



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 2015

No. 4

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

Reverend Patrick Riffle, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God, our father, You guide everything in wisdom and love. "You are good and forgiving, full of love to all who call upon You."

We now praise You for that love and rejoice in Your abundant blessing. You call us today to grow in the knowledge of that love and invite us to receive Your blessings.

Accept the prayers we offer for our beloved Nation; protect it and keep it ever in Your sight. Fill this House of Representatives with Your holy wisdom, and may that wisdom lead to right action.

Strengthen these Representatives and their staffs as they labor for the common good and for what is just in Your eyes. May true harmony, lasting freedom, and justice be secured for all so that there may be lasting peace.

We ask this in Your most Holy Name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MARINO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### FAREWELL, VERONICA KALTRIDER

(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, I am grateful to express my appreciation for Major Veronica Kaltrider. Veronica has been on loan to the office of the Second District of South Carolina from the United States Marine Corps for the past year serving as a military fellow.

Major Kaltrider enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in 1997 and received training the following year at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island, South Carolina. As the former Representative of this base, I know firsthand of the proficiency that Veronica has because of her training by the highest Marine Corps standards. Veronica's ability to connect with veterans has been a tremendous asset to our office.

Beginning this month, Veronica Kaltrider will serve as the manpower and personnel officer of the Marine Corps Office of Legislative Affairs. I wish her and her husband, Eric, a military police officer in the Marine Corps, all the best in the future. Godspeed.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy for the citizens of France fighting terrorism.

### RECOGNIZING JONATHAN STIVERS

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to celebrate the unanimous Senate confirmation of a public servant of integrity, energy, expertise, and ability; a person of deep dedication to our country, to ending poverty, fighting disease, and advancing democracy; someone I have had the privilege to have on my staff for the past 15 years, the new assistant administrator for Asia at USAID: Jonathan Stivers.

Over the years, Jon worked closely with USAID and congressional committees to promote our national interests, fight poverty and disease around the world, and address ongoing challenges in global development across Asia.

He played a central role in advancing foreign policy priorities of our country, especially in the fields of human rights, appropriations, HIV/AIDS, international trade, and in countries across the Asia-Pacific region. Many of our Republican colleagues know that Jon worked very much across the aisle on all of these issues.

Jonathan's professionalism and attention to detail were unparalleled, and I can say with confidence on the most challenging and critical issues of our day, Jon Stivers consistently exhibits the leadership needed to improve the global community.

Though we will miss his expertise and his experience, I am proud that he is serving these critical issues in his new position, and I wish him; his wife, Ramsey, who is here with us; his baby daughters, Josephine and Parker, all the best in their new adventures.

Thank you, Jonathan Stivers. Congratulations and good luck.

### LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I want to extend my support and gratitude to the law enforcement officers across the country who serve our communities and the American people daily.

Our Nation was founded on the rule of law, and every day law enforcement officers carry out this legacy. They protect our neighborhoods from criminals, fight crime, ensure justice, and keep the peace.

Sadly, many law enforcement officers have died in the line of duty. Last year 118 law enforcement officers died, including three from the Commonwealth of Virginia. Last year's murder of two NYPD officers is a sober reminder that our Nation's law enforcement officers face danger every day as they carry out their duty to protect the American people.

In the Gospel of John, we are told that there is no greater love than to lay down one's life for one's friends, and this is true of our Nation's law enforcement officers. Every day they risk their lives so that you and I may be safe from harm.

These brave men and women are heroes and deserve to be recognized and honored for their service to our country.

#### TAR SANDS TAX LOOPHOLE ELIMINATION ACT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, while I do not support the development of tar sands—an environmentally destructive and carbon-intensive process—we should not continue a loophole that lets oil companies off the hook for covering destruction from oil spills.

In 1990, we authorized the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund for the immediate costs of cleaning up oil spills, and it is funded by an excise tax on crude oil and petroleum products, but the oil derived from tar sands that would be transported through the Keystone XL pipeline is not subject to this tax.

Since that oil is a thick, sticky form of crude, more difficult and costly to clean up than other types of oil, the exemption makes no sense, especially if it is as safe as some allege. That is why yesterday I reintroduced the Tar Sands Tax Loophole Elimination Act, which would ensure that oil pays into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund that travels through this pipeline if it is ever constructed.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

#### READING THE CONSTITUTION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in just a few minutes my colleagues and I will be

following a tradition that we began when Republicans regained the majority in 2011 of reading the Constitution during the first week that we are back into session. I think this is a very important tradition that we have established here in the House of Representatives.

Our Speaker reminded us the other day that this is the first time in the history of the country that this has been done. This is our third Congress in a row to do this.

All of us, or almost all of us, carry a copy of the pocket version of the Constitution with us to remind us why we are here and what undergirds everything that we do in this House and in this Congress.

In the front of the copy I have, it says, "The Declaration of Independence was the promise; the Constitution was the fulfillment," and there is a quote from Alexander Hamilton: "The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for, among old parchments, or musty records. They are written, as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by the mortal power."

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on this body to take up legislation to repeal the last-minute changes to campaign finance law that were tacked into a 1,600-page bill to fund the government this December.

As a result of this legislation, the wealthiest donors can now each contribute more than \$750,000 per year to a political party, more than seven times the previous cap. Worst of all, these changes were buried in a bill with no hearing and no public debate. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this body never even got a chance to vote on this provision since the bill was not considered under an open amendment process.

In all the conversations that I have had with residents throughout Washington State, I can tell you I have never heard anyone, Democrat or Republican, argue that the wealthy can't spend enough on politics or that those with the deepest pockets don't have enough influence in our Nation's Capital.

That is why I have introduced the Close the Floodgates Act, to protect the interests of "We the People" and make sure that the wealthiest donors don't get another chance to flood our elections with even more money and to undermine our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, let's take up this legislation, strip out those loopholes, and get to work restoring the faith and trust of American voters.

#### DR. KENNETH COOPER

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable individual from Dallas, Texas, to recognize him for his introduction into the National Football Foundation's Leadership Hall of Fame last night, January 8, 2015.

I would like to thank Chairman Archie Manning, football player Troy Aikman, Mayor Tom and Laura Leppert, and football player Roger Staubach for recognizing Dr. Kenneth Cooper for his dedication to health and fitness and his continuing leadership to health care for all.

Throughout Dr. Cooper's career in the United States Air Force and in a medical career in Dallas, Texas, he has continued to revitalize health care and fitness. He is also the father of preventive medicine and known as the father of aerobics, trying to make sure that the American people and the world understand how important fitness is to our life and our health.

I want to express my hearty congratulations to Dr. Cooper on receiving this outstanding award on behalf of the National Football Foundation, and I hope the American people and, today, the United States Congress will do so as well.

#### FUNDING COLLEGE EDUCATION FOR ALL

(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, today the President will be speaking in Knoxville, Tennessee, on extending college educations to Americans.

I share with the President the goal of giving more Americans the opportunity to go to college, but I would submit to him he should not be holding up the Tennessee Promise plan in Tennessee as an example. He should be holding up the Tennessee HOPE Lottery Scholarship program, which I worked 20 years to achieve in Tennessee and has provided over \$3 billion to education, \$250 million a year.

Scholarship programs such as the President is talking about should have standards for students in high school to achieve to get a scholarship. They should have strong standards in college to maintain them. They should be in addition to Pell grants and in addition to other scholarships to pay for books and tuition.

The Promise plan takes from middle class and lower income students and gives to higher income students, doesn't have standards in high school to get the scholarship, and doesn't have high standards to keep it. It is a last dollar scholarship.

The President's plan should be more like the Tennessee HOPE Lottery Scholarship: assure students have an incentive in high school to get it and incentives to keep it with high grade standards, and it shouldn't go to for-profit schools, for that is an invitation to abuse.

I thank the President for his commitment, but I think he has the wrong program as his model.

#### FUNDING AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's attempt to bypass Congress and grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants is wrong and dangerous. It undermines the rule of law and threatens American jobs.

That is why right now several of my colleagues and I, including fellow appropriators, are putting the finishing touches on a plan that will wield the power of the purse to block executive amnesty.

I believe we have a solid strategy. We wanted to put forward the simplest, most straightforward bill language that could defund the President's immigration actions. Thankfully my own Alabama Senator, JEFF SESSIONS, had already generated some great model language doing just that, so we crafted that into the House bill.

We are still working on it, but I am confident that strong defund language will be presented to this House for inclusion in the Homeland appropriations title.

I believe the will of Congress must be to fund Homeland Security and its important functions, but to specifically block implementation of President Obama's unconstitutional immigration orders.

□ 0915

#### READING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 5, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for the reading of the Constitution.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, for the third time in the history of the House of Representatives, we will read aloud on the floor of the House the full text of the United States Constitution.

It is our hope that this reading will help demonstrate to the American people that the House of Representatives is dedicated to the Constitution and the system it establishes for limited government and the protection of individual liberty. We also hope that it will inspire many more Americans to read the Constitution themselves.

The text we will read today reflects the changes to the document made by the 27 amendments to it. Those portions superseded by amendment will not be read.

In order to ensure fairness to all those interested in participating, we have asked Members to line up to be recognized on a first-come, first-served basis. I will recognize Members based

on this guidance. Each Member will approach the podium and read the passage laid out for him or her.

In order to ensure relative parity and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order in order to ensure bipartisanship and balance. Additionally, because of his long-term leadership on civil rights issues, I will recognize the gentleman from Georgia, Representative JOHN LEWIS, to read the Thirteenth Amendment.

I want to thank the Members of both parties for their participation in this historic event. I will begin by recognizing the gentleman from Ohio, Speaker BOEHNER, to read the preamble to the Constitution:

Mr. BOEHNER. "We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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."

I now yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Section 2:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. "No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen."

"The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. "The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty-thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. "When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

"The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Section 3:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. "The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

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

Mr. DEUTCH. "The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided."

"The Senate shall chuse their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two thirds of the Members present."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. "Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and

subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment, according to law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Section 4:

“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.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Section 5:

“Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. “Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behaviour, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. “Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.”

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. “Neither House, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Section 6:

“The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place.”

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

Mr. LATTA. “No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of

the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Section 7:

“All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. “Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States: if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. “If after such reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a law.”

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

Mr. HILL. “But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. “If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.”

□ 0930

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. “Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.”

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

Ms. KAPTUR. 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; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; . . .”

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

Mr. HENSARLING. “. . . to borrow money on the credit of the United States;

“To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

“To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. “. . . to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

“To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

“To establish post offices and post roads; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. “. . . to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. “. . . to constitute tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

“To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. “. . . to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

“To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM).

Ms. GRAHAM. “. . . to provide and maintain a navy;

“To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

“To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. “. . . to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. “. . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. “. . . and 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.”

Section 9:

“The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.”

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. “The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

“No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.

“No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

“No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. “No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

“No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. “No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.”

Section 10:

“No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. “No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws: and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and controul of the Congress.

“No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Article II, section 1:

“The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected, as follows:

“Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office or trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. “The Congress may determine the time of chusing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

“No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not

have attained to the age of thirty five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. “The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

“Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation:—‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.’”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Section 2:

“The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. “He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. “. . . but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

“The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Section 3:

“He shall from time to time give the Congress information of the State of

the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient;

“He may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; . . .”

□ 0945

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. “. . . he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.”

Section 4:

“The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Article III, section 1:

“The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Section 2:

“The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;—to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;—to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. “. . . to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;—to controversies between two or more States,—between citizens of different States,—between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. “In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such ex-

ceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. “The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Section 3:

“Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. “The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Article IV, section 1:

“Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Section 2:

“The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

“A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Section 3:

“New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. “The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respect-

ing 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.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Section 4:

“The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Article V:

“The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. “. . . or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. Article VI:

“All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. “This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.”

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. “The Senators and Representatives before mentioned,

and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Article VII:

"The ratification of the conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. "Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the States present the seventeenth day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven and of the independence of the United States of America the twelfth in witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. George Washington, President and deputy from Virginia.

Delaware: George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom.

Maryland: James McHenry, Daniel of St Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll.

Virginia: John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. North Carolina: William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson.

South Carolina: John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler.

Georgia: William Few, Abraham Baldwin.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. New Hampshire: John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman.

Massachusetts: Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King.

Connecticut: William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman.

New York: Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. New Jersey: William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton.

Pennsylvania: Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. Amendment I:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or

prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. 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."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Amendment III: "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

□ 1000

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Amendment IV:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Amendment V:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. ". . . nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Amendment VI:

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. ". . . and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be con-

fronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Amendment VII:

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), the Republican Conference chair.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Amendment VIII:

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Amendment IX:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Amendment X:

"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."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Amendment XI:

"The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state."

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

Mr. FLORES. Amendment XII:

"The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. ". . . and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. “. . . the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—the person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. “. . . the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. “The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. “. . . a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Amendment XIII, section 1:

“Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

Section 2:

“Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Amendment XIV, section 1:

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of

the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Section 2:

“Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. “But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the Members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Section 3:

“No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. “. . . or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Section 4:

“The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. “But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebel-

lion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Section 5:

“The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.”

Amendment XV, section 1:

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. Section 2:

“The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Amendment XVI:

“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.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Amendment XVII:

“The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

“When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. “. . . provided, that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

“This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

□ 1015

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Amendment XIX:

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

“Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Amendment XX:

Section 1:

“The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 2:

“The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Section 3:

“If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. “. . . and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Section 4:

“The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Section 5:

“Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.”

Section 6:

“This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Amendment XXI:

Section 1:

“The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.”

Section 2:

“The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Section 3:

“This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Amendment XXII:

Section 1:

“No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. “But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Section 2:

“This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Amendment XXIII:

Section 1:

“The District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as Congress may direct:

“A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. “. . . they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.”

Section 2:

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

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

Mr. JOYCE. Amendment XXIV:

Section 1:

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay poll tax or other tax.”

Section 2:

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Amendment XXV:

Section 1:

“In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.”

Section 2:

“Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.”

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Section 3:

“Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.”

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Section 4:

“Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.”

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CHABOT. Amendment XXVI:  
Section 1:

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

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Section 2:

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

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

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

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

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

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

George Marcus of California, vice Elaine Wynn.

#### RECESS

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

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

□ 1104

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 19, I call up the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keystone XL Pipeline Act".

#### SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

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

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

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

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

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

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

I enthusiastically rise today to support H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. And for those who have not heard, according to the administration, the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD  
OF TEAMSTERS,

Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,  
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF  
OPERATING ENGINEERS,

Washington, DC, September 17, 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,  
General President.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,  
*General President.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

TRANSCANADA.

*Omaha, NE, December 8, 2014*

Re Keystone XL Project Update.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1115

So those are just a few of the problems.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. EMMER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

do with an attempt to expedite this project.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

□ 1130

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

And that is just the way it is.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Ranking Member.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Listen to what the president of LIUNA said:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

through the United States to a refinery.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1145

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

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

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

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

all fossil fuels. Approving the Keystone XL pipeline will create a dependence on tar sands crude, reversing the carbon pollution reductions we have been working so hard to accomplish. According to some experts, building the Keystone XL pipeline will triple production of the tar sands, and that is totally inconsistent with any future scenario for avoiding catastrophic climate change.

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Today, pick up two things, Mr. President:

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

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

Let's have a strong alliance with Canada forever.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1200

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge a "no" vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1215

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

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

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

JANUARY 7, 2015.

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

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

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

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

Consider the latest U.S. Census Bureau data:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,  
President & CEO.

JANUARY 8, 2015.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

KATHRYN D. KAROL,  
Vice President.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Garamendi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. PAY FOR ANY OIL SPILL CLEANUP ON AMERICAN SOIL.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—180

|         |         |         |
|---------|---------|---------|
| Adams   | Ashford | Beatty  |
| Aguilar | Bass    | Becerra |

|               |                |                |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Bera          | Grayson        | Nolan          |
| Beyer         | Green, Al      | Norcross       |
| Bishop (GA)   | Green, Gene    | Pallone        |
| Blumenauer    | Grijalva       | Pascarell      |
| Bonamici      | Gutiérrez      | Payne          |
| Boyle (PA)    | Hahn           | Pelosi         |
| Brady (PA)    | Hastings       | Perlmutter     |
| Brown (FL)    | Heck (WA)      | Peters         |
| Brownley (CA) | Higgins        | Peterson       |
| Bustos        | Himes          | Pingree        |
| Butterfield   | Honda          | Pocan          |
| Capps         | Hoyer          | Polis          |
| Capuano       | Huffman        | Price (NC)     |
| Carney        | Israel         | Quigley        |
| Carson (IN)   | Jackson Lee    | Rangel         |
| Cartwright    | Jeffries       | Rice (NY)      |
| Castor (FL)   | Johnson (GA)   | Richmond       |
| Castro (TX)   | Johnson, E. B. | Roybal-Allard  |
| Chu (CA)      | Kaptur         | Ruiz           |
| Cicilline     | Keating        | Ruppersberger  |
| Clark (MA)    | Kelly (IL)     | Rush           |
| Clarke (NY)   | Kennedy        | Ryan (OH)      |
| Clay          | Kildee         | Sánchez, Linda |
| Cleaver       | Kilmer         | T.             |
| Clyburn       | Kind           | Sarbanes       |
| Cohen         | Kirkpatrick    | Schakowsky     |
| Connolly      | Kuster         | Schiff         |
| Conyers       | Langevin       | Schrader       |
| Cooper        | Larsen (WA)    | Scott (VA)     |
| Costa         | Larson (CT)    | Scott, David   |
| Courtney      | Lawrence       | Serrano        |
| Crowley       | Lee            | Sewell (AL)    |
| Cuellar       | Levin          | Sherman        |
| Cummings      | Lewis          | Sinema         |
| Davis (CA)    | Lieu (CA)      | Sires          |
| Davis, Danny  | Lipinski       | Slaughter      |
| DeFazio       | Loeback        | Smith (WA)     |
| DeGette       | Lofgren        | Speier         |
| Delaney       | Lowenthal      | Swaiwell (CA)  |
| DeLauro       | Lowey          | Takai          |
| DeBene        | Lujan Grisham  | Takano         |
| DeSaulnier    | (NM)           | Thompson (CA)  |
| Deutch        | Luján, Ben Ray | Titus          |
| Dingell       | (NM)           | Tonko          |
| Doggett       | Lynch          | Torres         |
| Doyle (PA)    | Maloney,       | Tsongas        |
| Edwards       | Carolyn        | Van Hollen     |
| Ellison       | Maloney, Sean  | Vargas         |
| Engel         | Matsui         | Veasey         |
| Eshoo         | McCollum       | Vela           |
| Esty          | McDermott      | Velázquez      |
| Farr          | McGovern       | Visclosky      |
| Fattah        | McNerney       | Walz           |
| Foster        | Meeks          | Wasserman      |
| Frankel (FL)  | Meng           | Schultz        |
| Fudge         | Moulton        | Watson Coleman |
| Gabbard       | Murphy (FL)    | Welch          |
| Gallego       | Nadler         | Wilson (FL)    |
| Garamendi     | Napolitano     | Yarmuth        |
| Graham        | Neal           |                |

NAYS—237

|              |               |                 |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham      | Comstock      | Graves (GA)     |
| Aderholt     | Conaway       | Graves (LA)     |
| Allen        | Cook          | Graves (MO)     |
| Amash        | Costello (PA) | Griffith        |
| Amodei       | Cramer        | Grothman        |
| Babin        | Crawford      | Guinta          |
| Barletta     | Crenshaw      | Guthrie         |
| Barr         | Culberson     | Hanna           |
| Barton       | Curbelo (FL)  | Hardy           |
| Benishek     | Davis, Rodney | Harper          |
| Bilirakis    | Denham        | Harris          |
| Bishop (MI)  | Dent          | Hartzler        |
| Bishop (UT)  | DeSantis      | Heck (NV)       |
| Black        | DesJarlais    | Hensarling      |
| Blackburn    | Diaz-Balart   | Herrera Beutler |
| Blum         | Dold          | Hice (GA)       |
| Bost         | Duffy         | Hill            |
| Boustany     | Duncan (SC)   | Holding         |
| Brady (TX)   | Ellmers       | Hudson          |
| Brat         | Emmer         | Huelskamp       |
| Bridenstine  | Farenthold    | Huizenga (MI)   |
| Brooks (AL)  | Fitzpatrick   | Hultgren        |
| Brooks (IN)  | Fleischmann   | Hunter          |
| Buchanan     | Fleming       | Hurd (TX)       |
| Buck         | Flores        | Hurt (VA)       |
| Bucshon      | Forbes        | Issa            |
| Burgess      | Fortenberry   | Jenkins (KS)    |
| Byrne        | Fox           | Jenkins (WV)    |
| Calvert      | Franks (AZ)   | Johnson (OH)    |
| Carter (GA)  | Frelinghuysen | Johnson, Sam    |
| Chabot       | Garrett       | Jolly           |
| Chaffetz     | Gibbs         | Jones           |
| Clawson (FL) | Gibson        | Jordan          |
| Coffman      | Gohmert       | Joyce           |
| Cole         | Goodlatte     | Katko           |
| Collins (GA) | Gowdy         | Kelly (PA)      |
| Collins (NY) | Granger       | King (IA)       |

King (NY) Olson Shimkus  
 Kinzinger (IL) Palazzo Shuster  
 Kline Palmer Simpson  
 Knight Paulsen Smith (MO)  
 Labrador Perry Smith (NE)  
 LaMalfa Pittenger Smith (NJ)  
 Lamborn Pitts Smith (TX)  
 Lance Poe (TX) Stefanik  
 Latta Poliquin Stewart  
 LoBiondo Pompeo Stivers  
 Long Posey Stutzman  
 Loudermilk Price (GA) Thompson (PA)  
 Love Ratcliffe Thornberry  
 Lucas Reed Tiberi  
 Luetkemeyer Reichert Tipton  
 Lummis Renacci Trott  
 MacArthur Ribble Turner  
 Marchant Rice (SC) Upton  
 Marino Rigell Valadao  
 Massie Roby Wagner  
 McCarthy Roe (TN) Walberg  
 McCaul Rogers (AL) Walden  
 McClintock Rogers (KY) Walker  
 McHenry Rohrabacher Walorski  
 McKinley Rokita Walters, Mimi  
 McSally Rooney (FL) Weber (TX)  
 Meadows Ros-Lehtinen Webster (FL)  
 Meehan Roskam Wenstrup  
 Messer Ross Westernman  
 Mica Rothfus Westmoreland  
 Miller (FL) Rouzer Whitfield  
 Miller (MI) Royce Williams  
 Moolenaar Russell Wilson (SC)  
 Mooney (WV) Ryan (WI) Wittman  
 Mullin Salmon Womack  
 Mulvaney Sanford Woodall  
 Murphy (PA) Scalise Yoder  
 Neugebauer Schock Yoho  
 Newhouse Schweikert Young (IA)  
 Noem Scott, Austin Young (IN)  
 Nugent Sensenbrenner Zeldin  
 Nunes Sessions Zinke

NOT VOTING—12

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

□ 1256

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

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 16]  
 YEAS—266  
 Abraham Grothman Perry  
 Aderholt Guinta Peterson  
 Allen Guthrie Pittenger  
 Amodei Hanna Pitts  
 Ashford Hardy Poe (TX)  
 Babin Harper Poliquin  
 Barletta Harris Pompeo  
 Barr Hartzler Posey  
 Barton Heck (NV) Price (GA)  
 Benishek Hensarling Ratcliffe  
 Bilirakis Herrera Beutler Reed  
 Bishop (GA) Hice (GA) Reichert  
 Bishop (MI) Hill Renacci  
 Bishop (UT) Holding Ribble  
 Black Hudson Rice (SC)  
 Blackburn Huelskamp Richmond  
 Blum Huizenga (MI) Rigell  
 Bost Hultgren Roby  
 Boustany Hunter Roe (TN)  
 Brady (PA) Hurd (TX) Rogers (AL)  
 Brady (TX) Hurt (VA) Rogers (KY)  
 Brat Issa Rohrabacher  
 Bridenstine Jackson Lee Rokita  
 Brooks (AL) Jenkins (KS) Rooney (FL)  
 Brooks (IN) Jenkins (WV) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Buchanan Johnson (OH) Roskam  
 Buck Johnson, Sam Ross  
 Bucshon Jolly Rothfus  
 Burgess Rouzer Royce  
 Bustos Jordan Royce  
 Byrne Joyce Russell  
 Calvert Katko Ryan (WI)  
 Carter (GA) Kelly (PA) Salmon  
 Chabot King (IA) Sanford  
 Chaffetz King (NY) Scalise  
 Clawson (FL) Kinzinger (IL) Schock  
 Clyburn Kline Schrader  
 Coffman Knight Schweikert  
 Cole Labrador Scott, Austin  
 Collins (GA) LaMalfa Scott, David  
 Collins (NY) Lamborn Sensenbrenner  
 Comstock Lance Sessions  
 Conaway Latta Sewell (AL)  
 Cook Lipinski Shimkus  
 Cooper LoBiondo Shuster  
 Costa Loebsack Simpson  
 Costello (PA) Long Sires  
 Cramer Loudermilk Smith (MO)  
 Crawford Love Smith (NE)  
 Crenshaw Lucas Smith (NJ)  
 Cuellar Luetkemeyer Smith (TX)  
 Culberson Lummis Stefanik  
 Curbelo (FL) MacArthur Stewart  
 Davis, Rodney Maloney, Sean Stivers  
 Denham Marchant Stutzman  
 Dent Marino Thompson (PA)  
 DeSantis Massie Thornberry  
 DesJarlais McCarthy Tiberi  
 Diaz-Balart McCaul Tipton  
 Dold McClintock Trott  
 Doyle (PA) McHenry Turner  
 Duffy McKinley Upton  
 Duncan (SC) McMorris Valadao  
 Ellmers Rodgers Veasey  
 Emmer McSally Vela  
 Farenthold Meadows Wagner  
 Fitzpatrick Meehan Walberg  
 Fleischmann Messer Walden  
 Fleming Mica Walker  
 Flores Miller (FL) Walorski  
 Forbes Miller (MI) Walters, Mimi  
 Fortenberry Moolenaar Walz  
 Foxx Mooney (WV) Weber (TX)  
 Franks (AZ) Mullin Webster (FL)  
 Frelinghuysen Mulvaney Wenstrup  
 Garrett Murphy (FL) Westernman  
 Gibbs Murphy (PA) Westmoreland  
 Gibson Neugebauer Whitfield  
 Gohmert Newhouse Williams  
 Goodlatte Noem Wilson (SC)  
 Gowdy Nolan Wittman  
 Graham Norcross Womack  
 Granger Nugent Woodall  
 Graves (GA) Nunes Yoder  
 Graves (LA) Olson Yoho  
 Graves (MO) Palazzo Young (IA)  
 Green, Al Palmer Young (IN)  
 Green, Gene Paulsen Zeldin  
 Griffith Pearce Zinke

NAYS—153

Adams Bera Brown (FL)  
 Aguilar Beyer Brownley (CA)  
 Bass Blumener Butterfield  
 Beatty Bonamici Capps  
 Becerra Boyle (PA) Capuano

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

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—9

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1305

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Cuomo, and therefore I was not able to be here.

Had I been here, I would have cast my vote for Speaker for the Honorable NANCY PELOSI from California, and I want the RECORD to reflect the same.

□ 1315

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come. So at this point, I am pleased to yield to my friend from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected around noon. On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 186, the Regulatory Accountability Act, authored by Chairman GOODLATTE. This bipartisan bill will modernize the regulatory process, ensure transparency, and reduce overly burdensome costs that are hurting job creators across the country.

The House will also consider H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act, authored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative FITZPATRICK, which includes bipartisan reforms to reduce red tape and ensure that small businesses have access to the capital they need to grow.

Finally, the House is expected to consider legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security and respond to the President's unconstitutional executive action.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given us.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the majority leader for bringing to the floor in a timely fashion the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, which we passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion. I think that it was very, very important that we got that through the House early. As the majority leader knows, the Senate has already passed that bill, and it is on its way to the President. That, obviously, will raise the confidence level of those who are going to create jobs and enter into construction projects. It is very important for our economy and for our communities. So I thank the majority leader for his quick action and leadership on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful the majority leader can inform us of what form the Department of Homeland Security appropriation bill will come to the floor. And what I mean by "what form," the committee bill, obviously, will be supported almost unanimously on both sides—certainly on this side of the aisle unanimously—if, in fact, it is the funding levels that resulted from the agreement between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party and passed overwhelmingly, known as the Ryan-Murray budget numbers.

The committee marked up its bill, reported it out. It was included in the omnibus. But it was included, as the gentleman knows, only until February 27.

Can the gentleman tell me whether that will come to the floor as reported out of committee? And when I say "committee," I mean the House Appropriations Committee. Or when reported out, will it be considered under a rule? And if considered under a rule, will that rule allow amendments?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The base bill will reflect the Appropriations Committee's bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on funding for the Department of Homeland Security, the text of which will be available later today. And to answer the question, yes, the funding level will be at that.

We also will consider a series of amendments which respond to the President's executive action, and I expect the text of those will be available a little later today.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I am pretty sure I understand exactly what the gentleman said. Therefore, those amendments will be offered on the floor and will not be incorporated in the base bill?

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

When will the hearing on the rule be held so that our Members can know; so that if they have amendments they would like to offer, they can appear at the Rules Committee?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I anticipate the Rules Committee meeting on Monday.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that, and I will make sure that our Members know that.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Speaker just held a moment of silence—and I will be saying something in a few minutes—on the tragic events that have happened in France, the loss of life in the initial incident, in the hostage-taking, and of the law enforcement officer. Clearly this was in France, but we know that we are all vulnerable in all of the free world.

I would urge the majority leader to ensure that the Homeland Security bill passes this House in a bipartisan fashion. And what I mean by that is, I know there are going to be amend-

ments offered. I know his side of the aisle is very concerned and believes—and he has asserted—that the actions taken by the President were unconstitutional. We do not share that view, as the gentleman knows, that they were unconstitutional. We believe the executive was within his authority and prosecutorial discretion on the executive side of the government. But we also know that that issue is going to be an issue of substantial debate, discussion, and I am sure other legislative actions.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the majority leader to—I think it is in the best interest making sure the Homeland Security bill is passed so there is no doubt as to the resources that the Homeland Security Department will have to protect all Americans, to protect our homeland, and to coordinate extensively.

Secretary Johnson has made statements this week that the failure to have full funding for the Department of Homeland Security has already impeded his ability and the Department's ability to act fully on behalf of the security of this country.

So, Mr. Majority Leader, I know that all 435 of us are committed to making sure that we do everything we can to keep our homeland safe and our people safe. And I would hope that we would have nothing included in the bill which would be very controversial, reflecting our differences, when the underlying bill, I think, is not controversial, when the underlying bill is something on which we can almost unanimously, I think, agree and is something that ought to be passed and ought to be signed by the President and ought to give the Department of Homeland Security the full resources it needs to keep America safe.

And I would be glad to yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, currently, the Department of Homeland Security is funded up until February 27. But as was noted, next week is the second week back in. And we are taking this up in the second week because I believe on both sides of the aisle, we care about the homeland, we care about our security, and this is something that has been worked on together. And inside this body, we have a constitutional responsibility to deal with those items that are germane, and we will deal with all the items that are germane.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I look forward to working with him next week to hopefully achieve the passage of a bill that will not prove controversial in the Senate or with the President of the United States so that this can be effective, as the gentleman observed, as quickly as possible. I appreciate him bringing it to the floor, and I also appreciate the fact that the amendments are going to be considered separately. And I would hope that we

could join together in opposing amendments which will undermine the bipartisanship of the legislation.

We have 3-day weeks coming up now. We will have a couple of short weeks when the Republicans go to their retreat, their issues conference, and then when the Democrats go to their issues conference.

I would ask if you could give me a sense of the legislation that will be on for the remainder of the month.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct. We have 3-day weeks for retreats for the House on both sides of the aisle. And this year, the Republicans will be retreating with the Republicans in the Senate as well, leaving next Wednesday.

The House will be very active throughout January, focusing on bipartisan solutions that have been needlessly stuck in the Senate. As the gentleman knows, 382 bills did pass this House but got stuck in the Senate, and more than half of those actually were even passed by voice vote.

This will include a bill to expedite the Federal review process for natural gas pipeline permit applications and a bill to cut through red tape and ensure exports of liquefied natural gas to our allies.

As we get closer to consideration for each week, I assure the gentleman that a full list of bills coming before the House will be available for Members.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And lastly, Mr. Leader, if I could ask you about the border security bill. It is my understanding that the border bill could be coming to the floor this month. And I know that the gentleman from Texas, Chairman MCCAUL, has said that Republican leaders are getting close—and I am quoting—to having a separate border policy bill ready to go. I know they, referring to the Republican leadership, want Homeland appropriations on the floor next week, as we have already discussed. So what is going to be tied to that is unclear at this point, but we are working on a border bill right now.

Now, as you know, Mr. Leader, the McCaul border bill passed out of committee either on voice vote or unanimously, with both parties agreeing. And, in fact, the Democrats in the last Congress, in the comprehensive immigration bill that we introduced, included dropping the Senate border security bill and putting in the McCaul bill, as the gentleman undoubtedly knows, because we believed that was the better approach.

Can the gentleman tell me, will the McCaul bill, as passed in the last Congress, be the border bill that will be reported? Or does the majority leader know that at this point in time?

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

In speaking to Chairman MCCAUL, he does want to move a bill, maybe towards later this month. I know he has

a trip to the border with a number of Members. I know he would like to move the bill after that trip. So I anticipate a bill shortly. And as soon as we have a date, I will let the gentleman know.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And I hope that we can, as we did in the first iteration of the McCaul bill, have a unanimous bipartisan agreement because all of us want to make sure the border is, in fact, secure again, as we want to see that the Homeland Security Department has its full complement of resources to protect the American people.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 12, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXECUTIVE ORDERS REGARDING IMMIGRATION

(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, I rise today to discuss the President's executive orders on immigration, set to take effect in mid-2015.

The Constitution, in article I, section 8, expressly grants the legislature the sole authority to establish rules for naturalization. Yet on November 20, 2014, the President announced new policies that would enable a substantial portion of the unlawfully present alien population to obtain relief from removal and work authorization.

In addition to substantive constitutional separation of power concerns, the action raises national security implications and a range of other potentially harmful consequences.

For this reason, in December, the House passed H.R. 83, which imposes a February 27 funding sunset for the agencies responsible for carrying out the President's orders.

While this limitation creates an opportunity for the new majority in Congress to take action against the President's unilateral actions, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle should want to protect the rule of law, our constitutional separation of powers, and the best interests of hard-working Americans. The American people deserve as much.

#### WE ARE ALL CHARLIE

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as I know all Americans would rise if they were here, to express our solidarity with, our sympathy to, and our convictions for a strong alliance with the people of France.

The despicable and tragic murder in Paris on Tuesday of journalists and those who protected them ought to be a reminder that we cannot and must not take for granted the freedoms we enjoy living in a democracy.

The men and women who were targeted in Paris on Wednesday were cartoonists whose job was to use humor to make people question their leaders and their most cherished principles. Freedom of speech, protected in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which was read today on this floor, means nothing if that speech can be intimidated and shuttered by violence.

The principles that we speak of were part of a long tradition in France and in this country of bringing the loftiest of people and ideas down to Earth through the power of satire.

Freedom of the press and free expression of ideas are a necessary check against tyranny and oppression. They are as much a part of democracy as the right to vote and due process in court.

Mr. Speaker, in attacking these journalists, the terrorists made their target clear, and that is freedom itself—freedom in America, freedom in France, freedom throughout the world, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of dissent.

The taking of innocent hostages at a kosher market today further demonstrated the terrorists' utter disregard for the "liberty, equality, and brotherhood" that are the foundation of the French democracy and the American democracy.

The democratic nations of the world must continue to stand up to those who wish to stifle the basic freedoms that all people deserve. I know that all 435 Members of this Congress are united in that conviction. I join with all of my colleagues in offering my condolences to the families of the victims and to the French people.

Mr. Speaker, in that regard, I articulate what has just been demonstrated by all by standing in silence, just as President Kennedy declared, "Ich bin ein Berliner," and newspapers around the world after 9/11 read, "We are all Americans."

Today, all freedom-loving people around the world join together in solidarity to say, "We are all Charlie"—"Nous" sommes tous Charlie."

#### CHRISTMAS DRONES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Red Ryder BB gun is a ghost of Christmas past because, this year, Santa

gave drones. Here a drone, there a drone, everywhere a drone. Just more eyes in the sky and these eyes could be anywhere and on any person. How comforting is that?

It is estimated that by 2030, 30,000 drones will be over the skies of America. People are rightfully concerned that these eyes in the sky could be a threat to their constitutional right of privacy.

Mr. Speaker, we are entering a world of unchartered drone technology. That is why I am reintroducing the Preserving American Privacy Act. This bill seeks to ensure the privacy of Americans. It establishes specific guidelines for about when and what purposes that law enforcement and private entities can use drones.

Technology may change, but the Constitution does not. The Christmas spy machines that have useful purposes also need constitutional rules to prevent unlawful surveillance by law enforcement or private organizations.

And that is just the way it is.

#### A RETURN TO AMERICA'S HIGHEST IDEALS

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this week the Members of the 114th United States Congress took their oaths of office. Families and friends from around the country came to participate in this great American tradition of representative democracy and to support their loved ones. I was pleased that my own wife and five daughters were here with me as well.

The start of a new Congress is always an exciting time to renew our government and the promise of America, but as we all know, we face tremendous challenges. Political dysfunction and partisan gridlock have made smart and effective government very difficult here.

An arthritic economic recovery has dimmed the financial prospects of too many small businesses and their families. In our time of social fracture, more and more people are feeling directionless and alone.

Mr. Speaker, as I often like to say, there is nothing wrong in America that can't be fixed by what is right in America, but this will require bold resolve, innovative public policy, and a return to our highest ideals.

We must restore our economic vibrancy through responsible government, reclaiming our best traditions, and building a culture of life that respects the dignity and rights of all persons.

Let's repurpose Washington. Let's turn our country around.

#### CUBA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's concessions to the tyrannical Cuban regime have only strengthened the iron grip of the dictatorship, and by President Obama attempting to normalize relations with the island, we are only putting more money into the coffers of these thugs to continue their repressive ways.

The White House and the State Department were once again fooled by a tyrant, and that has grave consequences for our credibility around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal. It is a bad deal for the people of Cuba, a bad deal for America, and a bad deal for freedom-loving people everywhere.

Today, I was joined by other Members of Congress in sending a letter to Secretary Kerry urging the administration to stop its concessions, abandon the talks scheduled with Cuba later this month, and get serious about bringing true reforms to Cuba first before even contemplating a change in our relations.

If they won't listen, it is up to us in Congress to defend freedom for Cuba and, indeed, around the world.

#### APPRECIATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF PAUL CLYMER, PENNSYLVANIA STATE REPRESENTATIVE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, last fall, after 34 years of distinguished public service, Pennsylvania State representative Paul Clymer from upper Bucks County announced his retirement. Throughout his career, Representative Clymer has been a strong advocate on many issues ranging from education to economic development.

An avid historian, Paul chaired the committee responsible for the renovation on the State capitol building. He took a personal interest in this project, working diligently to ensure the completed renovation would live up to President Theodore Roosevelt's declaration in 1906 when he called it, "the handsomest building he ever saw."

More than a century later, thanks in part to Paul's work, the building still strikes visitors with awe. Although he has many accomplishments to his name, it has been Representative Clymer's gentlemanly demeanor for which he was best known.

Paul was known in government as a man of conviction who would stand up for his principles, yet also able to listen to those who passionately opposed him. He has been a model public servant and a mentor to many, including to me, and I want to say, "Well done, Paul, in your retirement."

AMERICA WELCOMES ALL PEOPLE AND DOES NOT STIGMATIZE BASED ON RELIGION, ETHNICITY, OR RACE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we started by reading the Constitution, and I did not want to leave this week without reminding us of Amendment One of the Bill of Rights:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Today, we stand with the people of France who, in the early years of our beginnings, certainly gave to America many of the democratic principles by way of their own values. Today, we acknowledge that violence will not undermine democratic values around the Nation or around the world.

We mourn those who have lost their lives, and we want to stop the terrorist violence, but what we most want to do is to be able to acknowledge the individual dignity of all people and that we will not stigmatize religions or ethnicities or race in this country, but we will recognize that we are great because we are able to welcome all from all places and to be able to accept their human dignity.

We have a Constitution and a Bill of Rights, and I am grateful for the greatness of this Nation, but I stand with the people of France and mourn their loss this week.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I would like to claim this time to spend a few moments on the floor of this House to express the appreciation of myself and my colleagues to those who serve every day in our law enforcement community.

There is no better way to kick off this time than to yield to a colleague of mine from the State of Washington, a former sheriff of 30 years in law enforcement, and a former Sheriff of the Year from King County, my colleague from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his kind introduction.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. I hope this becomes a yearly thing. It is sponsored today by the National Sheriffs'

Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the FOP, and other law enforcement organizations—national, State, and local organizations.

As Mr. JOLLY said, I served 33 years in the sheriff's office in Seattle, starting in a patrol car and eventually ending my career as the sheriff. I know from my own personal experience in serving those years that a cop's mission is to protect their community.

I know this from working with law enforcement not only in the sheriff's office in Seattle, but with the Seattle Police Department, all the police departments and sheriffs' offices in the State of Washington and even across this country. I have had the opportunity to work with a number of law enforcement organizations—local, State, and Federal.

Mr. Speaker, they come each day with the heart of a servant. They come each day knowing that, when they put on that badge and that uniform, that they may not go home. They know that, but they do it anyway.

Why do they do that? Why do they take that risk? Why did I take that risk for 33 years? Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I did come close several times in my career to losing my life to protect the community I served.

Let me also say that I lost some dear friends over those 33 years. One was my best friend, Sam Hicks, who was shot and killed in June of 1982. Another good friend in 1984 was stabbed to death.

It is a dangerous job, but it is a job they choose to do because they choose to serve the community. They choose to put their life on the line to protect and serve all of us, protect our families, our children, our businesses, and our property each and every day.

□ 1345

But no one is perfect, we know that. There are good police officers and there are bad police officers. There are good mechanics and there are bad mechanics. There are good lawyers and there are bad lawyers. We all come from the human race. There is good and bad in all of us. So no police department is perfect, and no police officer is perfect, and sometimes things go wrong. They are required to make split decisions, life-and-death decisions. In a moment's notice, you can have a gun pointed at you, and you have to make that decision: Do I shoot or not? Can I talk that person out of that gun? I have been in that position, too. Fortunately, I was able to talk that person out of his gun and took him to jail.

But sometimes things go wrong, and when it does, police, rightly so, must be under the microscope. There must be public scrutiny. Cops know that. Police chiefs know that. Sheriffs know it, and we accept that, too. But when things go wrong and we watch these incidents and these events unfold over the media, let us all remember that police officers have constitutional rights,

too. They are allowed due process, too. They are American citizens, too. They have constitutional rights and protections also.

The Constitution, as was mentioned earlier, was read today, reminding us that we all have those constitutional rights. You are innocent until proven guilty. So when something happens that we think is wrong, let's pay attention to the facts. Let's let the process go forward; and then based on the facts—based on the facts—let's work with the community, with the police department and the mayor and city council and change the policy, change the procedures, and make sure that it doesn't happen again.

But today, let us also remember the service of the men and women, the brave and dedicated men and women who put that uniform on every day. I am going to name a few police officers from Washington State who, 5 years ago—and this is the 5-year anniversary of the death of these police officers, gunned down, four of them gunned down while sitting in a coffee shop in Lakewood, Washington—paid that ultimate sacrifice, that ultimate price that we often hear talked about: Sergeant Mark Renninger, Officer Ronald Owens, Officer Tina Griswold, Officer Greg Richards, as well as Seattle Police Officer Timothy Brenton and Pierce County Deputy Kent Mundell, all from Washington State, all not with us today, all of their families missing them.

During these difficult times, Mr. Speaker, we need to come together as a community, as a country, as a nation, and recognize the service of these police officers across the country. I will end with the simple act that comes so easily for us with people who serve in the military, just a simple "thank you." If you see a police officer today as you go about your duties, your day's duties, please walk up and say "thank you." Please tell them you appreciate their service. That means the world to them.

Mr. JOLLY. I thank my colleague from the State of Washington.

Today, on Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I would like to yield to a champion supporter of law enforcement, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for scheduling this Special Order to honor the men and women who put their lives on the line every day, as we just heard from our colleague from Washington.

Last year in the United States of America, 119 law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line of duty; 119 lives snuffed out. It was not because they did anything wrong, but they were performing their duty to protect you and me so that every night when we go to sleep, we put our heads on our pillows and sleep soundly.

We take it for granted. There is something about it that we think is just natural. There is nothing natural

about someone who goes out every day and consciously gives of themselves and puts their life on the line for someone else. Jesus said there is no greater love than this, than someone who would lay down his life for his brother. And law enforcement officers do that every day.

Yet sometimes when we get these incidents in America, we somehow forget that. We forget that they have husbands and wives and children and parents and sisters and brothers and friends, that they are people, too. They are citizens in our community, just like we are, and they go out every day to protect you and me and give us a quality of life that, as I say, we take for granted. So it is altogether fitting that we would take today and recognize them, salute them, recognize them, honor them, thank them for what they do for all of us.

I hope that we won't just do it for today. I hope we do it 365 days a year, because they are here for us 365 days a year.

So on behalf of my constituents in the First Congressional District of Alabama, I say to law enforcement officials in my district and throughout America: We thank you. We salute you. God bless you.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as well to say thank you to law enforcement officers throughout Pinellas County, Florida, and across the Nation. Thank you for your service and thank you for your sacrifice. And I thank your families.

Each day in Pinellas County, Florida, the community I have the opportunity to represent, as well as across the country, thousands of law enforcement officers serve and protect us, often at great sacrifice to their families and at risk to their very own lives.

This was the case on December 21 when Officer Charles Kondek of the Tarpon Springs Police Department in Pinellas County responded to simple a noise complaint. It would be Officer Kondek's end of watch as he tragically lost his life at the hands of a gunman, a gunman whose actions represent the type of inhumanity that we entrust our law enforcement officers each day to protect us from. Officer Kondek was only 45 years old, and he is survived by, and his memory lives on through, his wife and his six children.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, this story repeats itself throughout communities across the country. The Nation witnessed, on December 20, in New York, two law enforcement officers who were assassinated by an individual with one intention: to take the lives specifically of law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, in my hometown of Pinellas County, the brotherhood of law enforcement officers, the sisterhood of law enforcement officers who protect us each day understands, just like law enforcement officers across the country, the very risk to their safety and to their lives and the risk and

the heartbreak of their families and their children, that that risk is very real.

In our county, we have lost a total of 24 officers, including, in recent years, St. Petersburg officers David Crawford, Jeffrey Yaslowitz, and Thomas Baitinger, each representing a precious loss of life while serving and protecting us.

And yet we find ourselves today listening to some, a minority in our society, who wish to give voice to those who undermine the very honor of law enforcement officers, who undermine the very sacrifice of our law enforcement officers, and who undermine the very danger that these law enforcement officers face each day. Instead, we should be rising to say "thank you" to the men and women of law enforcement, "thank you" to the men and women in our communities who protect and defend us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to do just that, to say "thank you." Thank you to Officer Kondek of Tarpon Springs for his service, and thank you to his family for sharing him with a community that will forever remember his ultimate sacrifice. Thank you to the families of all fallen law enforcement officers, and thank you to those who continue to serve each day.

I want to thank our local law enforcement leadership in my hometown of Pinellas County: Pinellas County Sheriff Bob Gualtieri, Clearwater Police Chief Dan Slaughter, St. Petersburg Police Chief Anthony Holloway, Chief Terry Hughes of my hometown of Indian Shores, Belleair Police Chief Bill Sohl, Gulfport Police Chief Robert Vincent, Kenneth City Police Chief Kevin Matson, Largo Police Chief Jeffrey Undestad, Pinellas Park Police Chief Dorene Thomas, Pinellas County Schools Police Chief Rick Stelljes, Tarpon Springs Police Chief Robert Kochen, Treasure Island Police Chief Tim Casey, and Chief David Hendry of the University of South Florida, St. Petersburg.

I especially want to thank all members of law enforcement in my hometown and those throughout Pinellas County who get in their cars each day and walk the streets, respond to crime, investigate crimes and respond to disturbances and ultimately protect us. I want to thank those I am privileged, within the law enforcement community, to call friends, officers from the Clearwater police force: my dear friend Detective Jonathan Walser, Detective Michael Stonelake, Detective Christopher Precious, Sergeant John Brown, Officer Bill Renfro, Lieutenant Juan Torres, and Lieutenant Richard Harris. And from the Pinellas County Sheriff's Department, my friend, Sergeant Steve Wagner.

Thank you to each of you.

And I want to thank the Capitol Police officers who protect each of us here as Members of Congress and the thousands of Capitol visitors each year that are protected from threats that at

times can be tragically real. Thank you to all who serve, from Pinellas County, throughout the State of Florida, communities across the country, and right here in this very Chamber. Thank you for protecting us. Thank you for serving. Thank you to every law enforcement officer for your commitment to duty, your service to your community, and your service to your fellow man.

As my colleague, BRADLEY BYRNE said, blessed are those who would lay down their life for their brethren. That is the oath—to risk their life to protect others—that our law enforcement officers renew each day.

Indeed, may our loving God richly bless each one of you who put on the uniform of law enforcement, and may God richly bless your families. May God's loving hands protect and defend each of you every day of your service, just as you protect and defend each one of us. Please know that this Member of Congress and millions of people across the country, including those in Pinellas County and Florida's 13th District, including communities throughout our Nation, are forever grateful for the service of law enforcement officers, your service to your fellow man. So today, on behalf of millions of Americans, I simply say to each of you serving as law enforcement officers, thank you.

With that, I yield to a new colleague of mine from Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

This week, I was honored and grateful to be able to vote for and help pass several bills that will improve the lives of so many hardworking Americans.

Earlier today, I was proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. I am grateful to be pushing this bill across the finish line because the Keystone runs through the Fourth Congressional District that I am privileged to represent. It is a long overdue, commonsense piece of legislation which will create good-paying jobs, will grow our economy, and will support more manufacturing and trade in this country.

During its construction, it is estimated that 42,000 jobs will be created by the Keystone, and it will put more than \$2 billion in the pockets of American workers.

□ 1400

To put this impact in perspective, those 42,000 jobs are 12,000 more than the unemployed population in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas.

Unfortunately, President Obama has indicated that he will veto the Keystone if it passes both Houses. I hope that this is just an idle political threat because, if it is not, then the President is intentionally harming the middle class Americans that this great job creation bill is going to help.

I hope and pray that our President won't play politics with legislation

that will provide opportunities to create jobs for tens of thousands of Americans to support their families.

This week, I was also proud to be able to support H.R. 30, which changes the definition of a full-time employee from 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week under the perversely named Affordable Care Act.

ObamaCare's 30-hour rule places an impossible burden on individuals and small businesses in my district and across this country, and I am glad to be able to help pass a bill which repeals a terrible provision from a terrible law.

But I say we haven't gone far enough. I know the people that I represent in east and north Texas won't be satisfied until we repeal every provision of the Affordable Care Act.

I was sent here to Washington to deliver results for the hardworking people of north and east Texas, and these bills show that I am doing that, and it is what I intend to keep doing because, while these are great bills and I am proud that we passed them this week, it is just a start.

We need more good bills to combat the President's executive overreach; to restore fiscal sanity; to secure our borders; to repeal all of ObamaCare; and, most importantly, to defend our great Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers for this time.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MOORE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of an unscheduled medical procedure.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 12, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Subpart B — Rural Energy for America Program (RIN: 0570-AA76) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention (RIN: 2501-AD53) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

10. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Clothes Washers [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0020] (RIN: 1904-AC77) received January 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

11. A letter from the 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 North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. A letter from the 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 blocking property of the Government of the Russian Federation relating to the disposition of highly enriched uranium extracted from nuclear weapons that was declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

13. A letter from the 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), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

14. A letter from the 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), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

15. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Elizabeth River; Portsmouth, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1032] (RIN-1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

16. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland

Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone: Carquinez Strait Cable Repair Operation, Martinez, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0950] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

17. A letter from the Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter notifying the Congress that the United States intends to join a consensus among Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) participants to invite the Government of Iceland to join the current group of 13 WTO Members engaged in the EGA negotiations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## 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. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 235. A bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 236. A bill to provide for the exchange of information related to trade enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 237. A bill to authorize the revocation or denial of passports and passport cards to individuals affiliated with foreign terrorist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MENG, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 238. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 239. A bill to preserve the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, as wilderness in recognition of its extraordinary natural ecosystems and for the permanent good of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 240. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COOK, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. NUNES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 241. A bill to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to impose notice

and a compliance opportunity to be provided before commencement of a private civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. FARR, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 242. A bill to restore access to year-round Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FLUDGE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 243. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to Microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 244. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for pharmacy benefits manager standards under the Medicare prescription drug program to further transparency of payment methodologies to pharmacies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and 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. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 245. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify certain existing provisions of law relating to effective dates for claims under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 246. A bill to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 247. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Maya Angelou in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the employer health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 249. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 250. A bill to provide a permanent appropriation of funds for the payment of death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services in event of any period of lapsed appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 251. A bill to transfer the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Office of the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 252. A bill to provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. HONDA:

H.R. 253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of small business start-up savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for start-up expenditures for business for 2015 and 2016; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs and to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for equity investments in research intensive small business concerns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 257. A bill to provide for United States participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO,

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 258. A bill to establish the Federal Interagency Working Group on Reducing Poverty which will create and carry out a national plan to cut poverty in America in half in ten years; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for expenses for household and elder care services necessary for gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to the hiring of veterans in the field of renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 261. A bill to prohibit monetary payments by the Federal Government to employees, officers, and elected officials of foreign countries for purposes of bribery, coercion, or any activity that is illegal or undermines the rule of law or corrupts a public officer or the office such officer represents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 262. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act so as to exempt real property from civil forfeiture due to medical-marijuana-related conduct that is authorized by State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. LEE:

H.R. 263. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for younger people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 264. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to benefit the Peace Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 265. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to establish a public health insurance option; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 266. A bill to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and

commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 267. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to allow former volunteers to use the seal, emblem, or name of Peace Corps on death announcements and grave stones; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 268. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to encourage Canadian tourism to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. TURNER:

H.R. 269. A bill to prohibit certain real property from being named after a sitting Member of Congress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should provide, on an annual basis, an amount equal to at least one percent of United States gross domestic product (GDP) for nonmilitary foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. NEAL, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 24. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a reading of the names of members of the Armed Forces who died in the previous month as a result of combat; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. LEE (for herself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 25. A resolution recognizing the anniversary of the tragic earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, honoring those who lost their lives, and expressing continued solidarity with the Haitian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### 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. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U. S. Constitution which gives Congress authority to “regulate Commerce . . . among the several States.”

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 10, 11, and 15

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 8 and Amendment XIV Sections 1 and 5

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 241.

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 18 (relating to the

power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate commerce as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 in order to enforce treaties made between the United States and several Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 and Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1) Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3)

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1) Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3)

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 257.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 258.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the US Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the US Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 261.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 2

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rules XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rules XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States which states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." This provision establishes the authority of Congress to appropriate funds, and place limitations and conditions on the use of those funds.

By Mr. BARR:

H.J. Res. 11.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is stated in Article V of the U.S. Constitution, which establishes the method for enacting amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution is based is found in Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.J. Res. 13.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

By Mr. SALMON:

H.J. Res. 14.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 27: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 32: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 36: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOHO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. YODER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRIF-FITH, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BABIN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BLUM, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LATTI, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 44: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 123: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 125: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 132: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 154: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 159: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 160: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 167: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SALMON, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 169: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 173: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 185: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 191: Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 203: Mr. KLINE, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 204: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 206: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 208: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 217: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 227: Mr. JONES and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 230: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 232: Mr. DENT.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 2: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Res. 12: Mr. Yarmuth, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. GABBARD.

H. Res. 13: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on H.R. 37 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 185 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.