vows of our Founders, we must be first, and therefore we intend to be first. It was a commitment and a promise to invest in science and innovation. When he said, in 10 years, we would send a man to the Moon and be back safely, it seemed impossible; but it happened even in a shorter period of time. He laid out his vision to do what was hard and unthinkable; but by the close of the 1960s, as we know, two American men walked on the Moon and returned safely home. So many other people were part of that success.

Our beginning ignited the fires of all kinds of innovation that our country has benefited from. Even though he wasn't there to see all of the legislation through, he had his vision; and he was an inspiration for others to get the job done.

So many times we all quote President Kennedy because he was so quotable and because he was so wise, and what he said resonates and is timeless. So, when I had the privilege of speaking at the groundbreaking of the Institute of Peace, I quoted what President Kennedy said at the American University in 1963.

He said:

> The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already more than enough of war and hate and oppression.

He went on to say:

> We shall be prepared if others wish it; we shall be alert to try to stop it; but we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just.

So remarkable.

Again, it would take hours for us to truly mention all of the accomplishments—the Moon shot and all the things about the Test Ban Treaty. The list goes on and on.

The fact is that a person came into the life of America from a family—and it is hard to imagine any other family in America that has had or who has made as great a contribution to the well-being of our country as the Kennedy Family, starting even with Rose Kennedy's father, Honey Fitz, but then

coming through to even now the service in the Congress of JOE KENNEDY, a grandnephew of the President. We also had the privilege here of serving with Patrick Kennedy.

So I will end where I began, in taking pride in the fact of President Kennedy's association with this House of Representatives, of this people's House, and to say that I am so happy that I had the opportunity to see him so many times. I will just close with one thought.

We were at the convention in Los Angeles. I was with my parents. We went to a restaurant after the President's speech at the stadium. It was the first time a President had accepted the nomination at a stadium. There were tens of thousands of people there. The speech was fabulous and great, and we went to this restaurant called Romanoff's because I said to my father and mother that I wanted to go to a Los Angeles-type restaurant. It turned out to be a Los Angeles-type in that it was very expensive. It was more expensive for shrimp cocktail than it would have been in Baltimore, Maryland, where we were from.

So my father said, How did you find this place? This is the most expensive restaurant I have ever been in.

I said, That is probably true, but it is an experience.

It costs so much more for a shrimp cocktail here than in Baltimore, Maryland; and he goes on and on.

In another few minutes, the doors of the restaurant open, and in comes President Kennedy from the speech. He came right over to the table.

To my father, Thomas D'Alessandro, he asked, Tommy, how did you like my speech?

Of course, my father told him, and then he asked me how I liked his speech. Imagine that. Then he went on with his entourage to have his celebratory dinner.

After that, price was no object as to the cost of the restaurant. The prices kept coming down in my father's view.

Again, I was lucky many different times to have the opportunity to have some conversation with the President. So, when that horrible thing happened that day for our country, everybody took it very personally.

Perhaps part of his legacy is the sacrifice that he made for our country—the inspiration that was intensified by that sacrifice. May we always, always remember it; and may we always remember what he said, that the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

May God bless the memory of President John F. Kennedy and his family. May we draw strength from his legacy and his vision. May God always bless the country he loved and led—the United States of America—and all who serve it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LARSON again for calling this Special Order. I am honored to be here with him and with our distinguished whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the leader.

I would point out, in history there are often iconic pictures. One has to wonder in looking at the pictures that grace museums across this country: That man who set a torch to be passed to another generation, could he have known when he was shaking Bill Clinton's hand that he would be a future President of the United States? Could he have known when he met with Tommy D'Alessandro's daughter that she would be the first woman Speaker of the House?

That was the inspiration of Kennedy, who touched so many people, and our leaders NANCY PELOSI and STENY HOYER typify a generation drawn into public service not only because of the inspiration but because of the calling of President Kennedy to public service.

The minority whip, STENY HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut not only for taking this Special Order but for the speech that he gave as we led into this Special Order about that wrenching day in November, the 22nd of November 1963, as to where he was and the memory he had.

Now, I thank the leader who has recalled so well what John Kennedy meant to our generation.

In my view, every generation of Americans has had a figure to whom it looked for guidance, for inspiration. However, few generations have had such a compelling figure as John Fitzgerald Kennedy was to my generation.

John Kennedy was the first President for whom I voted. I turned 21 in 1960, and I had the opportunity to vote for him in November. It was a controversial vote for some who thought that a young Catholic or, frankly, an old Catholic, should not be President of the United States for, after all, he would have to answer to the Pope. John Kennedy made it clear that he would answer to the American people and to his conscience, and that is what he did.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, all of us have memories, and I will refer to at least two.

I was a student at the University of Maryland in 1959. It was the spring of 1959, and there was to be a convocation, as there was every spring, with a major speaker being invited to give an address. It was to be given at Cole Field House, which was then the athletic field house for the University of Maryland. It still exists, but we now have another basketball center called Comcast Center.

Classes got out at 10:50 that morning, and I left class with no intention, frankly, of going to hear the speaker. I went to walk up the hill leading both to the student union and to Cole Field House. I was going to go to the student union, have lunch, talk to my friends, and then resume classes at 1:00.

But as I was walking up, there was a car driving up relatively slowly, there was some traffic, and I saw a 1958 Pontiac convertible. Mr. LARSON will recall that was a cool car. That caught my attention. But as I looked at the car, I then saw the person riding in that car. It was a warm day, the top was down, and I recognized the individual in that car as the speaker who was going to address us in the convocation. I said, that's really neat. Now, remember, I am 19 years of age. I said, I'm going to go hear him speak, and so I did go hear him speak.

He talked that day, as I am sure he did hundreds of other days in thousands of campuses throughout not only this country, but around the world before his death. He talked about young people getting involved in politics, not necessarily running for office, but getting involved in the politics of their community, in making a difference in their community, in taking their talents, and as Leader PELOSI has said, and as he enunciated in his inaugural address, bring their energy, faith, and devotion to the endeavor of making their democracy and their country better.

I listened to that speech. I walked out of the Cole Field House and the next week I changed my major from a business major to a political science major, decided I would go to law school and run for office.

It was in many ways a Damascus Road experience for me, a life-changing experience for me. Seven years after I heard Kennedy encourage young people, not just STENY HOYER—he never knew who STENY HOYER was—but encouraged people to get involved, 7 years later, 5 months out of Georgetown Law School, I was honored by some of the people of Prince George's County to be elected to the Maryland State Senate.

After, of course, I heard him speak on the campus of the University of Maryland in 1959, I worked in his campaign, never saw him, shook his hand once when he was at Ritchie Coliseum coming out of the coliseum.

I have heard two more inspirational speeches in my lifetime. One was, of course, the speech that is quoted so often, as Leader PELOSI said, the inaugural address, delivered on a very cold, snowy January day in 1961, in which he observed that the torch had been passed to a new generation born in this century—meaning the last—and saying that they had been tested by hard and bitter peace, but that that generation was proud of their ancient heritage and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed and to which he said we were committed today here and around the world.

What a proud observation that was of America's role in the world, then and now, a Nation willing to expend its treasure and its commitment of life and liberty to the defense of both here and around the world.

John Kennedy was an inspiration to my generation, but John Kennedy was

an inspiration to all generations in America. John Kennedy called us to service. John Kennedy observed that although the challenges in front of us were hard, that America could meet them, overcome them, and be a greater country.

I would suggest to all of us that we need that same kind of inspiration today. America is faced with challenges today. America is faced with division today. This body is faced with division today.

It is easy to forget, as we remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy, how close an election it was between Richard Nixon and John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Less, I believe, as I recall, than 200,000 votes separated them after millions of votes were cast. John Kennedy was declared the President of the United States, and our Nation remained divided.

That was the generation of the civil rights movement. That was the generation of Martin Luther King, of Rosa Parks, of so many other heroes of the civil rights movement, and our colleague JOHN LEWIS, the boy from Troy.

As we remember the assassination of John Kennedy, and in remembering that, like JOHN LARSON of Connecticut, I remember where I was. I had just delivered some papers to the United States Senator from Maryland for whom I was working while going to Georgetown Law School. And, JOHN, I came out the door leading from the Chamber and was walking down the steps and a Capitol Policeman said, did you hear? I said, did I hear what? The President has been shot. The President was my hero, and he had been shot.

Like almost every American, I walked down those steps in somewhat of a daze, walked over to the Russell Senate Office Building and sat down, as almost every American was doing that very moment, and watched the television reporting on the status of our President. It did not take long for them to report that we had lost him, that he had died, that the shot fired had been fatal.

I don't know how many people—I presume there are certainly some—who have cried for 96 hours. I did that; America did that. America had lost some degree, perhaps, of its innocence. America had been rendered vulnerable. America had lost its hero.

Edward Kennedy, the Senator, after Robert Kennedy was shot, spoke at his funeral and he said:

> My brother need not be idealized in death, or enlarged in death beyond that which he was in life.

But it is extraordinarily difficult not to idealize John Fitzgerald Kennedy as we remember him, as we remember the extraordinary trauma we experienced as he was killed.

His inaugural address addressed not only the American people, but freedom-loving people throughout the world, people seeking opportunity, people seeking liberty, people seeking justice. And the world responded.

When he went to Berlin, those in Berlin, then behind the Iron Curtain, knew that they had a kindred soul in John Fitzgerald Kennedy. When he said: ''Ich bin ein Berliner,'' they believed him. They believed that he was committed to their freedom as much as he was committed to the freedom of those he served in America.

John Kennedy made an extraordinary difference. His term was cut short by the assassin's bullet. The promise that was John Kennedy was not realized; but John Kennedy's impact on America, on young people, was profound.

I remember, JOHN—and I think you were here—when we served with Jack Kemp, a Republican, who would repeatedly in committee and on this floor cite John Kennedy as an inspiration. His legacy has not only been in terms of what he did and what he said, but his legacy remains in those he inspired to serve, in those who repaired to the high ideals that he put before us, this Congress, this country, and the world.

John Kennedy made a difference. We remember, we remember that he died tragically. But what we really remember is the contribution he made while he lived, however short that life was.

I thank the gentleman for allowing us to remember this day the loss we sustained on November 22, 1963.

SPECIAL ORDER ON JFK ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker, the first time I saw John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I was an undergraduate student at the University of Maryland.

He was a striking young senator making an improbable run for the Presidency, but what caught my eye was the stylish car carrying him through College Park.

I was young, and my journey into public service had not yet had its first steps.

I was impressed by that car, and I thought to myself—I better see what this man is all about.

So I followed it and listened to Senator Kennedy speak at a convocation speech on campus—a speech that changed the course of my life.

John F. Kennedy was a President who changed the course of our Nation.

He inspired so many young people like me to step up and pursue public service through civic engagement and programs like the Peace Corps.

He made a firm stand for freedom in the face of Soviet Communism and the terror it had imposed on so many nations.

At the same time, he espoused the enduring causes of peace, understanding, and disarmament.

At home he called on our people to view American citizenship not as a right but as a responsibility we have to one another.

And he opened our eyes to a new frontier ready to be conquered—a frontier of science and discovery. His legacy is now our history.

And although it was not easily achieved, President Kennedy would have been the first to remind us that nothing great comes without a measure of constructive hardship.

I will never forget that moment on campus when I followed his car as it led me on the first steps in my journey of service.

And, like most Americans who were alive on November 22, 1963, I will never forget the moment when President Kennedy's life of service came to a sudden and tragic end.

Tomorrow, we mark the fiftieth anniversary of that sad day in Dallas.

But let us remember John F. Kennedy for how he lived, not how he died.

Let us remember his heroism in the Pacific in World War II, saving the lives of those with whom he served so courageously in war.

Let us remember his ability to promote political courage not only by writing about it but by living it.

Let us remember his devotion to his family—a great family that continues to serve our Nation in so many ways, including in this House.

And let us remember the love of country and public service he instilled in his children from a young age—which we saw embodied just days ago as his daughter, Caroline, presented her credentials as our new Ambassador to Japan.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank our leader, and I thank him for his poignancy. I know how much it means to people listening to have a glimpse into history as it unfolded, and also the real-life experience of our great leader and President.

David Brinkley described that moment. He said that the assassination was beyond understanding:

> The events of those days don't fit, you can't place them anywhere, they don't go in the intellectual luggage of the time. It was too big, too sudden, too overwhelming, and it meant too much. It has to be separate and apart.

But we want to, as both our leaders have said, remember this President in the way that we viewed him in his heroic importance to this country and to generations then and now. Jacqueline Kennedy—as Ralph Martin, her biographer, said—talked about a person who had written to her about the President, and she said someone who had loved the President, but had never known him, wrote to me this past winter that:

> The hero comes when he is needed. When our belief gets pale and weak, there comes a man out of that need who is shining—and everyone living reflects a little of that light—and stores up some against the time when he is gone.

''So now he is a legend,'' Mrs. Kennedy would conclude, ''when he would have preferred to be a man.''

And so it has been—Steinbeck said of Kennedy:

> This man who was the best of his people and who by his life and death, gave back the best of them for their own.

□ 1430

Arthur O'Shaughnessy, the great Irish poet, said:

> For each age there is a dream that is dying and one that is coming to birth.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy embodied dreams that were coming to birth and, through his Presidency, ushered in the future dreams of this century and the next.

Heroes. Heroes are those people we admire for their accomplishments, their character, and their ability to inspire. They are often an extension of what we would like to be. If John Kennedy had never been President of the

United States, he would still have been a bona fide hero. His war record alone was heroic, his Pulitzer Prize admirable, and when you combine that with his personality, wit, and intelligence, you have a man to emulate and respect.

It is as President, however, that we remember John Kennedy. And in that capacity, his greatness came from being the cog, the catalyst, the spark that ignited the tremendous latent strength of our great Nation. Summoning the Nation like no other President before him, Kennedy established goals for excellence and raised the consciousness of the American people to a level of dignity benefiting a Nation embarking on building a positive future not just for the Nation, but for mankind.

Some would say John Kennedy was a tragic hero, much like the tragic heroes of Greek literature and Shakespearean plays. Kennedy was neither Achilles nor Hamlet. He was a man who, through sheer force of personality and conviction, motivated and excited people. He moved a Nation. What he shares with ancient heroes was the great promise of youth, cut short by death before that promise could be fulfilled.

James Reston wrote:

> The tragedy of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was greater than the accomplishment, but in the end tragedy enhances the accomplishment and revives hope.

What died in Dallas on November 22 was promise, the hallmark of both the Kennedy administration and the man.

''It's sad to see what happened in this country,'' Ted Sorenson has commented.

> It's as if people don't want to believe in anything today. Sometimes they even turn against John Kennedy because perhaps he was the last man they believed in.

Sorenson's remarks are well taken. I share his sadness and tire of cynics who seek only to tear down, discredit, destroy, and, in general, believe in nothing. I do not share, and I am sure most don't, an untainted or distorted view of John Kennedy. For whatever his human foibles and shortcomings may have been, his rhetoric of purpose, his goals for this Nation, are still worth believing in and aspiring towards.

Others will say that Kennedy had a superficial charisma, hyped by his ability to manipulate the media. Ralph Martin, a biographer of Kennedy, notes:

> John Kennedy had more than charisma. Sports figures have charisma. He had more than the magnetic attraction of a movie star. What Kennedy had was real. Magic.

He clearly was charismatic. He clearly was magnetic. He was poetic. But above all else, the magic that he had was real. John Kennedy's appeal was not limited to this country, it was worldwide, as STENY HOYER pointed out. Throngs gathered throughout the world not to chant anti-American slogans or to protest. They came to touch, to hear, to see the man who represented the hope of the free world. One has only to recall the vivid scenes in Berlin to realize there was a special magic about John Kennedy. The excitement was real.

John Kennedy struck a chord in all of us. Republican Senator Hugh Scott's wife asked:

> Why are you crying? You didn't have that much admiration for him.

To which he said:

> I am not crying for him. I am crying for the American people.

What John Kennedy meant to America is lodged deeply in our hearts and minds. He opened the door through his challenge and beckoned the people to a greater future, a new frontier. He was our voice. History will probably bear out that a thousand days was too short a time to judge the greatness of Kennedy as a President, but it will also bear out what Robert Kennedy said of his brother's legacy:

> The essence of the Kennedy legacy is a willingness to try and to dare and to change, to hope for the uncertain and risk the unknown.

It is in that context that the civil rights movement, the Bay of Pigs, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the Cuban missile crisis, the space race, and other actions of his administration will be judged, with the constant footnote to that ancient thief—time.

''It was all too brief,'' Ted Kennedy said of his brother's era.

> Those thousand days are like an evening gone. But they are not forgotten. You can recall those years of grace, that time of hope. The spark still glows. The journey never ends. This dream shall never die.

It is the end of the story of Camelot that takes on significance, and that Jacqueline Kennedy would speak so fondly of when she would talk of her husband. It was the point when King Arthur tells of his legends to a young boy, so they would still remember them even if he were killed in battle.

Fifty years have passed and the life and death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy still holds us captive. It is the topic of every magazine, of every news story, on every television show. But we always need to make sure that we separate the myth from the man. John Kennedy was not a myth. He was a real man with hopes and fears and doubts, and the same human frailties and many disabilities that we never even knew about. His time in office was too short to objectively evaluate his long-term objectives and goals, but we can never forget him or let him go.

Chris Matthews, in his recent book, talks about a conversation that he had with Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and he recalled that Moynihan said to him, ''We've never gotten over it.'' And looking at Matthews, he said, as Chris points out with generous appreciation, ''You've never gotten over it.''

Matthews said:

> I saw it as a kind of benediction, an acceptance into something warm and Irish and splendid, a knighthood of the soulful.

We have never gotten over it.

John Kennedy is a hero because of the message he brought, the hope and the dreams he inspired. He set a standard by which all successive Presidents are measured. He united the country on the great issues of the day, guided the Nation through crisis by calling on the American people to uplift their expectations, their goals, and their fellow man. It wasn't hollow rhetoric or dazzling showmanship; it was sincere and compelling belief in the purpose of this country and its people.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is a hero for all time and for those who believe in the promise of America because he elevated what it means to serve in government on behalf of the people. He made public service, whether it be elective office, serving as a House clerk, or in the Peace Corps noble and honorable pursuits. He made poetry, literature, and the arts in general a part of the fabric of our everyday life, and he did it all with the ease, grace, wit, humor, and understated elegance that exuded the confidence of the Nation he led and further ennobled his countrymen.

For those who listen, he speaks to us still.

This Thanksgiving as we pause, let us remember and be grateful for the great gift he gave us for that one bright, shining moment that there came the hero. And let us use that light to enlighten not only this Chamber but the world. And as President Kennedy would say so often, then let us go forward to lead the land we love, asking God's blessing, but knowing here on Earth His work is our own.

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

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mr. KING, New York

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATION AND RECORDS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2501, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission:

Mr. BARR, Kentucky

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RADEL (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for November 18 through December 31 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. LOWENTHAL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for November 18–21 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 22, 2013, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

VANCE M. MCALLISTER, Fifth District of Louisiana.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3783. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants; Clerical or Ministerial Employees (RIN: 3038-AE00) received November 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3784. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Protection of Collateral of Counterparties to Uncleared Swaps; Treatment of Securities in a Portfolio Margining Account in a Commodity Broker Bankruptcy (RIN: 3038-AD28) received November 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3785. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Ownership and Control Reports, Forms 102/102S, and 71 (RIN: 3038-AD31) received November 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3786. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Ovine Meat From Uruguay [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0085] (RIN: 0579-AD17) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3787. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Beans, Shelled or in Pods, From Jordan Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0042] (RIN: 0579-AD69) received November 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3788. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting two reports of violations of the Antideficiency Act in the Acquisition Services Fund, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3789. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Safeguarding Unclassified Controlled Technical Information (DFARS Case 2011-D039) (RIN: 0750-AG47) received November 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3790. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Removal of DFARS Coverage on Contractors Performing Private Security Functions (DFARS Case 2013-D037) (RIN: 0750-AI12) received November 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3791. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Requirements Relating to Supply Chain Risk (DFARS Case 2012-D050) (RIN: 0750-AH96) received Novmeber 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3792. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Darrell D. Jones, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3793. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; LaGrange County, IN, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8305] received November 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3794. A letter from the Director, Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Financial Reporting Requirements for Non-Profit Organizations received November 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3795. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, and William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program [Docket ID: ED-2013-OPE-0063] (RIN: 1840-AD12) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3796. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the FY 2012 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress, in accordance with the requirements in Section 121(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3797. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Utilization of Contributions to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3798. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3799. A letter from the Acting Administrator and Chief Executive Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting submission of Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) 2013 Annual Report, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 839(h)(12)(B) Public Law 96-501, section 4(h)(12)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3800. A letter from the President, African Development Foundation, transmitting a letter fulfilling the annual requirements contained in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, covering the period October 1, 2012 to September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3801. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-211, ''Driver's Safety Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3802. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3803. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3804. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3805. A letter from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General of the Farm Credit Administration for the period April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; and the semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the same period; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3806. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting

the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program: Expanding Coverage of Children; Federal Flexible Benefits Plan: Pre-Tax Payment of Health Benefits Premiums: Conforming Amendments (RIN: 3206-AM55) received November 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3807. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, Capitol Police, transmitting the semiannual report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; (H. Doc. No. 113—74); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3808. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer/Clearance Officer, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Remaining OMB-approved Forms [Docket No.: ONRR-2011-0022] [DS63610300 DR2PS0000.CH7000 134D0102R2] (RIN: 1012-AA09) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3809. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Application for Approval of Copper-Clad Iron Shot and Fluoropolymer Shot Coatings as Nontoxic for Water Fowl Hunting [Docket No.: FWS-R9-MB-2012-0028 and FWS-R9-MB-2012-0038; FF09M21200-134-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-AY61, 1018-AY66) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3810. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Depredation Order for Migratory Birds in California [Docket No.: FWS-R9-MB-2012-0037; FF09MB21200-134-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-AY65) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3811. A letter from the Branch Chief, Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and —Plants; Determination of Endangered Species Status for Mount Charleston Blue Butterfly [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2012-0069; MO 92210-0-0008 B2] (RIN: 1018-AY52) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3812. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Definition of ''Hybrid'' Migratory Bird [Docket No.: FWS-R9-MB-2011-0060; FF09M21200-134-XMB123199BPP0] (RIN: 1018-AX90) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3813. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — General Provisions; Revised List of Migratory Birds [Docket No.: FWS-R9-MB-2010-0088, FF09M21200-134-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-AX48) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3814. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and Delisting, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Magazine Mountain Shagreen from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0002] (RIN: 1018-AX59) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3815. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Foreign Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing Five Foreign Bird Species in Colombia and Ecuador, South America, as Endangered Throughout Their Range [Docket No.: FWS-R9-IA-2009-12] (RIN: 1018-AV75) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3816. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental Commercial Fishing Operations; Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan Regulations [Docket No.: 130703586-3834-02] (RIN: 0648-BD43) received November 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3817. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC943) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3818. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Emergency Rule Extension, Georges Bank Yellowtail Flounder and White Hake Catch Limits and GOM Cod Carryover Revisions [Docket No.: 130219149-3397-02] (RIN: 0648-BC97) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3819. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; 2014 Tilefish Fishing Quota Specification (RIN: 0648-XC887) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3820. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC946) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3821. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaksa; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC945) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3822. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC944) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3823. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Delisting of the Eastern District Population Segment of Steller Sea Lion Under the Endangered Species Act; Amendment to Special Protection Measures for Endangered Marine Mammals [Docket No.: 110901553-3764-02] (RIN: 0648-BB41) received November 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3824. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Minor Editorial Corrections and Clarifications (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2013-0158 (HM244F)](RIN: 2137-AF03) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3825. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0479; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-070-AD; Amendment 39-17649; AD 2013-22-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3826. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kankakee, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0176; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-13] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3827. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0929; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-17646; AD 2013-22-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3828. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wadena, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0172; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AGL-9] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3829. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Washington, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0584; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ACE-6] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3830. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0564; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-050-AD; Amendment 39-17631; AD 2013-21-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3831. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Mesquite, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0580; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ASW-2] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3832. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Curtis, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0608; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ACE-14] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3833. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0666; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-17635; AD 2013-22-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3834. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ennis, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0280; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ANM-13] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3835. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Cut Bank, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0664; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ANM-22] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3836. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Glasgow, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0529; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ANM-17] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3837. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Prineville, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0576; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ANM-11] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3838. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Salmon, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0531; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ANM-20] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3839. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Qualification, Service, and Use of Crewmembers and Aircraft Dispatchers [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0677; Amdt. No. 121-366] (RIN: 2120-AJ00) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3840. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Rome, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0533; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ANM-19] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3841. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Cut Bank, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0532; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ANM-21] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3842. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Kenai, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1174; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AAL-12] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3843. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0514; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-068-AD; Amendment 39-17647; AD 2013-22-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3844. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0928; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-036-AD; Amendment 39-17645; AD 2013-22-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3845. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH (ECD) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0519; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-068-AD; Amendment 39-17623; AD 2013-20-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3846. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0936; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-033-AD; Amendment 39-17652; AD 2013-22-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3847. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0927; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-030-AD; Amendment 39-17644; AD 2013-22-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3848. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Inc., Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0481; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-003-AD; Amendment 39-17653; AD 2013-22-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3849. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Type Certificate Currently held by AgustaWestland) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0529; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-050-AD; Amendment 39-17648; AD 2013-22-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3850. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0328; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-184-AD; Amendment 39-17643; AD 2013-22-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3851. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0868; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-194-AD; Amendment 39-17650; AD 2013-22-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3852. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0488; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-002-AD; Amendment 39-17619; AD 2013-20-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3853. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0594; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-019-AD; Amendment 39-17641; AD 2013-22-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3854. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0491; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-012-AD; Amendment 39-17609; AD 2013-20-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3855. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0490; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-004-AD; Amendment 39-17611; AD 2013-20-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3856. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0492; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-17608; AD 2013-20-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3857. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0631; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-142-

AD; Amendment 39-17640; AD 2013-22-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3858. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0526; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-14-AD; Amendment 39-17633; AD 2013-22-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3859. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0624; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-071-AD; Amendment 39-17632; AD 2013-21-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3860. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0665; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-082-AD; Amendment 39-17634; AD 2013-22-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3861. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0543; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-202-AD; Amendment 39-17610; AD 2013-20-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3862. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters (Type certificate currently held by AgustaWestland S.p.A.) (Agusta) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0518; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17607; AD 2013-20-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3863. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company (Robinson) [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0380; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-067-AD; Amendment 39-17588; AD 2013-19-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3864. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0360; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-033-AD; Amendment 39-17591; AD 2013-19-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3865. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France (Eurocopter) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0480; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-090-AD; Amendment 39-17589; AD 2013-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3866. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0352; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-063-AD; Amendment 39-17598; AD 2013-19-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3867. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0155; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-17581; AD 2013-18-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3868. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30921; Amdt. No. 3556] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3869. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30920; Amdt. No. 3555] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3870. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30925; Amdt. No. 3560] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3871. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30926; Amdt. No. 3561] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3872. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30924; Amdt. No. 3559] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3873. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30923; Amdt. No. 3558] received November 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3874. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Windsor Decision and Rev. Rul. 2013-17 to Employment Taxes and Special Administrative Procedures for Employers to Make Adjustments or Claims for Refund or Credit [Notice 2013-61] received November 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3875. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification to Congress that the Department will commence disaster relief operations in the Philippines; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1791. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to codify authority under existing grant guidance authorizing use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities; with an amendment (Rept. 113–273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1095. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to transfer unclaimed money recovered at airport security checkpoints to nonprofit organizations that provide places of rest and recuperation at airports for members of the Armed Forces and their families, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2719. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ROTHFUS):

H.R. 3570. A bill to prohibit the United States from following guidance issued by the Secretary of the Treasury regarding how multilateral development banks should engage with developing countries on coal-fired power generation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 3571. A bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 3572. A bill to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in North Carolina; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs.

BUSTOS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 3573. A bill to ensure that the percentage increase in rates of basic pay for prevailing wage employees shall be equal to the percentage increase received by other Federal employees in the same pay locality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 3574. A bill to eliminate certain subsidies for fossil-fuel production; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Appropriations, Financial Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. BARBER):

H.R. 3575. A bill to establish conditions under which the Secretary of Homeland Security may commence U.S. Customs and Border Protection security screening operations at a preclearance facility outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 3576. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve ballot accessibility to uniformed services voters and overseas voters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 3577. A bill to establish the Commission on Health Care Savings through Innovative Wireless Technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3578. A bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of an airman or an air traffic controller for a sleep disorder is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CARTER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 3579. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to appear before certain committees of the Congress before the United States reaches the debt limit and defaults on Government obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3580. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to use revenue generated by certain fines, penalties, and settlements that are not designated for restitution or any other purpose to fund evidence-based youth mentoring projects, justice reinvestment efforts, and innovations in medical research and development; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the employment tax treatment and reporting of wages paid by professional employer organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 3582. A bill to establish a Water Infrastructure Investment Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Ms. GRANGER, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 3583. A bill to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 3584. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to authorize privately insured credit unions to become members of a Federal home loan bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 3585. A bill to direct the President to submit to Congress a report on fugitives currently residing in other countries whose extradition is sought by the United States and related matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 3586. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit and a deduction for small political contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 3587. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide guidance on utility energy service contracts used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3588. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to exempt fire hydrants from the prohibition on the use of lead pipes, fittings, fixtures, solder, and flux; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3589. A bill to terminate the Denali Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3590. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CHU, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VELA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. ENYART):

H.R. 3591. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to provide treatment for diabetes in minority communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 3592. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require a jobs score for each spending bill considered in Congress; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3593. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the construction of major medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 3594. A bill to prohibit the payment of death gratuities to the surviving heirs of deceased Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 3595. A bill to require the disclosure of determinations with respect to which Congressional staff will be required to obtain health insurance coverage through an Exchange; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 3596. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance to uninsured newborns under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 3597. A bill to require public employees to perform the inspection of State and local surface transportation projects, and related essential public functions, to ensure

public safety, the cost-effective use of transportation funding, and timely project delivery; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3598. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to permit insurers to offer catastrophic coverage plans to anyone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 3599. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to payments to long-term care hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 3600. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for clarification regarding the children to whom entitlement to educational assistance may be transferred under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HALL, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 3601. A bill to provide for parental notification and intervention in the case of an unemancipated minor seeking an abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3602. A bill to designate the Philippines under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of the Philippines to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 3603. A bill to limit the construction on United States soil of satellite positioning ground monitoring stations of foreign governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 3604. A bill to clarify the requirements of authorized representatives under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 3605. A bill to make a technical amendment to the T'uf Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 3606. A bill to permit certain activities to be conducted on Federal land within the Emigrant Wilderness of Stanislaus National Forest in the State of California at the level at which such activities were conducted on such land before the wilderness designation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 3607. A bill to enable States to opt out of certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3608. A bill to amend the Act of October 19, 1973, concerning taxable income to members of the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HANNA, Mr. REED, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3609. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3260 Broad Street in Port Henry, New York, as the ''Dain Taylor Venne Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 3610. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 3611. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress an annual report on immigration policy directives issued by the Department of Homeland Security, to ensure that each such policy directive is subject to the rule making process described in section 553 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 3612. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3613. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a change in payment for certain hospitals under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3614. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the recognition by States of skills learned in the military by a veteran when issuing licenses and credentials; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3615. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the hiring of veterans by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 3616. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to distribute additional information to Medicare beneficiaries to prevent health care fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 3617. A bill to authorize a national grant program for on-the-job training; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BLACK):

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that children trafficked in the United States be treated as victims of crime, and not as perpetrators; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution recognizing the need to improve physical access to many United States postal facilities for all people in the United States in particular disabled citizens; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. Res. 426. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the Thursday before Thanksgiving as ''Children's Grief Awareness Day''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, Ms. ESTY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KEATING, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 427. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 29, 2014, as a national day of remembrance honoring the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th

President of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

153. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Council of District Of Columbia, relative to Resolution No. 20-276 supporting the federal Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

154. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3 urging the President and the Congress to take a humane and just approach to solving our nation's broken immigration system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. RANGEL introduced A bill (H.R. 3618) for the relief of Kadiatou Diallo, Sankerala Diallo, Ibrahima Diallo, Abdoul Diallo, and Mamadou Pathe Diallo and Fatoumata Traore Diallo; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 3570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the powers of Congress, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H.R. 3572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCARTHY of California:

H.R. 3576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause I—The times, places, and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing senators.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 3577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LoBIONDO:

H.R. 3578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 2:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To borrow Money on the credit of the United States.

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 3581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and the 16th Amendment.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Title I, Section 8.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 3583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 3584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 3586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 which, in part, states: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, . . .'' and the Sixteenth Amendment which states: ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.''

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 3587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority delegated to Congress to enact this legislation is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which authorizes Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 3593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 14 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States; the authority raise and support an army, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to

make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

The purpose of the bill is to provide assistance to the VA for their construction activities so that the veteran population has access to healthcare facilities. In order for the U.S. Government to support and regulate our land and naval forces for future engagements, it is necessary and proper for the Congress to legislate the construction of facilities so the current and future veteran population is provided adequate healthcare.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 3594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 and Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 3595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular statement and account of Receipts and Expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 3596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 3597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I., Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 3601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States.'' The Parental Notification and Intervention Act specifically establishes a federal nexus in that it applies to ''any person or organization in or affecting interstate commerce.''

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

The Parental Notification and Intervention Act also establishes a federal nexus in that it specifically applies to ''any person or organization . . . who solicits or accepts federal funds.'' The power to appropriate money and make laws to execute this power, gives Congress the authority to make laws affecting persons or entities that accept federal funds.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 3602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

Constitutional analysis is a rigorous discipline which goes far beyond the text of the Constitution, and requires knowledge of case law, history, and the tools of constitutional interpretation. While the scope of Congress' powers is an appropriate matter for House debate, the listing of specific textual authorities for routine Congressional legislation about which there is no legitimate constitutional concern is a diminishment of the majesty of our Founding Fathers' vision for our national legislature.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, located at section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 3606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 confers on Congress the authority to manage and regulate territory or other property held by the United States

''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 3607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States . . .''

The 10th Amendment to the Constitution: ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution vests Congress with the authority to engage in relations with the tribes

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 3609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 3611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 3612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 ''to provide for the common Defense and Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause I (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 3616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 60: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 184: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 351: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 503: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. SALMON, Mr. YOHO, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 543: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 580: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LANCE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 630: Mr. SARBANES and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 647: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 650: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 664: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 685: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 713: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 721: Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 855: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 938: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 1000: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1070: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. RUSH, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HARPER, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1102: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1125: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 1144: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1209: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1239: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1250: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1276: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1281: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1303: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1428: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1473: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1507: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1528: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1563: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1652: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1692: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1726: Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1750: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1767: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1787: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1814: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1816: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1838: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. POSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1852: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 1869: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. AMODEI, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1985: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2001: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2012: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2028: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2037: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2040: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2066: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2103: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2195: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2342: Mr. WAXMAN, MR. HINOJOSA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2368: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2415: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2482: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2499: Mr. HOLT and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2502: Mr. NADLER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MENG, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2504: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2529: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2541: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 2607: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2663: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 2727: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2737: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2761: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2791: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 2800: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2805: Mr. HALL and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2807: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 2810: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2818: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2835: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2866: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 3003: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3040: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3043: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3086: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3118: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 3121: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HALL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3130: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3159: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3199: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 3279: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 3299: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3303: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 3306: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 3335: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3352: Mr. JONES, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3357: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3360: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 3361: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 3369: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3370: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. GRAYSON, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3374: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 3391: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3392: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 3410: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 3413: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3431: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3436: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 3445: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3449: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3453: Ms. NORTON and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3461: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. McGovern, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POLIS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3462: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3463: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 3469: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 3471: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3480: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 3482: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3483: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 3484: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3485: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3486: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3488: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COOK, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 3490: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 3494: Ms. TITUS, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 3509: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3516: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3517: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3522: Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 3529: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 3530: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 3538: Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BASS, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3539: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr.

SALMON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BARR, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 3541: Mr. JONES, Mr. Culberson, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 3555: Mr. DENT, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 3558: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3560: Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. WATT.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. SALMON.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 11: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 30: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 147: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 231: Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. OWENS.

H. Res. 247: Ms. GABBARD.

H. Res. 281: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H. Res. 302: Mr. UPTON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 350: Mr. KINGSTON.

H. Res. 356: Mr. PAULSEN.

H. Res. 365: Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 404: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 407: Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 409: Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 410: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H. Res. 411: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H. Res. 417: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PERRY.

H. Res. 425: Mr. BARR, Mr. AMASH, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1698: Mr. COFFMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Municipal Legislature of Moca, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 27 requesting the President and the Congress initiate the process of admission of Puerto Rico as the 51st state; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

57. Also, a petition of the California State Lands Commission, California, relative to a Resolution supporting the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2013; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

58. Also, a petition of the Caddo Bossier Port Commission, Louisiana, relative to Resolution No. 9 demanding that the Army Corps of Engineers maintain a minimum of a nine foot deep by two hundred foot wide channel to allow safe and reliable barge transportation on the Red River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.