

Dan Kildee repeatedly voted against approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. Kildee has also supported shutting down the Line 5 pipeline which could cause gas prices to surge even higher, leading Michiganders to pay even more for gas.

BACKUP:

Dan Kildee has repeatedly voted against approving the Keystone XL Pipeline:

- On May 22, 2013, Dan Kildee voted against H.R. 3, a bill to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline. (H.R. 3, [Roll Call #179](#), Passed 241-175: R 222-0, D 19-174, Kildee Voted Nay, 5/22/13)
  - H.R. 3 was a bill “to approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes.” (Congress.gov, H.R. 3, [Bill Text](#), Engrossed in House: 5/22/13)

<b>Calendar No. 81</b>	
113 <sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS 1 <sup>ST</sup> SESSION	<b>H. R. 3</b>
To approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes.	
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES MAY 23, 2013	
Received; read the first time	JUNE 3, 2013
Read the second time and placed on the calendar	
<b>AN ACT</b>	
To approve the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes.	
<i>Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.</i>	
<b>SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.</b>	
This Act may be cited as the “Northern Route Approval Act”.	

(Congress.gov, H.R. 3, [Bill Text](#), Engrossed in House: 5/22/13)

- On November 14, 2014, Dan Kildee voted against H.R. 5682, legislation that would approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. (H.R. 5682, [Roll Call #519](#), Passed 252-161, R: 221-0, D: 31-161, Kildee Voted Nay, 11/14/14)
  - H.R. 5682 was a bill “to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.” (Congress.gov, H.R. 5682, [Bill Text](#), Engrossed in House: 11/14/14)

Text: H.R.5682 — 113th Congress (2013-2014) [All Information \(Except Text\)](#)

Listen to this page

There are 3 versions: Engrossed in House (11/14/2014) Text available as: XML/HTML | XML/HTML (new window) (9KB) | TXT (3KB) | PDF (112KB)

Shown Here:  
Engrossed in House (11/14/2014)

113th CONGRESS  
2d SESSION

## H. R. 5682

### AN ACT

To approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

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

**SECTION 1. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.**

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

(Congress.gov, H.R. 5682, [Bill Text](#), Engrossed in House: 11/14/14)

- On February 11, 2015, Kildee voted against S.1, a bill that would approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. (S.1, [Roll Call #75](#), Passed 270-152, R 241-1, D 29-151, Kildee voted Nay, 2/11/15)
  - S.1 was a bill “to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.” (Congress.gov, S.1, [Bill Text](#), Engrossed in Senate: 1/29/15)

Text: S.1 — 114th Congress (2015-2016) [All Information \(Except Text\)](#)

Listen to this page

There are 3 versions: Engrossed in Senate (01/29/2015) Text available as: XML/HTML | XML/HTML (new window) | TXT | PDF

Shown Here:  
Engrossed in Senate (01/29/2015)

114th CONGRESS  
1st SESSION

## S. 1

### AN ACT

To approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

*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 Approval 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).

(Congress.gov, S.1, [Bill Text](#), Engrossed in Senate: 1/29/15)

- Dan Kildee opposed the Keystone XL pipeline citing environmental concerns as well as concerns over tax breaks for oil companies. “Congressman Dan Kildee (MI-05) today expressed strong opposition to a bill being brought to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives giving a foreign oil corporation a multi-million dollar tax break while at the same time potentially leaving Michiganders on the hook for the costs associated with the spill of foreign tar sands oil in the U.S. The bill under consideration today would exempt TransCanada Corporation, a Canadian oil company attempting to build the Keystone XL pipeline in the U.S., from making an 8 cent per barrel contribution toward the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. Currently, conventional crude oil companies are required to contribute 8 cents per barrel to the Trust Fund, but oil sands crude oil, which TransCanada is attempting to distribute, are exempt from such contributions. In 2013, TransCanada reported \$1.5 billion in profits. ‘Under this bill, foreign oil companies collect billions in profits while taxpayers get stuck with the mess in the event of an oil spill,’ Congressman Kildee said. ‘Why should a Canadian corporation get another tax break paid for by American taxpayers? My constituents are sick and tired of special corporate tax

breaks for oil companies, not to mention also having to shell out millions of dollars in cleanup costs when things go wrong. Foreign companies like TransCanada should get no special exemptions at my constituents' expense.' Congressman Kildee expressed great concern with making American taxpayers potentially liable for the cleanup associated with an oil spill, similar to the 2010 Enbridge oil spill in Michigan. 'Michiganders know all too well the devastating and long-term negative consequences of oil spills,' Congressman Kildee said. 'Four years later, we are still cleaning up over a million gallons of oil sands crude oil in Michigan waterways from the Enbridge oil spill. Oil companies and pipelines like the Keystone XL carrying oil sands need to be held to the same standard as other oil companies and not get special carve outs to boost their profits and lessens their liability in the event of a spill.' In July 2010, a pipeline operated by Enbridge Energy burst, spilling over a million gallons in the Talmadge Creek and Kalamazoo River. To date, it is the largest inland oil spill and one of the costliest. According to Enbridge's recent Security and Exchange Commission filing, cleanup costs have already reached \$1.21 billion and growing. Congressman Kildee has continuously fought to end taxpayer-funded subsidies for Big Oil companies. Last year in Congress, he co-sponsored H.R. 601, the Permanent Repeal of Oil Subsidies Act, which would permanently end taxpayer-funded giveaways to the nation's largest oil companies. The bill, which has not been allowed an up-or-down vote in Congress, would save taxpayers more than \$80 billion over the next decade." (Congressman Dan Kildee, "Congressman Dan Kildee: Michiganders 'Sick And Tired' Of Billions In Tax Breaks For Oil Companies At Expense Of Working Families," [Press Release](#), 11/14/2014)

**Dan Kildee supported shutting down the Line 5 pipeline which could cause gas prices to surge even higher, leading Michiganders to pay even more for gas:**

*Editor's Note: Dan Kildee spoke on line 5 at an event with Brenda Lawrence, video can be [found here](#).*

- **In 2020, Dan Kildee signed onto a letter calling for a shutdown of Line 5 pipeline operations.** "In a letter to U.S. Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao, Dingell - along with fellow Michigan Democrat U.S. Reps. Elissa Slotkin, Dan Kildee, Andy Levin, Brenda Lawrence, Rashida Tlaib and Haley Stevens - wrote that the Line 5 dual pipelines should shut down operations until a full investigation is completed." (Lauren Gibbons, "Michigan Congressional Democrats ask feds to temporarily shut down Line 5 pipeline," [Michigan Live](#), 6/24/20)
- **In 2021 it was reported that Biden's plan to close Line 5 could cause gas prices to surge.** "Millions of Americans could face even higher energy bills this winter if the Biden administration closes a gas and oil pipeline running through Michigan, a group of Midwest lawmakers has warned." (Matt Cannon, "Biden Shutting Down Line 5 Pipeline Could Send Gas Prices Surging," [Newsweek](#), 11/8/21)
  - **"Line 5 pipeline could be under threat due to the White House exploring the potential impact of closing it on fuel prices in the region, according to a recent Politico report, amid a drive to reduce the U.S.'s dependence on fossil fuels."** (Matt Cannon, "Biden Shutting Down Line 5 Pipeline Could Send Gas Prices Surging," [Newsweek](#), 11/8/21)
- **While Americans were paying an average of \$4 per gallon of gasoline, Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer is fighting to shut down Enbridge's Line 5 pipeline, which could cause consumers across the Midwest to pay even more for gasoline.** "Americans are already paying an average of \$4 for a gallon of gasoline these days. And if Michigan Gov.

Gretchen Whitmer succeeds in shutting down Enbridge's Line 5 pipeline, consumers will pay even more in the Midwest. Ms. Whitmer is fighting Enbridge in state and federal court with the goal of compelling the closure of Line 5, a crucial pipeline carrying fossil fuels between Canada and several U.S. states. Her campaign is contrary to a U.S. treaty with Canada, not that she seems to care." (Editorial Board, "Whitmer Wants Higher Gas Prices," [The Wall Street Journal](#), 3/14/22)

- **Line 5 moves more than half a million barrels of oil and natural gas liquids each day throughout Canada and Great Lakes region and there is no prepared alternative.** Line 5 moves more than half a million barrels of oil and natural gas liquids each day throughout Canada and the Great Lakes region, and there's no ready alternative to transport this amount of energy. The report predicts a closure would mean that 'refineries in Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Ontario, and Quebec would lose about 45% of their crude oil input.' They'd have to scale back operations or shut down, which would constrict the fuel supply and jack up the price of gasoline and diesel for years." (Editorial Board, "Whitmer Wants Higher Gas Prices," [The Wall Street Journal](#), 3/14/22)
- **According to the Consumer Energy Alliance, if the attempt to shut down Line 5 is successful, consumers in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Pennsylvania will pay an additional \$4.75 billion or more each year for gasoline and diesel fuel.** "But maybe in an election year she'll care that if she prevails, consumers in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana and Pennsylvania will pay an additional \$4.756 billion or more each year for gasoline and diesel fuel, according to a new report from the Consumer Energy Alliance, a business and consumer advocacy group." (Editorial Board, "Whitmer Wants Higher Gas Prices," [The Wall Street Journal](#), 3/14/22)
- **According to the Consumer Energy Alliance's study, shutting down Line 5 would drive up the cost of gasoline and diesel from 9.47% to 11.66% independent of other market conditions.** "Their study estimates Ms. Whitmer's bow to the climate lobby would drive up the cost of gasoline and diesel from 9.47% to 11.66%. The authors say this estimate is 'independent of any other market conditions, such as the surge in fuel prices observed over the past 12 months that are tied to international oil markets and logistical challenges caused by the pandemic.'" (Editorial Board, "Whitmer Wants Higher Gas Prices," [The Wall Street Journal](#), 3/14/22)
- **According to the Consumer Energy Alliance, if the attempt to shut down Line 5 is successful, consumers in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Pennsylvania would pay an additional \$4.75 billion or more each year for gasoline and diesel fuel.** "But maybe in an election year she'll care that if she prevails, consumers in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana and Pennsylvania will pay an additional \$4.756 billion or more each year for gasoline and diesel fuel, according to a new report from the Consumer Energy Alliance, a business and consumer advocacy group." (Editorial Board, "Whitmer Wants Higher Gas Prices," [The Wall Street Journal](#), 3/14/22)
  - **"At a time when the U.S. should be focusing on energy stability and security, Ms. Whitmer's ideological hostility to pipelines threatens more economic harm and consumer pain."** (Editorial Board, "Whitmer Wants Higher Gas Prices," [The Wall Street Journal](#), 3/14/22)

**Pipelines decrease energy costs and dependence on foreign sources:**

- ***RealClearEnergy* Headline: “Americans Need More Oil And Natural Gas Pipelines”** (Jude Clemente, “Americans Need More Oil And Natural Gas Pipelines,” [RealClearEnergy](#), 4/24/19)
- **Lack of pipelines are correlated to higher energy costs.** “We surely know that a lack of pipelines in the six New England states, New York, and California have installed much higher energy costs. These states, for instance, have the highest electricity prices in the country, at least 50% above the national average. Their goal has become an insidious chain reaction: to increase energy prices.... to lower demand... to lower greenhouse gas emissions.” (Jude Clemente, “Americans Need More Oil And Natural Gas Pipelines,” [RealClearEnergy](#), 4/24/19)
- **A lack of pipelines encourages more dependence on foreign sources for energy products.** “For example, Saudi Arabia is now the main source of foreign oil for California, lacking the pipelines and policies to connect with neighbor Canada. And for the past two winters, Everett LNG terminal in Boston has been taking gas imports from Russia because it doesn't have the pipeline capacity to get flowing shale supply from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio during the high demand season. This is about as non-sensical as energy policy can get. Russia is a sanctioned U.S. country and nearby Appalachia now produces 37% of U.S. gas, holding the Marcellus shale play - probably the largest gas field in the world. Hopelessly out-of-touch, anti-pipeline positions devastate U.S. energy security and force us to turn to a precarious international market that is controlled by politically riskier OPEC and Russia. And not building pipelines also erodes our environmental security.” (Jude Clemente, “Americans Need More Oil And Natural Gas Pipelines,” [RealClearEnergy](#), 4/24/19)