United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2013 No. 47

# House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE).

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*April 10, 2013.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable REID J. RIBBLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

## MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

## ELIMINATE THE SEQUESTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, most of us came here to this place to serve the American people and to ensure that the most powerful law-making body answers the needs and the cries of those who cannot speak for themselves, and yet, as we languish in those values, they may be more on paper than they are in action.

I rise today to ask, maybe even plead, that this House puts on the floor H.R. 900, which is to eliminate the sequester from the Budget Reconciliation Act and to go to regular order because the people of the United States are hurting, and even more so, I would say that they are crying.

It's very easy for us to be able to say there is no impact; we see no impact. I hope for those who have been in their districts for the last 2 weeks that they will realize how inaccurate and untrue that is. In fact, it hurts me to see the pain in my constituents' faces and homes because of sequester—a reckless scheme to move Congress to act and it did not work.

Some will say whose fault it was, whose idea it was. We really don't care because right now there are people who have lost Head Start seats, whose parents have been told their children cannot come back to school anymore. Grown men crying—grown men crying because their little one cannot go back to a Head Start class, and they have nowhere else for them to go.

The WIC program that is so desperately needed for women, infants, and children—cut to the bone. This is a scheme that is long overdue for us to get rid of.

Food inspectors. Just recently, a food business was shut down in my district. The thought of it is horrible. Many of their products in our local grocery stores. If we had not had food inspectors from the FDA, which we probably won't have anytime soon because they're being slashed and eliminated, this product would still be on the market. $85 billion in cuts is too nondescript.

The Federal emergency management under Homeland Security, $1 billion being cut, which means those who are still suffering from Superstorm Sandy, many of whom are homeless, 40,000 are still in hotel rooms in New York, they won't be able to be helped.

Department of Transportation, $1.943 billion, and that means the New Starts, mobility, people waiting in line for light rail, jobs cut immediately. I spoke this weekend to FAA members, air traffic controllers. Don't think it's not being felt, and it will be felt more and more in the summer increase of travel because of $637 million in losses, and almost $500 million of that is jobs.

We are in trouble. $512 million cut from Customs and Border Patrol over the international ports of entry. We're talking about comprehensive immigration reform and border security. There's your border security—cutting the very personnel that are ensuring the security of America. That's wrong-headed, and it's time to stop now.

But it really pains my heart, if you will, to see the cuts to those innocent families with those children in Head Start, to see the cuts to workers who have done nothing other than to come to work every morning, those Federal workers, and the impact on contractors to the Department of Defense, work that is forward-thinking in dealing with technology, cut to the bone, slashing employees. We will see the surge of the economy going down.

This is not the fault of the administration. This is the inaction of us in the United States Congress, and I think it is immediately necessary for Speaker BOEHNER to put on the floor of the House for a full debate H.R. 900, eliminate the sequester, simple sentence, and go to regular order. Begin the process of the budget. Whether you like this budget or that budget, begin the appropriate process of appropriations, for if you don't think that we're going to have one of the darkest seasons forthcoming, you wait and see what $85 billion in reckless cuts means. It's a trickle-down effect. You cannot recoup. Jobs will not come back, and we were moving up, creating jobs.

Everybody wants to point the finger as to whose fault it is, and I believe it is something where we have to come together.



Printed on recycled paper.

I want to finish on the note that medical research funded by the National Institutes is also being cut, and we were number one in medical research. The time is now. Get rid of the sequester and help the American people.

## BUREAUCRATIC CODESPEAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let's say I take one of my 10 grandkids, Barrett Houston, to a basketball game he is playing in. He gets hit in the face with a basketball, so we go to the doctor to see if his nose is broken. The doctor asks Barrett Houston this question: Is this the first time you've been hit in the face with a basketball, the second time, or do you have a habit of being hit in the face by a basketball? Barrett says, I don't know. Doctor says, I've got to know because, you see, I've got this codebook here, and the law requires that I make sure I put in the codebook the way you were hurt by the basketball and how many times because there are five codes for being hit in the face by a basketball. And let's say he doesn't know. Well, the doctor has to be accurate in how he diagnoses being hit in the face by the basketball or the doctor's in trouble.

Let's say I take another one of my grandsons, Jackson, to go hunting, but he happens to get assaulted by a wild turkey. We go to the doctor, and the doctor says, Hey, I've got to know exactly how you were hurt by that turkey because there is a code for being assaulted by a turkey for the first time. There is a code for being assaulted by the turkey a second time. There is a different code for being pecked by a turkey rather than being bitten by a turkey. There are nine codes. The doctor must get the right code or he is in violation of the law about being assaulted by that turkey. It seems nine codes for a turkey assault is a bit silly.

□ 1010

Right now, Mr. Speaker, there are 18,000 of these codes. Doctors must be accurate when they fill out the diagnosis of a patient who comes and sees them.

Stay with me, Mr. Speaker.

Soon, there will be 140,000 of these medical codes that doctors must get right or they're in trouble by the Federal Government. The new code system is called ICD–10. For example, you're injured at a chicken coop; that's code number Y9272. You are injured at an art gallery, you fall down; that's Y92250. There are even three new codes for being injured when you walk into a lamppost. You walk into a lamppost for the first time, that's one code; you walk into a lamppost for the second time, that's a different code; you walk into a lamppost habitually, that is even a different code. And the doctor must get it right, because he's in violation of Federal regulators if he doesn't get it right.

The doctors I've talked to say this is an expensive distraction from treating patients. Well, no kidding. It's red tape, it's bureaucracy, and this is what happens when clueless Big Government here in Washington starts telling people out in the workplace—doctors and patients—what they must do. And when the government intrudes into our lives with more regulations, the government continues to make things more complicated. It finds problems in every solution.

Doctors are really in the business of helping the sick and the injured and saving lives. Do they really have the time and money to translate a complicated 140,000-codebook when they diagnose everything that happens? But they don't have a choice. If they miscode, they do not get paid. Even more so, they face the threat of being fined by the Federal Government.

There's more. To set up this new 140,000-code philosophy, it's going to cost an average single practitioner doctor $80,000. Now, isn't that lovely? If it's a practice of 5 to 10 people, that's going to cost that practice $250,000 to comply with Federal regulations, the new codebook.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, when regulators go to work every day down the street in one of these big office buildings, they sit around a big oak table, they pull out their lattes and their iPads and they ask the question to each other: ''Who shall we regulate today?'' They type out a few regulations and send it out to the fruited plain and the masses. They don't care about the cost or the effect or whether the regulations make any sense; they just do it anyway. And we have to deal with it.

These new codes are not going to make one sick person well, but yet doctors must comply with these new codes or the code police are going to punish them. Doctors want to take care of patients, but the Federal Government is forcing 140,000 complicated, unreasonable new codes on all of us that are hard to decipher. Maybe we should sequester these new codes. Where are those World War II code breakers when we need them most?

And that's just the way it is.

## THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I welcome the President's budget submission, which will mark the first time since 2009 that the House, the Senate, and the President have all submitted budgets. It's an encouraging development, but the larger question is whether Congress can actually use the budgeting process to show how we will do business differently.

Despite the media sideshows about the artificial sequestration crisis, the major issues we have to address to fix the budget and our current deficit are spending on defense, health care, and the tax system itself.

Although the administration has started us down a path to manage Pentagon spending in the future, we have barely scratched the surface. There are too many unnecessary bases at home and abroad that should be phased down or closed. There's far too much invested in an antiquated nuclear arsenal that we haven't used in 68 years and contains many, many times more weapons than we would ever need for deterrence. The $700 billion scheduled to be spent over the next 10 years must be reduced dramatically. We have yet to come to grips with the long-term costs of an all-volunteer Army and the right balance between reserve and regular forces. Until these fundamental issues are addressed, the challenges of the future are going to be difficult to face because we spend too much time and energy and money preparing for the conflicts of the past while we avoid hard budget reality.

Health care expenditures continue to be the greatest overall threat to the budget, but not because the United States doesn't spend enough money on health care. We spend more than anybody else in the world—twice as much as many countries. But even spending far more than anybody else, we're still not able to deliver quality health care for most Americans. Instead of fighting health care reform, we should be working together to accelerate that process so that we can reward value over volume of health care. If the Oregon model of health care that we are working on diligently to implement were applied on a national scale, it could save over $1 trillion over the next 10 years—as much as was fought about in the battle over sequestration.

We must also reform the Tax Code, which is unfair, complex, and costly, with over $160 billion just to administer it. I would suggest that we think about implementing a carbon tax, which has the potential of reducing the deficit and tax rates for individuals and business in a fair and comprehensive form. The carbon tax has the added benefit of being the most direct way to reduce the threat to the planet caused by extreme weather events promoted by carbon pollution.

It's very encouraging that the President's budget again speaks to infrastructure improvement and investment, but we need to be bolder and more comprehensive in our approach, especially at how we deal with funding rebuilding and renewing America. At a time when 17 States have stepped up to increase transportation funding, it's unacceptable that we pay for the highway trust fund with a gas tax that hasn't been increased since 1993 and is increasingly collecting less money as fuel efficiency improves.

The introduction of the President's budget is an important step forward. It

will hopefully spark an earnest, thoughtful, focused discussion about how we do business differently, how we pay for the needs of a growing and aging America, and how we can get more value for the investments we are already making, all while laying the foundation for a more prosperous future.

## AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. When I was home, like most Members, during the Easter break, I had the opportunity to read in the Raleigh, North Carolina, paper an article that just really took me backwards. The title of the article is: ''Iran Is Victor in Post-War Iraq.'' The first paragraph says:

> Ten years after the United States-led invasion to oust Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, the geopolitical winner of the war appears to be the common enemy: Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I think most of us in the House know that 25, 30 years ago, our Nation supported Saddam Hussein when he was fighting the Iranians. This is what frustrates the American people. We create a bad policy; we continue to support a bad policy. It makes no sense.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to speak to the inspector general for the Iraq Project, and when I get the report, I would maybe like to share more information. Just for example, approximately $11.7 billion in waste, fraud, and abuse. What makes this so ironic is that the Iranians are possibly becoming the beneficiaries of this money. The taxpayers now are spending money in Iraq that could possibly be going into the coffers of the Iranian people. I guess that makes sense to most of my colleagues, but it doesn't to me.

I encourage the American people to go to www.costofwar.com. If you can get it on the Internet, you need to see it. The American people need to understand what is happening in Afghanistan and Iraq. You will see a combined total of $1.4 trillion, and it's a running total. It doesn't stop; it doesn't pause; it just keeps running. So there we go again. Poor Uncle Sam can't take care of his bills, but we're going to take care of these foreign countries. It makes no to sense to me.

Mr. Speaker, a total of 6,656 American troops have died in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, not to mention the thousands of civilian lives lost and the veterans who return home physically and mentally wounded. Whether it's in Iraq or Afghanistan, we cannot continue to spend money that we don't have and neglect the American people.

□ 1020

I hope the people of this country and my fellow colleagues share my outrage and my concern, because it would be almost a sin if we continue to spend this money without any accountability or very little to speak of.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I visited a soldier from my district in North Carolina. He was at Walter Reed Hospital at Bethesda. His father called me 4 months ago and said, I really would appreciate if you would see my son. He's lost a leg. He's lost fingers. He's badly burned.

Mr. Speaker, it was humbling to go to Walter Reed yesterday and see this young corporal, but he is what makes America great. His attitude is excellent, not complaining about his injuries, and I just pray to God that we will realize that if we don't stop spending the money we don't have that young men and women like the corporal in the years to come will not get benefits because we will be financially broke. That will be a sin, and I hope it never happens.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will be back next week. I will have the inspector general's estimate on the cost to stay in Iraq for 2 more years, and I hope to have some figures I can leave and put in the RECORD, because it is time that we have a debate on our foreign policy right here in the House of Representatives. Maybe we will in May. I hope so.

With that, Mr. Speaker, as I always do, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is rights in the eyes of God for God's people today and God's people tomorrow.

I ask God to please bless the President, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today and God's people tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, three times, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

## FOLEY CELEBRATES 30TH SEASON WITH BLACKHAWKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Chicago Blackhawks television announcer Pat Foley, who is celebrating his 30th season with the team. As the voice of the Blackhawks, Pat has come to define the Chicago hockey experience. In fact, it's impossible to imagine watching stars like Jonathan Toews or Pat Kane without his play-by-play running through your head.

The hockey bug bit Pat early in his life. As a child at bedtime he would hide his radio underneath his pillow from his parents, Rob and Mary, so he could listen to his broadcasting idol, Lloyd Pettit, a great in his own right, call Blackhawks games, but only the last two periods.

Much like the players, themselves, Pat worked his way up to the Stanley Cup winning team, calling baseball and hockey games at his alma mater Michigan State before landing his first professional job with the Grand Rapids Owls of the International Hockey League. Pat joined the Hawks broadcast team in 1980 at just 25 years of age and has been a fan favorite ever since. The Glenview native has earned two Emmy Awards for his work and was inducted into the Chicagoland Sports Hall of Fame, joining broadcast legends Jack Brickhouse and Harry Caray. He's also been active in the local community helping numerous charities, and he recently joined me on the ice in a game with wounded warriors from the USA Warriors team.

For his hard work and dedication and for making some of the greatest moments in Blackhawks history even more memorable, I say thank you to Pat Foley. Lloyd Pettit would be proud. And, of course, go Hawks.

## IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, in the midst of talking about immigration reform, which I think is something that we're going to be addressing very shortly and something we ought to address very shortly, I want to just come forward and share an experience I had over the last week.

I'm still a pilot in the Air National Guard. That's a job I've kept while I've been in the Congress and a job I hope to continue to keep. Part of what I did last week is I actually went and worked on the border with the Air National Guard. We do an ISR—intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—looking for people that have crossed illegally into our country and, frankly, looking for drugs and things along that line. It was a unique trip for me, because most times when Congressmen go to the border, they actually probably would go in an official capacity as a U.S. Congressman. We've all experienced these trips. You see what the administration, frankly, wants you to see. So they take you somewhere like El Paso where there's a very effective fence in place.

But where they don't take you is a place called Mac Pump. Mac Pump is in McAllen, Texas, one of the areas that I worked in my capacity as an Air National Guard pilot, and it really was actually kind of disheartening what we would see. You'd see folks cross the Rio Grande, that would stand in the United States of America. As we would call Border Patrol to come and assess the situation, they would literally step back and put their ankles in the water and at that point they are unapprehendable. And they would stare, 5 feet away from U.S. Border Patrol, and maybe a hundred yards away then another group, knowing that our Border Patrol agent was tied up, would

then cross the Rio Grande and make it free. Or they'd outlast the Border Patrol agent and then they'd step back onto U.S. territory and then the agent would come back. They'd play this cat and mouse game. It could easily be solved with a border fence. It could easily be solved with actually real border security.

This isn't border security that we're going to do because we're upset, because we're angry, but because I believe that we have to have real immigration reform in this country. Things like high-skill visas are very important, but allowing people who want an opportunity to come to the United States to do so through a legal process.

The problem that we have set up now, though, and really frankly the sad part about it is a lot of these immigrants believe that the second they set foot in the United States of America, everything's going to be good. Everything's going to be all right. And we agree. This is the greatest country in the world. The problem is once many of these immigrants step into the United States of America, their journey has just begun, because the other part of where I worked in this mission over the last week was about 50 to 100 miles inland in Texas, as we would find people hunkered down in moss, very thick brush, as they would try to wade and rely on their guides. In many cases their guides would vacate when they'd hear Border Patrol, and they'd run away from these groups of people hiding in the brush and would leave them stranded in the middle of the Texas plains without water, without food, without any knowledge of where they're going. In fact, in this sector I was working last year, there were 200 dead bodies found, and that's only a fraction of those that actually die on this journey.

So I believe that border security is important so that we can set up a situation in which those that want to come here legally can do so and can go through the legal process of living in the United States or eventually becoming a United States citizen, and we're not creating a situation in which many of these immigrants are coming and frankly losing their lives.

I've talked to Border Patrol, and the interesting thing is now I did it out of the capacity as a U.S. Congressman, although of course they knew what I did in my other job, and I said, if I could take one thing back to Washington, what would it be? And they said, if you take back one thing to Washington, tell them that even though the Secretary is saying that the border is secure, even though the administration is saying the border is secure, it is not secure. Take that back. We need more border patrol agents, we need the fence, we need the ability to do our job. They're prevented from doing legal things that are humane to apprehend in many cases folks running with dope and trying to escape, giving them the opportunity to do what they need to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I agree with those that are saying we need immigration reform in this country, and I'm a believer in that. I believe it's time that we understand and talk about the fact that America is a nation built of immigrants. My third or fourth generation ahead of me came over from Germany. I respect that and I appreciate it, and I think it's a tradition we need to continue. But I believe the first step to real immigration reform is border security. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, my trip to the border for a week as a pilot in the Guard opened my eyes to the fact that we are continually exposing ourselves not just to dope and drugs being run into this country but into a potential of a terrorist attack on the United States and a weapon that was run through the border of Mexico, because it's done every day.

## END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my grandmother used to say an apple a day keeps the doctor away. I hated it when she said that, but you know, Mr. Speaker, she was right. Good, nutritious food will keep you healthy. That's because food is medicine. Fruits, vegetables and other healthy foods like beans, legumes, grains and proteins are critical for proper development. Simply put, healthy people eat healthy food.

The opposite is also true. The more junk food we eat, the less healthy we are. But there are different reasons why people eat less nutritious food. Many people choose to eat non-nutritious food, but there are many others who cannot afford to buy healthier options. These low-income households have to stretch their food dollars in order to make ends meet.

□ 1030

This requires them to buy less nutritious, high-calorie foods that are more affordable on a fixed income. This is why we can have an obese hungry person. They're filling their stomachs with food that isn't good for them, simply because it's all they can afford or all they have access to.

This kind of diet has long-term negative effects on individuals and on the communities where they live. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about ways to End Hunger Now, we must look at the way the quality of food, or the lack of quality, is impacting hunger in America.

In a 2011 report entitled, ''Hunger in America: Suffering We Are All Paying For,'' the Center for American Progress estimated that the health costs for hunger were at least $130 billion each year. $130 billion a year, just for health costs related to hunger.

The authors of the report examined medical research and found that there are serious medical consequences directly related to hunger. Specifically, this research found that there is likely to be higher rates of iron deficiency, headaches, stomach aches, frequency of colds, activity-limiting health impairments, specific nutrient deficiencies, more hospitalizations, longer inpatient stays, and poorer overall health status.

Along with these physical health issues, there are also mental health conditions attributable to hunger, including anxiety and irritability, depression, withdrawn behavior, psychosocial dysfunction, suicidal thoughts and behaviors, and a need for mental health services.

The response is clear, Mr. Speaker. We must treat hunger as a health issue. It frustrates me that we in Congress still act like it's a better option to spend over $130 billion in hunger-related health costs than to actually prevent hunger in the first place.

Last month, in March, ProMedica and the Partnership to Fight Chronic Disease released a white paper called, ''Addressing Hunger Essential to Improving Health.'' This paper details how critically important it is to treat hunger as a health issue. The white paper points out that hungry people of all ages, from pregnant women to children to adults to seniors, suffer from a lack of nutrients found in healthy foods. The lack of nutrients results in serious health issues, the very same health issues that cost our Nation over $130 billion in health care costs alone. That's nuts.

Doctors and nurses should be looking for signs of hunger in their patients. Medical students should have more courses on nutrition. They should be treating hunger just like any other condition. If someone has high blood pressure or a rash, they get a prescription to treat that problem. Doctors should be writing food prescriptions, if that's what it takes, to get nutritious food to the food insecure.

Health care organizations like ProMedica in Ohio and Michigan, UMass Memorial in Worcester, Massachusetts, and Children's Health Watch in four locations, including Boston Medical Center and Drexel University, are trying to right this wrong. They promote health and wellness in general, but they are also treating hunger as a health issue. They are working to reduce the number of hospital readmissions by including food security in their patients' discharge plans. They want to make sure that people don't need to be readmitted to a hospital because they suffer from a setback simply because they don't have food to eat once they leave the hospital. They are also working to raise awareness about nutrition and exercise and to increase access to healthier food in underserved areas.

Mr. Speaker, we need to learn from these organizations and others. That's why I believe it is so important that the White House convene a conference on food and nutrition. We are not going

to end hunger now if we don't bring the best and the brightest minds together in one place, including doctors, nurses, nutritionists, dietitians, and other health professionals. We need a national plan of action, and the best way to begin is with a White House conference.

Mr. Speaker, we know that healthy food builds healthy bodies. We know that by ignoring hunger, our Nation pays hundreds of billions of dollars in health care costs. We know that nutritious food is good medicine for body and mind.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America, the richest, most prosperous nation on Earth, hunger should not be an issue. We need to come together, Mr. Speaker. We need to come together now. We need the President to lead on this. We need to come together and end hunger now.

## CANCER PATIENT PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1416, the Cancer Patient Protection Act of 2013.

On April 1, 2013, the Obama administration reduced Medicare payments to the costs of cancer-fighting drugs. This is having a devastating impact on seniors fighting cancer and the Nation's cancer care delivery system, which is already in crisis.

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, CMS, said that it does not have the authority to stop these devastating cuts to lifesaving chemotherapy drugs. That's why yesterday I introduced the Cancer Patient Protection Act of 2013, H.R. 1416, to ensure seniors, especially those on lower or fixed incomes, get the treatment they need.

The cuts the Obama administration is choosing to implement will jeopardize patient access to cancer care and result in higher overall costs for both seniors and the Medicare program by forcing patients into costlier hospital treatment settings.

The United States enjoys the most respected and most successful cancer care delivery system in the world. More than 60 percent of U.S. cancer patients rely on Medicare; and, until recently, over 80 percent of the Nation's cancer patients were treated by physicians in the community setting.

According to recent studies by Milliman and Avalere, community oncology clinics provide the most cost-effective model for delivering high-quality cancer services to elderly Americans. Despite this, a series of changes to Medicare reimbursements over the past decade have imperiled these vital innovations. The administration has decided to apply the sequester cut both to payments for part B drugs and to the 6 percent services payment.

A recent survey done by the Community Oncology Alliance shows the CMS cuts will force 72 percent of community cancer centers to stop seeing new Medicare patients, or not see Medicare patients without secondary insurance, and/or send Medicare patients elsewhere for treatment, such as costly hospitals, where treatment costs more.

When community cancer centers are forced to close their doors or limit services, access to cancer care is compromised for all cancer patients, especially the vulnerable population of seniors who rely on Medicare and those on fixed incomes and lower income individuals whose options are already limited.

Fortunately, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the authority to protect against further destabilization of the community cancer care safety net.

The Office of Management and Budget, OMB, directed all Federal agencies to "use any available flexibility to reduce operational risks and minimize impacts on the agency's core mission in service of the American people" and to "identify and address operational challenges that could potentially have a significant deleterious effect on the agency's mission or otherwise raise life, safety, or health concerns."

Further, the Social Security Act compels the Secretary to adhere to the Average Sales Price-based formula that Congress established under the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003. The Social Security Act expressly mandates that the Secretary reimburse physicians at 106 percent of ASP for office-administered drugs, providing detailed directions to the Secretary on how to calculate the average sales price.

Congress has distinguished the Medicare drug payment methodology, and these provisions warrant deference under sequestration and guidance from the OMB.

By passing this bill, we are ensuring that everything can be done to prevent these cuts from going into effect. I encourage my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

## IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of comprehensive immigration reform.

I would like to thank my colleague from Illinois, who spoke earlier about his experience, saying that he believes in comprehensive immigration reform. I do, too. I just wish that when he was asked, or when he asked the Border Patrol agent, "If there was one thing you could bring back to Congress, one thing, what would it be?" I wish that that gentleman would have said his Bible, because that's what he should have said, "Bring your Bible. That will give you the best guidance. Bring your Bible."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, I'm allowed to read from the Bible. Is that correct? No one will come and tackle me? I'm new at this. It's my first year here, and I hope I'm not violating any law. But if I am, I'm going to do it anyway.

I would like to read from Matthew 25, because Matthew 25 speaks to the judgment. I think it's very important for us to read this section.

□ 1040

It reads like this:

> When the Son of Man comes in His glory, escorted by all the angels of Heaven, He will sit upon His royal throne and all the Nations will be assembled before Him, and then He will separate them into two groups as a shepherd separates sheep from goats. The sheep He will place on His right hand, the goats on His left. The King will say to those on His right, "Come. You have my Father's blessing. Inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the creation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me food; I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was a stranger, and you welcomed me.

"I was a stranger and you welcomed me." Who is the stranger? Who is the stranger among us that we welcome? I'll tell you who the stranger is among us who we welcome. The stranger is the wife of the soldier that we spoke to 3 weeks ago here in Washington when he came and he testified and said:

> I'm not afraid of dying in Afghanistan or Iraq. I've been on three tours of duty. What I'm afraid is that my wife will get deported because she's undocumented, and then who will take care of my children?

She is the stranger, the soldier's wife.

Who is the stranger? Who is the stranger among us? Who is this least among us? I'll tell you who it is. It's the child and the parents who are here, where the child is born here. He's an American citizen, but the parents weren't, so the parents can get deported and you break the family apart. We deport the parents and we don't know what happens to the children because they go to strangers. We break this family.

Who is the stranger? Those parents, that child. How we treat them is how we're going to be judged.

We have an opportunity here before us, and I'm very thankful now for the churches in this country. The Catholic Church for many years has been saying, We need humane, comprehensive immigration reform. They've said it loud and clear. And now the evangelical churches are out there saying the same thing. God bless them. And I know that they're praying, and I know that my parish is praying that we'll all open our hearts to this.

I have to tell you, I haven't been here long, but I do get the opportunity to pray with my colleagues on the Republican side, and they are great people with great heart, and I hope that God speaks to them at this point in time and says: The stranger is the soldier's wife; the stranger is the child whose parents are going to be ripped away from them. He is, in fact, the people

that died crossing the border because they want a better life for themselves. Those are the strangers. We are going to be judged on how we treat them. So we have an opportunity here.

But also, stepping apart from that, people say, But it's illegal, what they've done is illegal. You know, the law is interesting. I happen to be a lawyer. There are two ways to look at the law. There's the law that says it's malum per se—it's bad or evil in itself. Malum per se in itself. Murder is malum per se. It's always evil, it's always wrong to kill.

On the other side you have malum prohibitum. What is malum prohibitum? Malum prohibitum means it's bad or wrong or illegal because we prohibit it. For example, if you drive 56 miles an hour in a 55-mile-an-hour zone, you've broken the law. Have you done anything illegal? Yes, you have. Have you done anything immoral? No. The road was built to go faster than that, your car was, the brakes are good. You violated the law. What do we often do? In fact we change the law and we say 55 miles an hour doesn't make any sense. We change it to 60 or 65 or 70. I've been through Texas; now it's 75 there. I'm from California. We only have 70. Why? Because the law doesn't make any sense.

Our immigration law doesn't make any sense. So, yes, they've broken the law, but a law that doesn't make any sense. Let's change the law. Let's open our hearts. Let's take this Bible and let's take a look and see what it says to us. What it will say is this: that how we treat the stranger is how we are going to be judged as a Nation.

## UNTREATED MENTAL ILLNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. While the Senate argues about gun issues and talking about what is in the hands of those perpetrators who commit heinous crimes, I want to talk about America's shameful secret that people don't want to be talking about, and that is our willful ignoring of dealing with mental illness. We have to start talking about not what is in people's hands, but what is in their hearts and minds.

Approximately 5 percent of individuals with schizophrenia will die by suicide during their lifetime, a rate 50-fold greater than the general population. Keep in mind now suicide has overtaken all other areas of accidental deaths. It is now the leading cause of death by injury, about 38,000 per year.

We understand that mental disorders are brain disorders with specific systems that are rooted in abnormal patterns of brain activity. Many of those with psychosis show up between ages 14 and 25 when there are changes occurring in the branching and pruning of brain cells. Yet, there is a delay between the first episode of psychosis and the onset of treatment with an average of 110 weeks before someone gets care. There are 100,000 young Americans who will have a first episode of psychosis this year and will join over 2 million others with schizophrenia.

Look at this: one-sixth of murderers in prison are mentally ill. Here are some other quick facts. The number of murders in the U.S. in 2011 committed with rifles: 323. In 2011, more murders were committed with knives: 1,694; hands, fist and feet: 728; and blunt weapons such as clubs and hammers: 496, according to FBI data.

A while ago I sent a letter to Secretary Sebelius, the Secretary of HHS, seeking clarification of the laws of confidentiality known as HIPAA, specifically asking why we have not loaded 1.5 million more records into the National Instant Criminal Background Check System so that these people cannot purchase guns. I hope the Secretary will respond soon.

Recently, I also handed a note to the President of the United States and will continue to pursue questions with the Government Accountability Office, asking where are we spending our money and is it effective in going to help those with mental illness and severe mental illness. We simply don't know.

In the United States, an estimated 11.4 million Americans, or about 4.4 percent of all adults, suffer from serious mental illness. What happens is that States in many cases do not submit those records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. There are many States that haven't submitted any at all, and this is a problem because people who should not be purchasing weapons are.

But underlying all of this, we had better take off our blinders and deal with the underlying root cause of mass violence: untreated mental illness. Look at yesterday in the news when a man went on a campus and attacked people with a knife. Look at the other shootings that have taken place by people with untreated or undertreated mental illness. Why aren't we talking about our action on those?

Our current system is especially falling short for those with a serious mental disorder who deny they're ill. Half of those persons with severe psychosis don't even understand they have mental illness. They refuse their medication or simply cannot function in a community setting. So what have we done historically in this country? We've burned them as witches, we imprison them as dangerous. We still have not dealt with the underlying needs.

There were 500,000 psychiatric beds in 1955. There are 40,000 now. We have a lack of long-term treatment options. There are gaps in the care for young adults. There are artificial limits and barriers to care under insurance. Four years ago plus we passed a mental health parity law, and we still do not have the regulations for that.

Parents who are not informed and cannot get their children help or treatment is another problem with HIPAA laws and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, which creates barriers between parents knowing what is going on with their children in school when they have a severe mental illness. Of course, there is the stigma of acknowledging there is a problem or getting treatment.

Politicians refer to those committing these murders as evil, as monsters. Television shows where there's tragedy or comedy mock them. This is not the way to deal with the underlying problem. We have a shortage of psychologists and psychiatrists throughout this country and in the military as well, where suicides have overtaken combat as the number one cause of death.

I am asking for an audit from the Government Accountability Office of every single penny spent on mental illness diagnosis, research, and treatment throughout our government, through HHS, through the judiciary, through Labor, every branch. We need to know these answers. It is a shameful secret in this country that we still refuse to deal with mental illness. And if we do not, shame on us.

□ 1050

## CONGRATULATIONS TO THE WINNERS OF THE C–SPAN STUDENT DOCUMENTARY CONTEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, most Americans watching these proceedings today are watching them on C–SPAN. C–SPAN is a public service that was created by the cable industry in 1979 to carry our House proceedings and other public affairs programming. It's carried in my district by DirecTV, Comcast, and the DISH Network.

I won't bore you with all of the content that appears on C–SPAN. Some is very interesting and some is not. Nevertheless, every year C–SPAN holds a student documentary contest for middle school and high school students.

Today, I am proud to announce that one of my constituents, a young man named Samuel Gladden, a 10th grade student at Miller Grove High School in Lithonia, received $250 for his honorable mention documentary: ''Education: The Greatest Common Factor,'' about how education is related to the economy.

I also want to congratulate Mr. Zach Cohen, a seventh grade student at the Alfred & Adele Davis Academy in Sandy Springs, Georgia, who received $1,500 for the second prize, a documentary entitled: ''Education: Take a Spin,'' which is about education in the United States of America. He interviewed me for this piece, and I want to thank him for doing that.

I want to congratulate both Zach and Samuel for winning these prizes out of nearly 2,000 entries.

You can see these and other winning videos at studentcam.org. I would encourage everybody, once you finish watching C–SPAN, to go to studentcam.org. It will captivate you to see what these young students have done and to listen to their views on education and on how our future will be affected by either our investment in education or in our desire not to do that.

## SECURITY IN ENERGY AND MANUFACTURING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Security in Energy and Manufacturing Act of 2013.

This bill will extend the Advanced Energy Manufacturing Tax Credit program. The program provides a 30 percent tax credit, or a grant in lieu of a tax credit, to companies that are constructing, expanding, or retrofitting their facilities that manufacture renewable energy.

We have seen our manufacturing base erode as a result of increased global competition. Not only will the SEAM Act help us rebuild our manufacturing industry; it will also provide an opportunity to do so while exploring responsible energy production. Energy innovation is quickly becoming one of the world's largest industries; and countries all over the world are purchasing billions of dollars' worth of wind turbines, solar panels and other green technologies. I want to see these products made in the United States and for our country to remain competitive.

We know this program works. The first allocation of funding was extremely successful in leveraging private capital, and that led to the investment of over 180 energy manufacturing facilities across 43 States in our country. The number of wind turbines and their workable components made in the U.S. has more than doubled since then, and that is just one aspect of the renewable energy field.

Expanding this program also means creating additional high-tech, high-wage manufacturing jobs in our own backyard. Companies like Tempe's Monarch Power could expand and increase the creation of innovative products, ranging from energy generation to energy storage, even a mobile renewable power system—all while remaining affordable. We must partner the power of American innovation with the potential of American production. My bill encourages just that.

In my home State of Arizona, renewable energy enjoys broad bipartisan support. Democrats and Republicans, including Barry Goldwater, Jr. and our own Governor, Jan Brewer, have advocated for solar and renewable energy because they know that the future of our State and the future of our country depend on it. I stand today with a broad coalition of leaders from my State who have a long history of supporting energy innovation as a smart investment for America.

We have the opportunity to restore U.S. manufacturing jobs, to help our country remain competitive in the manufacturing industry and to invest in a wide range of clean energy production. I ask that the body join me in supporting the SEAM Act of 2013.

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

## PRAYER

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

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

The Members of Congress are powerful people. Their words bear weight and their positions before the people deserve respect. Therefore, they need to be steeled from arrogance on one side and casual routine on the other.

Lord, only the two-edged sword of Your Word and Your purity of Spirit can bring freshness to their spirits and confirming hope to their constituents. Strengthen their pledge to uphold the Constitution against blatant and subtle attacks and to serve the people with all their hearts.

Then may their speech, their decisions, and their working together within the pluralism of this democracy be for Your greater honor and glory.

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 gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GABBARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

## GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we all want to prevent gun violence, but anything we do must start by respecting the Second Amendment.

Sadly, a Member of this House ignored that constitutional right last week. She claimed that banning certain kinds of gun magazines would somehow stop killers from killing. She actually said that if Congress would ban gun magazines, they will simply disappear as they're used up. Of course, that's not true. You see, gun magazines are reloadable, much like a stapler.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I can be an asset to my colleagues who may not know how guns work. As a gun owner and an Air Force veteran myself, I've actually exercised my Second Amendment rights. Perhaps those of us who understand the subject matter should lead the effort to stop gun violence.

My colleague's poor understanding of guns will lead to poor policy. Here's some reading material to help bring her up to speed. It's called the Second Amendment. It says, ''The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.''

## THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I too adhere to the Second Amendment, as all of us do. I can assure the gentleman that anything we do with sensible gun legislation that will protect the lives of babies whose lives were lost in Newtown and Aurora and Virginia Tech and Columbine will be fair and just. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will hear from those of us who are sending him a letter: no filibuster, but real gun-sensible legislation.

Let me turn to the budget and indicate that it is important that we rid ourselves of the sequester and ask the Speaker to put on the floor H.R. 900. I think it is good that the President has saved dollars out of the Iraq and Afghan war of over $1 billion and provided security for embassies and $222 million for gun legislation enforcement, but we must not have to change CPI.

Many people don't realize that in this instance of Social Security seniors are paying more money for health care.

They will not be able to compensate. Those who are poor and vulnerable will be worst off after the changed CPI.

I join with many, many Members of the United States Congress to say we can make Social Security solvent, Medicare solvent and Medicaid solvent, but we must not have to change CPI. I oppose it and many others.

## TAX CODE

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, April 15, the dreaded tax day, is almost here. According to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, Americans will have to work 108 days this year just to be able to pay their taxes—108 days. That's just not right, and Americans are sick of it. The good news is Congress has a chance to do something about it this year.

So what would the average American want to see in a new Tax Code?

One, lower tax rates on individuals and businesses, with an assurance that those rates would remain low;

Two, no ridiculous special interest loopholes or giveaways, especially those that have nothing to do with creating jobs; and

Three, making sure that everyone pays their fair share.

If Congress aims for these goals, Americans should get a Tax Code that encourages work and investment, resulting in economic growth and job creation.

And let's not forget, we cannot allow any future growth-generated revenue to be spent on wasteful government programs. Instead, the revenue should go toward eliminating the deficit and then paying down our debt.

Let's cut spending, lower our deficit, and fix our loophole-ridden, work-penalizing, and jobs-killing Tax Code once and for all.

## MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, later today, I will join House Democratic Whip STENY HOYER to announce our Make it In America agenda, a legislative package that will help reinvigorate our manufacturing sector and grow American manufacturing jobs. These bills will help to put our country back to work by helping to create good-paying jobs, the kind of jobs that built the American middle class of this country.

Earlier this year, I introduced one such proposal, the Make It In America Manufacturing Act, which establishes a competitive grant program that will help small- to medium-sized manufacturers retool their facilities and retrain their workers to compete in the 21st century.

Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND of New York has introduced a companion bill in the Senate that is cosponsored by Senators JACK REED and SHELDON WHITEHOUSE. These are the kinds of commonsense proposals that we need to support if we are going to get our economy back on the right track and get folks back to work.

I urge my colleagues to support the Make It In America agenda, and I look forward to joining Whip HOYER for his announcement this afternoon.

## PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's budget is 65 days late and trillions of dollars short. And while his plan contains plenty of tax increases, budgetary gimmicks, and stimulus-style spending, it fails to adequately address our Nation's unsustainable deficits and debt. In fact, the President's budget would never balance.

I share President Obama's view of a thriving middle class and strong manufacturing base, but the policies put forth in his budget show the White House is more focused on increasing the size of government than growing the private sector. If the President is truly serious about building a 21st century economy, then he should work with House Republicans in eliminating the roadblocks to innovation and entrepreneurship. That means reducing government red tape, creating a fairer and flatter Tax Code, and ending the deficit spending.

I urge the President to join us in putting forth sound policies that will grow jobs and put our country back on a sustainable path.

□ 1210

## WESTERN NEW YORKERS WILL FIGHT FOR WHAT THEY DESERVE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, in western New York, we don't expect anything to be handed to us. History has taught us that we have to fight for what we deserve. Our community just won two recent victories against Federal bureaucracies by standing up and demanding better.

When the Veterans Administration decided to cancel the Golden Age Games just 2 months before they were to be held in Buffalo and stick our community with a $2.2 million loss, the community fought back. Last week, the VA reversed its decision and announced that the games would proceed as planned.

When the Army Corps of Engineers decided to prohibit access to Squaw Island Pier in Buffalo, a popular fishing destination on the waterfront, we pushed back hard. This morning, I met with Corps officials. They assured me that public access to the site would continue.

Western New Yorkers won two victories in 2 weeks because we stood up for ourselves. Let this be a lesson to our community and a warning to the Federal bureaucracy: when you make senseless decisions that hurt western New York, you're going to have a fight on your hands.

## FATHER EMIL KAPAUN

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

Mr. POMPEO. It is an honor today to tell you about one really good man. He was born in Pilson, Kansas, and later became an ordained priest in Wichita in 1940.

This very good man, a fellow named Emil Kapaun, served as a military chaplain during World War II and again in September 1948, this time entering the Korean battlefield with his unit, the 3rd Battalion of the 8th Cavalry Regiment of the 1st Cavalry Division.

There we saw what comes of a good man when placed in dangerous times. Father Kapaun became a hero. He died after saving hundreds of lives on the battlefield and in a prisoner of war camp, having dedicated himself to the physical and spiritual health of his fellow prisoners for a very long time.

Tomorrow, President Obama will bestow upon Father Kapaun, this very good man, the Medal of Honor, America's highest military honor.

I want to take this moment to recognize his fellow POWs who never wavered in an effort to secure this medal for Father Kapaun, to the Catholic Diocese of Wichita, and everyone else who has worked so hard for this recognition.

Finally, I want to thank the fellow Members of this body who supported my provision in the NDAA to allow a waiver for the statutory time exception so that he could receive this award.

Father Kapaun is a true American hero, a hero of mankind and so deserving of this Medal of Honor.

## PLEASANT GROVE BASKETBALL

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pleasant Grove High School boys basketball's team for recently winning the Division 1 State Championship.

In their hard-fought victory, they displayed sportsmanship and teamwork and became the first local team to host the Division 1 State Championship.

When forward Matt Smreker was asked about the victory, he told reporters:

We don't have the biggest names, but we play hard and together with great chemistry, and we won because we're a team.

Matt was right, the Eagles won because they were accountable to each other. The dedication and commitment of the players, coaches, fans, and parents made this victory possible.

The teamwork displayed by the Pleasant Grove boys basketball team is an example for Washington. In Congress we need to work together and hold each other accountable and work as a team.

Congratulations again to the Eagles for your tremendous victory.

## THE DISTINGUISHED WARFARE MEDAL

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, our country has a proud history of honoring our military heroes, and in doing so we place an emphasis on recognizing servicemembers whose actions placed them in harm's way for the benefit of our Nation and their fellow soldiers.

It's because of this proud history that I have serious concerns about the Department of Defense placement of a newly established Distinguished Warfare Medal in the order of precedence. Surely it is appropriate to recognize servicemembers who make contributions through technology-driven warfare; however, I agree with the VFW that we must continue to preserve the sanctity of our medals for those Americans who sacrifice their personal safety for the safety of the country and their brothers in arms.

That is why I strongly support the effort led by my friend, Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, who is a decorated veteran himself, to alter the rank of the Distinguished Warfare Medal such that it ranks below the Purple Heart in precedence.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to join me by cosponsoring his bill, H.R. 833, and urge its passage.

## AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the chance to visit Afghanistan to get a firsthand perspective of the status of our withdrawal, as well as to visit some of our deployed Hawaii troops.

Our servicemembers continue to serve with the highest level of professionalism, selflessness, and integrity. I'm grateful to them and their families for their unwavering coverage and sacrifice.

Our military and civilian personnel in Afghanistan are committed to the ongoing transfer of responsibility for security to the Afghan National Security Forces. The Afghan forces are made up of warriors who are ready to fight and who are already leading a majority of the security operations, building confidence in their ability to withstand the Taliban and insurgency threats.

The U.S. drawdown is crucial for our military and our resources to focus on addressing imminent and direct threats like North Korea. Along with Guam and Alaska, Hawaii's families have been placed in the crosshairs of this threat. We cannot be complacent. We must take action to ensure that our families and assets are protected and defended.

## THE BUDGET

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the President finally decided to join the budget discussion today. Good. It's high time he got off the sidelines.

The contrast between the President's budget and the balanced House Republican budget is stark. The President relies on stimulus and taxes; House Republicans rely on government-spending restraint and reform to achieve economic growth. If recent history is any indication, we chose the better path.

Examine this President's track record of growing the economy: government spending is up, workforce participation is down; national debt is up, family take-home pay is down. If President Obama's trillion-dollar stimulus didn't work, how is a shallow imitation going to help us now? The President's budget will never balance and will yield an endless string of deficits.

The Republican Path to Prosperity requires Washington to make due with a little less and keeps money in the private sector where it can be invested in job creation, expansion, and real economic growth.

The American people waited 65 days for the President's budget. They deserve more than stimulus and taxes.

## THE UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 829 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis. Mr. Speaker, I'm devastated by this because the American people are devastated.

Unemployment is depriving people of health care, higher education, and even food and shelter. Does this sound like a civilized Nation?

Mr. Speaker, the American Society of Civil Engineers gave the U.S. a failing grade for infrastructure. We have no shortage of shovel-ready public projects that can put people to work, but this Congress is unwilling to act.

Mr. Speaker, our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

□ 1220

## THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Mr. MESSER. The President's budget proposal reportedly would cap the amount of money people could save in individual retirement accounts. This is a very bad idea. More than a third of people aged 55 and older are not saving for their retirements. Three-quarters have saved much less than they will need to retire comfortably.

We should be encouraging people to save. We need to encourage people to take more responsibility for their future well-beings instead of discouraging sound financial planning. We need to incentivize self-reliance instead of government dependence. This proposal fails on all of these fronts.

Rest assured, Mr. Speaker, the White House has said that the savings cap will allow ''substantially more than is needed to fund reasonable levels of retirement saving.'' My constituents don't need the President deciding what is reasonable for them in their retirements. They don't need him deciding anything else for them either. We need sensible reform.

## IMPACTS OF THE SEQUESTER

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I rise today to address the sequester.

Many of those in this House have been telling their constituents that the sequester doesn't make any difference, that nothing has really changed; but that simply is not true.

For example, a cut to the Federal Aviation Administration's budget will result in the furloughing of most of FAA's 47,000 employees, or at least one day per pay period through the end of the fiscal year. Even those employees who provide safety-critical services, like systems specialists and aviation safety inspectors, will be subject to the furlough. As much as 10 percent of the FAA's workforce could be on furlough on any given day, resulting in reduced air traffic control, longer delays and economic losses for air transportation, tourism, and the economy as a whole.

Last week, I visited Lynn Evans-Biga, the executive director of the Luzerne-Wyoming County Head Start in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, an agency which serves 1,000 students and has a waiting list of 700 already. It will have to accept 49 fewer students because of the 5.2 percent sequester cut.

## CONGRATULATIONS TO FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIVERSITY

(Mr. DESANTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am here to congratulate a team that captivated the Nation with style, swagger, heart, and class. I'm talking about four letters that few people have ever heard of until just March—that is FGCU—put on the map by their men's basketball team. As a Representative and servant of southwest Florida, I am so proud to have Florida Gulf Coast University in my backyard—our backyard, our home—now known as ''Dunk City.''

The men's basketball team and the university itself have only been around for, basically, a few years. Heck, the players are actually older than the school itself. Now, this was only FGCU's second year of Division 1 eligibility, and in their second year they went all the way to the sweet 16—busting brackets, knocking down threes and, of course, representing Dunk City with a total of 148 dunks this year.

I am proud to represent Dunk City. I am proud of our young team and our young campus of Florida Gulf Coast University, and we all look forward to another stunning season next year.

## FOSTERING MIDDLE CLASS PROSPERITY

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we need to focus on fostering middle class prosperity, and I feel investing in job training and education is the best way to do that.

We recently had an opportunity to revamp the Workforce Investment Act. However, the consolidation approach that was taken with that bill was counterproductive. That legislation could have been a bipartisan effort. Instead, it has gone to the Senate to die.

So I propose, instead of belittling Federal employees, attacking unions and repealing environmental protections, why don't we focus on working together across the aisle and doing what we can to equip people with the skills and the education they need to fill the job openings that are out there.

That might sound warm and fuzzy, but that is what Americans want us to do. My constituents have told me again and again: let's focus on practical solutions to the problems people are facing, not political ideology.

## FIXING AMERICA'S MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEM

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Yesterday, Dylan Quick, a 20-year-old student at Lone Star College in Texas, went on a rampage with a knife, hurting more than a dozen people. He told police he had fantasized since elementary school about stabbing people to death.

Tucson shooter Jared Loughner told his psychologists that he wished he had been taking his anti-psychotic medication. If he had been, Loughner, who has schizophrenia, says the Tucson shooting might not have happened.

A psychiatrist treating James Holmes told campus police a month before the Colorado theater attack that Holmes had homicidal thoughts and was a danger to the public. Holmes also exhibited signs of schizophrenia.

Those with mental illness are generally more likely to be the victims rather than the perpetrators of violence, but those with untreated mental illness are at increased risk of violent behavior. Ten percent of all homicides are committed by individuals with schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and other psychotic illnesses.

When will we acknowledge that it is not just what is in the killer's hand that makes him dangerous, be it fist, knife or gun, but what is in his mind? We must take off the blinders and acknowledge the importance of the diagnosis of mental illness and severe mental illness. Let's fix our mental illness system.

## MARKING 30 YEARS OF SAN RAMON

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Tonight, San Ramon celebrates its 30 years as an incorporated city.

It's a city I know well. My mother grew up there, and my grandfather was the editor of the Valley Pioneer newspaper. I went to elementary school there, and I coached youth soccer there for years.

Americans first came to San Ramon in 1850 when Leo and Mary Jane Norris purchased property there. The name ''San Ramon'' came from a Native American sheep herder in the area named Ramon. For many years, agriculture was a key part of San Ramon's economy. Starting in the 1960s, suburban development began there; modern San Ramon emerged; and the population took off. Eventually, the residents voted to incorporate as a separate city.

It has grown from about 4,000 people in 1960 to over 70,000 today. It's the fourth largest city in Contra Costa County. It is the location of the headquarters of 24-Hour Fitness and Chevron, and it is the west coast headquarters of AT&T. Both of its high schools, California High School and Dougherty Valley High School, were ranked by U.S. News & World Report as being in the top 200 California high schools. These are just a few examples of the highly educated, hardworking folks who live in San Ramon.

## CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY MEN'S HOCKEY TEAM

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing the people of Minnesota understand, it's hockey.

That's why I'm so excited to be able to be here today to congratulate the St. Cloud State University men's hockey team. They're making history. Never before in their history have they advanced to the Frozen Four. I'm here to congratulate them for the first time in the program's history. It has taken talent; it has taken teamwork; it has taken dedication; and the men on this team have shown it all.

I know I speak for all of the people back home in St. Cloud when I say we are extremely proud of these young men and what they've already accomplished. The Cinderella story is going to take place tomorrow evening. It has captivated the community. We can't wait to cheer them on when they take on Quinnipiac in the Frozen Four.

So congratulations. Good luck. Go Huskies.

## SEQUESTER

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we are back from a 2-week recess in the district. Everyone must have been told or seen the impacts of the sequester.

When the sequester went into effect a little over a month ago, people did not see its immediate impact. Now it's different. Many of them, and us, were hoping that the continuing resolution would take care of the sequester, but it did not. Now many of them, and us, are hoping that the President's budget—unlike the Ryan budget, the Republican Study Caucus, or the minority budget in the Senate, which kept the sequester in place—will repeal the sequester.

We know for hospitals like those at home that have large numbers of Medicare patients a 2 percent cut to Medicare is devastating; we know our friends who are still struggling with the recovery from Hurricane Sandy will be affected by the $1 billion cut to FEMA; and for our Federal employees, the furloughs to cover the sequester will affect not only them and their families but our local economies. We need to recognize that slashing with the sequester is not the answer, but also know that we need to reduce our deficit sensibly.

□ 1230

## AMERICANS WANT A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the President released his February 2014 budget proposal this morning, and now for the first time in over 4 years, the House and the Senate and the President all have submitted budget blueprints showing their priorities for getting our Nation's finances back in good standing.

In the House, our budget balances within 10 years by slowing the growth of government, responsibly and carefully reforming Federal spending, while strengthening and preserving Medicare and Social Security for future generations. And the House budget pays down the national debt to zero within our lifetimes.

Just 12 weeks ago, taxes went up on every American; yet, unfortunately, the President's plan raises taxes again on Americans while increasing spending, growing the size of government, and never, ever balancing.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want balance in Congress, and they want a balanced budget. As we go forward, let's do our job and control spending. Let's balance our own books, and let's stop the constant push for higher taxes on the American people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

## PROTECTING EARNED BENEFITS

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to set the record straight here with regard to Social Security and Medicare:

First of all, neither one of them are responsible for the debt and the current fiscal crisis that we find ourselves facing;

Secondly, neither of them are entitlements. They're earned benefits that people started paying for the very first day, the very first hour they went to work, and they have every right to expect those benefits;

Thirdly, there are some long-term problems with both, and they should and need to be fixed, but they can be done, clearly, without reducing the benefits.

Let me remind all of us that nothing has done more in this country to lift more people out of poverty than Social Security, and nothing has done more to add more life and more years to life than Medicare.

Mr. President, my fellow Members, we must stand up for Social Security and Medicare and protect those benefits going forward.

## CONTROLLING GOVERNMENT SPENDING

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this morning was a remarkable time. The President, even though it's 65 days late, came out with a budget today. And it is interesting to note that it is about $600 billion of new taxes, after we've just had a $620 billion tax increase on this economy, with the health care bill, about another $1.2 trillion of new taxes and fees, and his budget proposal increases the size of government 50 percent over the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I've been home for the last couple of weeks talking to constituents, and what they tell me is the fact that they want a balanced budget. The President's budget never gets to balance. Our budget does. They want a balanced budget. They want us to get control of spending in Washington because they know how it affects themselves, their families, and the future of this country.

The spending coupled with all of the new regulations, the health care mandates coming down on small businesses, they are stopping job growth. We have got to get some common sense in this House.

## SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, sequestration has been in effect for 41 days, and already it is hurting American families. Just outside my district at Fort Knox, more than 5,000 civilian employees face at least 2 weeks of furlough because of these indiscriminate cuts in Federal spending.

A constituent of mine whose husband is a military technician for the Kentucky National Guard said her family will lose close to 20 percent of their income because of furloughs. He is one of at least 460 technicians in my district who will be furloughed.

I've talked with a school principal who's forced to lay off special education teachers because of sequestration. I've met with local social service organizations who are concerned that sequestration will eliminate entire Federal grant programs, jeopardizing jobs and essential services for Louisville families. And officials at the University of Louisville are worried that cuts to their research will interrupt lifesaving medical advances.

Mr. Speaker, sequestration was a threat, not a policy. That's why I voted against it. It now is clear that the real threat of sequestration is to middle class families who can least afford another recession. Congress should enact a budget that eliminates sequestration and spares even more American families the pain of this ill-advised austerity.

## A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, we've all heard the statement ''a day late and a dollar short.'' Well, the President is now 2 months late with his budget and billions of dollars short. It's clear, this President wants to balance the increase of government on the backs of the American people. He believes that government needs the resources more than hardworking Americans.

We put forward a budget to be able to protect our senior citizens, to be able to build for the future for our children. The real approach, when we're talking about balance, is to have a budget that truly balances.

This administration continues to grow government, continues to waste the hardworking dollars of the American taxpayer.

Let's stand up and put politics aside and stand up for the people of this country and put forward a budget that will truly put America back to work.

## CREATING JOBS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about the urgent need to create jobs and grow our economy, an issue that should be our number one focus right now. We are nearly a month and a half into the sequester, which has imposed painful cuts to defense, transportation, and education, and it's hurting our economy.

I'm disappointed the House Republican leadership chose the path of the sequester rather than working with House Democrats to stop these needless, across-the-board cuts. I'm also disappointed that House Republicans have chosen the politics of brinksmanship and government shutdowns rather than negotiate a compromise with Democrats.

We must stop politicizing every function of government from the debt ceiling to the budget. Creating jobs and strengthening our economy starts with the private sector and government working together to ensure confidence and investment across the country.

I encourage all of my colleagues to come together and focus on jobs. Let's work on legislation that helps our constituents obtain jobs and grows our economy.

## PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, prescription drug abuse is killing more people in this country than car wrecks. It's hard to believe, but it sneaked up on us.

In my district 10 years ago, we started an organization called UNITE, Unlawful Narcotics Investigations, Treatment and Education, a holistic approach, and it works. We've put in jail about 4,000 pushers. We've got drug counselors in schools. We've got clubs in schools to entertain young people on nice things to do and the like, drug courts in every county. It works, but the problem persists.

Last week, I had the great honor and pleasure of helping host in Orlando, Florida, a drug summit on prescription drug abuse, almost a thousand people from 49 States and several foreign countries focusing on the problem. It's the second year we've done that, the second straight year. Mayor Bloomberg was there. The head of CDC was there, the head of FDA, heads of all sorts of Federal organizations, and we're determined to help wipe out this big killer in this country.

□ 1240

## CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KEVIN KRIGGER

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the horses line up in Churchill Downs for the running of the Kentucky Derby next month, all eyes in the U.S. Virgin Islands will be on young Kevin Krigger, a jockey from my home island of St. Croix, who will be riding the horse, Goldencents.

We're all proud of Kevin, who grew up in LaVallee and attended Central High School. Kevin always wanted to be a jockey and grew up in the sport, riding horses on our beaches and country roads, challenging anyone he could to a race.

Before he was recruited by other Virgin Islanders who race in the States, he was well known on the tracks of St. Croix, St. Thomas, and Tortola as a talent to watch. He proved himself riding on the west coast, in particular, at Emerald Downs in Seattle, Washington, before his historic win on Saturday at the Santa Anita Derby.

On Saturday, Kevin Krigger became the first African American to win the Santa Anita Derby. Last fall, he was the first African American jockey to win a million dollar race in Louisiana's Delta Jackpot. If he rides Goldencents to victory in the Kentucky Derby next month, he will become the first African American to do so since 1902.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin Krigger's family and fans in the Virgin Islands will be cheering wildly on the first Saturday in May. I congratulate his mother, Averil Simmonds, and his father, Albert Krigger, Jr. We're all proud of this young man and his accomplishments, and wish him Godspeed in this and all of his future endeavors.

## PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, you can't spend more money than you bring in. That's a fairly simple concept, isn't it? But apparently not for Democrats who run the administration in Washington.

Under President Obama, we've had 4 years of government spending, each year spending over $1 trillion more than we took in. That kind of spending is not only irresponsible, it's dangerous. It drives up the national debt, hurts families, neighbors, and our friends.

The time to rein in Washington spending is now, a concept so obvious it has become a cliche. House Republicans understand this. That's why we passed a responsible budget that keeps our taxes low and balances spending. That's more money in your family's pocket.

The President is going to introduce a budget that doesn't balance and tries to raise taxes again.

House Republicans know the way forward, a way forward to foster a healthier economy and help create jobs. It's time for the President to get serious about this issue as well.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 678, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION SMALL CONDUIT HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL JOBS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 140 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 140

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except: (1) those received for printing in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII dated at least one day before the day of consideration of the amendment; and (2) pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

This resolution provides for a modified open rule for the consideration of H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act, and provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

It makes in order all amendments which were preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which otherwise comply with the rules of the House. So this modified open rule is very fair, it's a generous rule, and it will provide for a balanced and open debate on the merits of this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also pleased to stand before the House and support this rule, as well as the underlying legislation, H.R. 678, which is the long title I gave earlier.

I appreciate the hard work of the bill's chief sponsor, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), and of the subcommittee of jurisdiction, Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California, for allowing this bill to move forward from the committee and continuing the Natural Resource Committee's record, under Chairman HASTINGS' leadership, of furthering several important pieces of legislation which, if enacted, will greatly improve our Nation's energy policies and provide a responsible, balanced approach to further domestic energy development.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday we received the news that the economy had only added 88,000 jobs in the month of March. The percentage of unemployed Americans dropped, but that is almost entirely because thousands of workers have given up looking for jobs at all.

This slowdown is a warning to Congress, but we won't take it, I feel sure, since we've pretty much ignored it. Unless this majority reverses the spending cuts contained in the sequester, the health of our economy is only getting worse.

Months ago, economists were warning that the sequester will stall out our economy and lead to job loss, and as we can see by the March data, their predictions are beginning to come true.

With economic warning bells beginning to toll, one would expect Congress to make job creation our number one priority. But one would certainly be wrong because we haven't done that at all. Unfortunately, such expectations don't even come close.

Instead of working on legislation to grow our economy and to create some good-paying jobs, we are wasting valuable session time discussing yet another bill that went nowhere in the last Congress, and I predict will go nowhere in this one as well. But we seem to have the time to waste.

The majority has decided that erasing environmental regulations for hydropower companies is a better use of time than putting Americans back to work and to help families pay their bills.

Furthermore, the bill before us today is a solution in search of a problem that does not exist. Despite the rhetoric of the majority, small conduit hydropower projects are rarely delayed because of environmental regulations. In fact, from 2006 to 2010, 13 exemptions were completed in less than a year, and in 2011 there were nine exemptions that were granted in an average of 40 days.

In addition, changes within the last year have made the process even easier for hydropower developers. Under the new regulations by the Bureau of Reclamation, all a developer has to do to avoid a full environmental assessment is to get a simple, 1½ page form filled out with 15 boxes to check ''yes'' or ''no.'' That is certainly not a burdensome regulation. All they have to do is check the box ''yes'' or ''no,'' indicate the project is not in an especially sensitive area.

Most small conduit hydropower projects will easily pass this test because the reclamation sites are already developed. But despite what you may hear, there is little evidence that there is even a problem with hydropower regulation that needs to be solved.

Contained within today's legislation is a proposal to clarify the lines of authority between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. This is a worthwhile effort that would receive bipartisan support, and we made that very clear. Standing alone, though, this proposal could pass on suspension within a matter of minutes. That would, of course, leave us with nothing to do here today, so here we are.

During the debate in the Natural Resources Committee, the majority was given the opportunity to agree to the noncontroversial and bipartisan parts of the legislation and drop their partisan attacks on environmental safeguards.

□ 1250

Unfortunately, the majority has once again rejected this chance for productive compromise and chosen the partisan path. And as a result, we are here spending time debating another partisan bill that will not pass the Senate and turning our back on the pressing economic needs of this country.

I've said many times on the floor during rules debates that CBS News had estimated it costs $24 million a week to run the Congress of the United States. And it has been embarrassing that we do so little work. But for millions of Americans, the luxury of the time that we take here is something they cannot afford.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the underlying legislation so we can get back to the task of growing our economy, repealing the sequester, and creating American jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of this piece of legislation, to explain why it is so necessary that we do this, even though on paper it seems like this problem is solved.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank Chairman BISHOP for yielding.

When we're talking about job creation in this country, I think it's worthy to note I just traveled through the Third Congressional District of Colorado visiting with people from Pueblo to Alamosa, Durango, Cortez, Montrose, Craig, Hayden, and Steamboat. One of the greatest challenges that they face is regulations coming out of Washington when it comes to job creation.

The fact of the matter is we're spending $1.75 trillion per year for businesses to be able to comply with government mandates. Is it a sensible approach to be able to look at regulations that simply don't work and are inhibiting job creation and our ability to be able to achieve the most carbon-free, environmentally friendly legislation that we can have? That's hydropower. That is a sensible approach.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of House Resolution 140 and for an open discussion on how we're going to be able to work together to be able to promote clean, renewable hydropower development in rural America and create much-needed jobs in the process. At a time when our country needs to be able to focus on domestic energy production and job creation, hydropower can play a critical role in providing clean renewable energy while expanding job opportunities in some of our hardest hit rural communities.

Hydropower is the cheapest and cleanest source of electricity available through modern technology. It's the highest source of non-carbon-emitting energy in the world and accounts for approximately 75 percent of the United States' total renewable electricity generation, making it the leading renewable energy resource of power. Canal-based hydropower can produce up to 1,400 megawatts of power in Colorado alone. Let's put this in perspective. This is the equivalent of the power produced by the originally designed output of the Glen Canyon Dam, just out of Colorado, not including the rest of the western United States.

Increased conduit hydropower serves a number of purposes: it produces renewable and emissions-free energy that can be used to pump water or sell electricity to the grid; it can offset diesel-generated pumps; it can generate revenue for the hydropower developer to help pay for aging infrastructure costs and water/power facility modernization; and it can create local jobs and generate revenue for the Federal Government.

As it stands, Federal regulations hinder this development on Federal projects and subject job creators to unnecessary requirements which can render small hydropower projects economically unfeasible. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act. This legislation authorizes power development at the agency's conduits to clear up multi-agency confusion and duplicative processes and reduces the regulatory costs associated with hydropower development.

H.R. 678, as passed by the Natural Resources Committee with bipartisan support, would eliminate the requirement of duplicative and unnecessary environmental analyses for projects on manmade facilities which already underwent a full environmental review at the time of their construction or when undergoing rehabilitation. The bill covers small hydropower generators installed on manmade pipes, ditches, and canals; and the renewable energy development promoted by the bill in no way impacts the natural environment. By streamlining this process, we can finally make these small conduit hydropower projects financially feasible and unleash private investment in clean energy that will reduce costs for ratepayers and increase tax revenue for the Treasury while putting people back to work.

I understand that some of my friends on the other side have reservations about this provision; and as I have made clear in the past, I'm open to working with my colleagues to be able to address their concerns with the NEPA provision. However, failure to address the existing regulatory uncertainty would negate one of the primary purposes of the bill and would ensure that the renewable energy development envisioned by the bill remains in limbo. I'm optimistic that discussing this issue openly will allay any concerns Members may have and allow us

to be able to arrive at a solution which ensures the implementation of a statutory framework that streamlines the project approval process and reduces costs.

I'm proud to have the support of the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, and the American Public Power Association, among others. I think the broad support this bill has seen among those most directly impacted indicates how close we are to making this renewable energy development a reality. I look forward to an open discussion on the merits of the bill, which I believe will speak for themselves.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time until my colleague is ready to close.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me take a moment just to give my impression of this particular bill, and then I'll be ready to close at that time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill which had a bipartisan vote in this body last time and a bipartisan vote in the committee, sent to the Senate, where an errant Senator was able to hold the process up. Fortunately, in this session, there is a new chairman of that committee in the Senate from the West who clearly understands the value and significance of hydroelectric power.

So I think that everyone in this body on both sides of the aisle can agree that our Nation is in great need of more energy. If we want to create real jobs, private sector jobs, there has to be a strong energy component to our ability to do that. Our Nation has tremendous amounts of energy that are locked away domestically in the forms of oil and gas and low sulphur and high-BTU coal reserves; but too often special interest groups and layers of bureaucracy have kept us from becoming more energy self-sufficient with these areas. And we're now seeing and feeling the results every time somebody tries to pay an electric bill.

This administration seems to be dragging its feet on energy development of everything from the Keystone Pipeline to the development of public lands. But there is also another source of energy that is presently being unused and can be put to good use without negatively impacting the environment. The energy resource is what we're addressing here in this particular bill. This bill deals with electricity that can be generated from hydro, a renewable energy resource that is very clean and helpful to the environment.

Numerous witnesses testified this year and last year that there is an uncertainty on the NEPA costs, which throw these projects into limbo and often render projects financially unfeasible and stifle private investment far beyond what has been able to be done. Thus, this is stifling what could be done to produce self-sufficiency in energy production. One witness from Arizona simply testified in 2011 that it would cost them $20,000 to install this generator that would create energy in a Federal canal. Yet the NEPA analysis would cost them $50,000 to check the boxes and do that simple paperwork, as we have heard about. The environmental paperwork in this case is almost three times the cost of the capital that you would put into the project. And it all is redundant since the NEPA analysis was done in the first place for the entire canal. This is a second project put in the same canal that has already gone through this process. It's a manmade canal.

Witnesses have testified this year that despite the Bureau of Reclamation's claim of its categorical exclusions and having a policy in place, not one project has utilized this project because of a potential legal uncertainty surrounding categorical exclusions.

□ 1300

As a result, there is no new development that has occurred, and the gentleman from Colorado's amendment will improve this particular situation. So, once again, let this be done.

This is not denying a NEPA review. NEPA has already been done on every one of these projects. This is saying you don't need to do the same thing a second time, which is simply redundant, it is silly, it's red tape, bungling by administrations that need not be there.

The choice is very simple in this particular bill: Either you can give the administration, the executive branch, the right to make these kinds of decisions on moving us forward, in which case the administration can make and can take away their decision at whim, in which case it invites litigation because of the uncertainty of an administrative policy, and also invites conflict within different administrative agencies. Or we can do what we're supposed to do and actually pass legislation to solve problems. The gentleman from Colorado's approach is simply allowing the legislature to make the decision, to institute what the policy will be and tell the agencies how they will proceed into the future. We can either have the legislature stand up and do our job and do it the right way or we can pass it all off and let the executive branch come up with regulations now which they could change and also are subject to the fear of litigation.

This is an easy thing to do. This bill actually should be a no-brainer. It will increase the energy production we have in the country, it will increase the ability of making sure that we have adequate water resources in the West, it will also give a needed boost of revenues to the canal companies, and it will create ultimately more jobs, especially with a cheap form of highly effective energy production.

This bill is reasonable, and it's understandable why it passed with a bipartisan vote last time. I hope it passes with a bipartisan vote again, and I hope we can recognize that this will move us forward.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time unless the gentlelady has other speeches that she has requests for.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, so I am prepared to close if my colleague is.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am prepared to close when you are.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today's bill does nothing to address the pressing economic issues facing every American household and fails to stop the sequestration cuts that are threatening our economy as a whole. It's rather ambiguous. On one hand it gives; on the other hand it takes back away, but we'll get into that in the general debate.

Instead, today's legislation unnecessarily attacks environmental protections while doing nothing to create new jobs. Today's legislation includes a blanket waiver for all small conduit hydropower projects that generate less than 5 megawatts of power. The requirement is arbitrary and would fail to protect the environment. Environmental danger is not determined by the megawatts produced but whether the hydropower project is located where it is likely to do damage. A 1-megawatt project in the wrong location would be more harmful to the environment than a 6-megawatt project in the right location.

Perhaps most importantly, consideration of this legislation is taking up time that we could otherwise be using to repeal the sequester and create jobs. As I have mentioned repeatedly on the House floor, my colleague and ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, has appeared at the Rules Committee repeatedly offering legislation to repeal the sequester and reduce our deficit in a responsible way. The Rules Committee on at least three times has never even allowed it to come to the floor. Despite voting on hydropower legislation twice in the last 13 months, the majority has rejected Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who, as I said, is the ranking member on the Budget Committee, and his bill would save and create thousands of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1426 from Representative TIM BISHOP of New York to roll back tax giveaways to big oil companies. The bill is known as the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous matter immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so that we can get back to trying to grow our economy and create American jobs,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me state a couple of things. Number one, this is a good rule. Therefore, you should vote for this rule. It is a fair and open rule—a fair and modified open rule. More importantly, it is a rule that will allow us to discuss a very good bill. This bill encourages energy production. We may think of these as small energy projects, but I am told that all these small projects already being held up in Colorado would create the amount of energy that comes from a large project like the Glen Canyon Dam. It's a large amount of energy that is clean energy that we will be producing. Number two, this bill gets rid of redundancy. It is not that we are doing away with environmental protection or a review for environmental protection. That environmental protection review has already been done. It is that we're simply saying for these small projects you don't need to do the same thing a second time and incur the cost, which is an amazing amount of cost, and potential litigation factors that go along with it.

If we do want to produce private sector jobs, and that is a worthy goal, you have to have energy to do it. This bill produces the energy which will be used to grow the economy to produce those jobs that we really want. That is why it is a bipartisan bill, and I expect a bipartisan vote on this particular bill. It's a good bill, and we should pass it today. This is a fair rule, and I urge its adoption.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 140 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1426) to disallow the deduction for income attributable to domestic production activities with respect to oil and gas activities of major integrated oil companies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1426.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 190, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—236

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

Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—190

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

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL)
Hastings (FL)
Lynch
Markey
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1334

Mr. PASCRELL changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ELECTING MEMBERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 142, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 142

*Resolved,*

**SECTION 1. ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.**

(a) JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY.—The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration and the chair of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Committee on Appropriations:

(1) Mr. Harper.
(2) Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.
(3) Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.—The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee on Printing, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration:

(1) Mr. Harper.
(2) Mr. Nugent.
(3) Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.
(4) Mr. Vargas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 142.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## REMOVAL OF MR. SMITH OF NEBRASKA AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1175

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw Mr. ADRIAN SMITH of Nebraska as a cosponsor of H.R. 1175.

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

There was no objection.

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION SMALL CONDUIT HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL JOBS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 678.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Pursuant to House Resolution 140 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 678.

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

□ 1338

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act.

Those of us from the Pacific Northwest know and understand the importance of hydropower and the significant role it plays in our economy. In my home State of Washington, hydropower produces 70 percent of our power, and it helps keep electricity rates low and affordable for our residents.

□ 1340

It is one of the cheapest and cleanest forms of electricity, and helps make other intermittent sources of renewable energy, like wind and solar, possible.

Yet too often, as is frequently the case with energy projects on Federal lands, the development of new hydropower gets caught up in bureaucratic red tape and regulations.

Today's bill, sponsored by our colleague from Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, would cut through that red tape to expand the development of small conduit hydropower. Specifically, it clears up Federal agency confusion by directly authorizing hydropower development at almost 47,000 miles of Bureau of Reclamation canals. It also streamlines the regulatory process for developing small canal and pipeline hydropower projects on existing Bureau of Reclamation facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I want to stress the point that these new projects will only be at existing facilities. These existing man-made facilities have already gone through extensive environmental review when they were initially built. Requiring duplicative reviews on existing facilities only imposes unnecessary delays and, thus, administrative costs.

I realize that the Bureau of Reclamation has come up with its own version of streamlining since we considered this bill in the last Congress, but it's only a theoretical version of streamlining since it has never been used in the 6 months after it was created. This bill simply streamlines the regulatory and administrative process so that water users can be free to develop hydropower at the Federal canals they already operate and maintain.

This bill will help generate thousands of megawatts of clean, cheap, abundant hydropower and, thus, will bring in new revenue to the Federal Government and, more importantly, Mr. Chairman, create new American jobs. Best of all, we can do this at no cost to the American taxpayer. This is exactly the type of commonsense proposal that Republicans support as part of the all-of-the-above energy plan. Hydropower must be part of the solution. Families and small businesses rely on access to affordable electricity, and this bill is a simple way to lower prices by expanding production on one of the best forms of clean, renewable energy.

Mr. Chairman, nearly identical legislation passed the House last Congress with bipartisan support. I hope the House will once again do so today, and that the Senate will take action on this job-creating energy bill.

I want to thank particularly members of the Natural Resources Committee Mr. TIPTON of Colorado, Mr. GOSAR of Arizona, and Mr. COSTA of California for their tremendous work on this bill and for being strong champions of small-scale hydropower production.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the general premise of this bill but oppose the legislation as is due to the inclusion of the NEPA waiver.

Today we are debating H.R. 678, a bill that should be noncontroversial. In fact, it should have already been enacted into law. We all agree that adding small conduit hydropower projects is a great idea—no, it's really a wonderful idea—and H.R. 678 could have easily been passed through the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. But, unfortunately, my esteemed colleagues on the other side have chosen to turn this noncontroversial bill into a partisan fight over ideology by waiving compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, for Federal conduit projects.

As my colleague from Washington indicated, it means jobs. It means the addition of clean energy. It means all of those things, but to the exclusion of NEPA. As the gentleman mentioned, H.R. 678 would amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and, thus, would facilitate and expand the private development of small conduit hydropower at the Bureau of Reclamation facilities. The legislation seeks to accomplish several goals, the most important of which is authorizing reclamation to develop and increase power at most of those facilities.

H.R. 678 also includes a provision that waives NEPA for all conduit projects generating less than 5 megawatts. The bill waives NEPA, which is on page 4, lines 14 to 18, even though the Bureau of Reclamation has implemented a categorical exclusion on their own accord to apply to small conduit projects. You may call it theoretical, but it has only been there 6 months, and it takes government a long time to get the word out to those parties. The waiver of NEPA in this bill is unnecessary, since Reclamation has already implemented this guidance through this categorical exclusion. The legislation seeks to solve a NEPA problem that does not exist. Unfortunately, some Members on the other side of the aisle have characterized the waiver of NEPA as ''the main purpose of this legislation.''

The waiver in this bill is the exact same waiver that Republicans put into the nearly identical bill last Congress. Just like the last time, the Senate will not pass it, and the bill will again expire in the Senate. This is totally unnecessary. This is not what anyone on this side of the aisle wants to see happen, and we would support the bill without the NEPA waiver.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation and ask my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this legislation on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the so-called streamlining that the Bureau has pledged to do and has done has produced no new projects for reasons that were made very clear to our Subcommittee on Water and Power by numerous witnesses. NEPA is at the heart of the problem. As the chairman said, the Bureau of Reclamation operates 47,000 miles of pipelines and canals that have already undergone extensive environmental review. By installing small generators in the existing pipelines, we could add the equivalent generating capacity of major hydroelectric dams, meaning millions of dollars of new revenue to the government, millions of watts of new, clean, cheap electricity, and all the jobs these projects would produce.

The gentlelady has said that she supports the objective and is willing to do everything that she can to help except by getting government out of the way. The Federal bureaucracy has made it cost prohibitive for people to install these small generators in these existing canals and pipelines. Rather, they force them to conduct crushingly expensive environmental reviews, navigate time-consuming bureaucratic mazes, pay exorbitant administrative fees, and risk the uncertainties of endless internal review and external litigation. These bureaucratic obstacles often cost more than the projects themselves and turn sensible, economic electricity projects into cost-prohibitive farces.

As proposed to be amended, this bill requires the Bureau to categorically exclude the installation of these small, hydroelectric generators in existing facilities that have already undergone environmental review. It designates the central office within the Bureau to provide uniform guidance on processing applications. It establishes a sensible and streamlined process to determine development rights. And it ensures that installation of hydrogenerators will not disrupt existing water operations.

Mr. Chairman, think about the implications just to farming as one example. Some irrigation districts are forced to use diesel generators to pump water to their fields. You put hydroelectric generators in existing canals and pipes, and they become virtually self-sustaining, while reducing reliance on other sources of electricity that do produce air emissions.

It is truly mystifying that a Nation plagued by prolonged economic stagnation, chronic unemployment, and increasingly scarce and expensive electricity would adopt a willful and deliberate policy obstructing the construction of these inexpensive and innocuous generators in already-existing facilities. Even FERC, a bastion of regulatory excess, agrees that these studies are unnecessary when conducted on similar non-Federal facilities.

I believe this bill is a model for the future. I hope that similar regulatory reforms will soon be extended to other Federal and non-Federal facilities.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member, Congresswoman NAPOLITANO, for her efforts on this legislation, Chairman DOC HASTINGS, as well as the chair of the subcommittee, TOM MCCLINTOCK, and the author of this measure, Congressman TIPTON, for trying to bring folks together.

□ 1350

Mr. Chairman, people from every walk of life are looking to Congress today to see if we can come together to deal with any of our problems, whether they be big, small, or in between. I rise today to support legislation, I think, that does that. This isn't the biggest

legislation we'll deal with this year, nor is it the smallest; but it's something that will help America's energy policy.

Our bipartisan bill would amend the Reclamation Act, as has been stated, of 1939, to create a permanent process for how local irrigation districts and water agencies develop this very valuable, renewable, carbon-free energy at our reclamation facilities. And as we're putting together an energy policy that uses all-of-the-above, this becomes an important part.

H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act, is a bipartisan bill that puts existing resources and knowledge we already have to expand one of the most important tools in our Nation's energy toolbox. Let me repeat that: one of the most important tools in our Nation's energy toolbox.

Hydropower is the single largest source of clean, sustainable energy and has been powering our country for over 100 years throughout the land. When most people think about hydropower, of course, they think about the big projects, Hoover Dam and other modern engineering marvels.

However, the beauty of this hydropower legislation is it can also be used on much smaller scaled, reliable projects in which we already have the infrastructure in place. Every day, water flows thousands of miles through canals, pipes and ditches across this country. I know—I happen to represent one of those places, the great San Joaquin Valley, in which we have a vast network of dams and reservoirs and canals that provide that water for those who most need it, our cities and our farms.

We have an old saying: where water flows, food grows. Every day we miss valuable opportunities to utilize this resource's full potential. This bill changes that.

This water could easily be harnessed to provide low-cost, renewable energy to American families and help add to the increment of energy that we need in this country.

Currently, small conduit hydropower is largely untapped and underutilized; and it's also, obviously, a clean-energy opportunity. The greatest barrier to unleashing the next generation of hydropower is not technological, because we have made great progress on the technological side. Unfortunately, it's regulatory.

Currently, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, otherwise known as FERC, maintains jurisdiction over small projects like those that I am talking about.

Serving on the Natural Resources Committee, I've heard from folks across the country say that these regulations are too costly and too difficult to navigate. Obtaining an exception from FERC's permitting rules can take up to 6 months and cost nearly $50,000 for a local water district to pursue. That's unnecessary, and it's also a waste of valuable resources.

Our bipartisan bill, again, would amend the Reclamation Act of 1939 to create a permanent process for how local irrigation districts and water agencies develop this very valuable, renewable, carbon-free resource for reclamation facilities.

By streamlining the process, the irrigation districts would be empowered to develop small conduit hydropower at no cost to the taxpayers. These projects typically are 5 megawatts and less.

Harnessing the power of water already flowing through reclamation facilities would stimulate rural economies, reduce pumping costs for farmers who face those pumping costs every year.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues who are supporting this legislation. I want to thank Congressman TIPTON for this effort, because it helps us take advantage of existing facilities that are already in place to provide additional resource of power where we need it.

If we want to strengthen our energy portfolio, let's start with the low-hanging fruit. This is low-hanging fruit.

Let me just give you some numbers. In California there are 20 small hydro projects, should this legislation become law, that would be available to this process. Let me underline that: 20 projects in California that would qualify.

In the Nation, the Bureau of Reclamation has determined that there are 373 projects throughout the country that potentially would qualify should this legislation become law.

The bill does just that. I urge your support for H.R. 678.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank Chairman HASTINGS for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 678 is a commonsense piece of legislation to foster clean, renewable energy development, create rural jobs in America, and to do so without taxpayer cost, while returning revenues to the U.S. Treasury and, by all measures, should be considered low-hanging fruit, as our fellow Member has just noted, for congressional action.

There's been a lot of discussion on both sides of the aisle about the need to be able to pursue an all-of-the-above strategy. Hydropower, as the cleanest and most abundant natural energy source, should be at the forefront of any comprehensive natural energy policy.

Increased conduit hydropower serves a number of purposes. It produces renewable and emissions-free energy that can be used to pump water or sell electricity into the grid; it can generate revenue for the irrigation district to be able to help pay for aging infrastructure costs and facilitate modernization; and it can create local jobs and generate revenue to the Federal Government.

It's as simple as this poster demonstrates, as easy as putting a portable generator into moving canal water.

Many irrigation districts and electrical utilities seek to develop hydropower on Bureau of Reclamation pipes, ditches and canals; but regulatory uncertainty and the threat of unnecessary bureaucratic requirements stand in the way.

This legislation seeks to remove duplicative environmental analysis where doing so will considerably reduce costs for hydropower developers, while retaining the analysis necessary to protect valuable natural resources.

While the Bureau of Reclamation has recently begun to inventory facilities suitable for small conduit hydropower generation and develop directives and standards to help promote that end, for far too long, duplicative review for small hydropower projects on existing, manmade facilities rendered these projects financially unfeasible, and significant uncertainty still remains.

The generating units covered by H.R. 678 would be installed on entirely manmade waterways which have already received a full environmental review when they were built or rehabilitated. Any transmission associated with these projects that would result from the passage of this bill must still undergo full environmental review where they impact the environment. To require a lengthy review for dropping a small generator into a pipe simply defies logic, and we cannot pursue an all-of-the-above energy strategy if we continue business as usual.

In addition to creating regulatory certainty and removing duplicative processes, this legislation authorizes power development at the agency's conduits to clear up multi-Federal agency confusion and further reduces the regulatory costs associated with hydropower development. This provision of the bill will provide the necessary statutory authority to be able to reduce litigation that the agency is sure to seek under the current framework which relies on broad authorities that do not specifically authorize hydropower development.

This legislation ensures the continued use of the Bureau facilities, primarily for water supply and irrigation, and protects the interests of those maintaining and operating these facilities by offering them the first right of refusal to take advantage of small conduit energy development projects.

Non-Federal operators know the details of the facilities best and are locally invested. As a result, it's only logical to offer them the first opportunity to develop this energy on facilities that they maintain.

Additionally, those irrigation districts with preexisting arrangements with the Bureau or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for water delivery and hydropower development will not be disturbed by this bill.

I'm proud to have the support of the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, the American Public Power Association, and the National Hydropower Association, among others.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be able to make this public law and to start putting rural America back to work and developing clean, renewable energy.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I agree with my colleague, except some of those projects were built in 1902 and through the 1970s. I think we do need NEPA protection.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

□ 1400

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I would like to thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Madam Chair, I rise to object today to the consideration of this bill and rather propose that we stand in this House and we consider Mr. HOYER's Make It In America package. We can come together and focus on real solutions that will get our economy moving again, and we should take up Mr. HOYER's Make It In America package because it will strengthen our economy and create non-outsourceable jobs at home, here in America. The Make It In America package includes bills like mine, H.R. 1022, the Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2013 that will help secure America's place as a leader in science and technology with a 21st century workforce.

What are rare Earth elements? Well, these are 17 chemical elements—elements that, prior to coming to Congress and learning about how they affect our economy, I couldn't point out at pistol point—that are very critical to making cell phones, to making our electric cars, and also to making our antimissile systems. Despite the name, they are very abundant in our country and they can be extracted in an environmentally safe manner.

So what's the problem? Well, today, 97 percent of rare Earth elements are extracted and exported from China. Eighty percent of rare Earth magnets and almost 100 percent of related metal production are coming from China. In 2010, China temporarily cut off rare Earth supplies to Japan, the European Union, and the United States, highlighting the potential consequences to the United States for relying so heavily upon China for rare Earth production that is so crucial and critical to what we can create here in America.

My district includes northern Silicon Valley, home of silicon chip processing, home of the technology boom, home of the Internet, and also home of many advanced manufacturing production sites. H.R. 1022, the Securing Energy Critical Elements in American Jobs Act of 2013 aims to help reduce our dependence on China for these critical elements and instead make it here in America. But in order for us to do this, we need to invest in developing our technical workforce here at home.

Currently, the United States lacks the necessary technical expertise to ensure a reliable supply of energy critical elements. My bill, H.R. 1022, enlists the talents of our university students and encourages them to develop the technical expertise necessary to secure America's access to these elements. We need to ensure that the best and brightest minds in our area and our country have the tools and support they need to support America's access to energy critical elements. H.R. 1022 will promote collaboration and research opportunities in the fields of energy-critical elements for students at higher institutions, and coordination of Federal agencies to promote a stable supply of energy-critical elements.

We also have in my congressional district what's called the ''Tri-Valley,'' or, as I like to call it, the ''I Valley,'' or the ''Innovation Valley.'' This area also would rely upon energy-critical elements. And as the ranking member said, we have an opportunity today to work in a bipartisan fashion. Unfortunately, I do not see us doing that. So I would conclude by asking that we come together.

Also, in my bill there's a loan guarantee for companies with new processing and refining technologies. The Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2013 will help to spur private investment in companies on the forefront of this critical field. It's very important that we have the Federal Government at the very inception, in the beginning, providing the research and Federal funding. But most important is to get it out into private industry. And that's what this bill calls upon.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to stop wasting time with partisan bills like this today. Instead, let's come together to train and secure a 21st century workforce. Let's harness our own resources. Let's Make It In America, and we can help all Americans make it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, before I yield time to the gentlelady from Wyoming, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I find the gentleman's argument on the other side rather striking because he's talking about American-made jobs and another piece of legislation not associated with this. And I would just point out, what could be more American-made jobs than putting hydropower facilities on American soil? That creates jobs. That's what this bill is all about.

And the second point, the gentleman mentioned the rare Earth issue that we have. Last Congress, we passed legislation here so we could utilize the known rare Earth supplies we have in this country, and it was the other body, controlled by the gentleman's own party, that didn't act on it. And he sounds like it is a big, big issue now. I suspect we may have, Madam Chairman, that legislation again in front of us, and I would hope that we could elicit the gentleman's support when that bill comes to the floor.

With that, Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), a valuable member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I rise in support of H.R. 678, of which I'm an original cosponsor, and I want to thank Representative TIPTON, Chairman MCCLINTOCK, and Chairman HASTINGS for their hard work on this bill, which unlocks significant hydropower development potential in my home State of Wyoming.

Congress and the Bureau of Reclamation have over the years created hundreds of canals and pipelines to serve water uses in the West. Most of these conduits were never envisioned as power sources because the technology wasn't there or it wasn't yet cost-effective. But technology has changed, and now it's feasible to harness and channel the energy byproduct of these water flows. The Bureau of Reclamation has identified 373 conduits in the West with hydropower potential. Wyoming leads the States with 121 of these sites and is second only to Colorado in terms of the potential energy output. In Wyoming alone, the estimated potential is 82 million kilowatt hours annually from a clean, renewable energy source. Unleashing this potential, while still protecting the environment and end water users, is what this bill is all about.

First, H.R. 678 eliminates bureaucratic confusion by expressly authorizing the Bureau to oversee hydropower development in its conduits.

Second, it directs the Bureau of Reclamation to exempt small hydropower projects from duplicative environmental paperwork requirements. We're talking about placing small power generators in canals and ditches where the ground has already been disturbed. Fences have gone up. Environmental analysis has been conducted, sometimes multiple times because of the Bureau's contract renewals with some water users. Requiring duplicative environmental analysis on preexisting conduits makes no sense, provides no environmental benefit, and imposes more costs and bureaucratic uncertainty on potential developers.

Third, the bill protects water supply and delivery as the primary and fundamental priority for these conduits, whose vital mission will not be disrupted.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, jobs-creating bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentlewoman from California has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CARDENAS. I thank the gentlewoman for giving me the opportunity to speak on this matter.

H.R. 678 could easily be a bipartisan, noncontroversial bill. But Republicans insist on including an unnecessary provision to waive environmental review. It sets the wrong precedent. Nearly 100 days have passed since the 113th Congress has been sworn in, and not one bill has been brought to the floor that would have a measurable effect of reinvigorating our manufacturing sector. In fact, quite the opposite has happened.

Democrats have announced the Make It In America initiative to focus on four areas to help our economy grow. In order to strengthen the economy, this Congress must: adopt and pursue a comprehensive manufacturing strategy; promote the export of U.S. goods; encourage innovation; and train a 21st century workforce. In addition to these four core components, we must work together to address the equally important task of getting our small business owners access to capital they so desperately need. Without capital, our businesses are stagnant, cannot invest in their own growth, and will not hire that unemployed person who has been searching for a job for months.

We must do more to get the financial institutions back to lending in this country. Now it's up to Republicans and Democrats to work together to enact and pass Make It In America legislation and help secure America as the world leader when it comes to job creation and when it comes to innovation. When it comes to hydropower, it's very important for us to understand yes, we need more hydropower, yes, we need innovation, yes, we need to make sure the small and large hydropower actually moves forward. But doing it at the expense of the environment by waiving environmental review is just not the right way to do it.

□ 1410

Many people in these Chambers speak constantly of making sure that we don't put things on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. Every time we waive environmental review, every time that we don't do things carefully, we move in a direction where it takes sometimes a year or 2 or 3 to go in the wrong direction, it takes decades for us to correct those environmental problems.

So environmental review should be part of the process and, yes, it should be streamlined and, yes, we need to make sure that we do things in a fashion that does put people back to work, but we have to do it carefully and responsibly.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), another valuable member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation and Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act of 2013. This legislation was one of Representative TIPTON's and my top priorities in the Natural Resources Committee last Congress, so I am pleased to join him again as an original cosponsor and appreciate that the House is taking up the legislation so quickly in the 113th Congress.

Our country is failing to fully tap its hydroelectric power generation potential. The Federal Government owns over 47,000 miles of canals, laterals, drains, pipeline and tunnels throughout the West that are perfectly suitable for hydropower production, but hardworking irrigators and power providers in our districts, already operating and maintaining this infrastructure on behalf of the Federal Government, cannot install hydropower generators because government regulations and bureaucratic confusion are making it cost prohibitive.

H.R. 678 will clear away these bureaucratic obstacles that stand between our Nation and thousands of megawatts of clean, cheap, abundant, and reliable hydroelectricity. The resulting development will create jobs in rural communities hit hardest by the recession, increase our country's renewable energy portfolio, and even generate revenue for the Federal Treasury.

The Members of this body opposing this legislation claim it could cause harm to the environment. To be clear, this bill only allows for development on existing irrigation canals and ditch systems, not free-flowing rivers and streams. These conduits have been in place for years, do not contain any endangered wildlife or fish, and were subject to environmental analysis at the time of construction or rehabilitation.

On the poster to my left is a clear example of what we are talking about. Folks, it's concrete. It's been sitting here with running water. I don't see the need and I hope you don't see the need for a NEPA environmental assessment. This canal is in the western part of my congressional district. We have miles of this type of infrastructure throughout the State, including the Central Arizona Project. It provides my constituents with the water necessary to live in the desert and even grow a good portion of this Nation's produce.

The experts on the ground say we are sitting on a hydropower gold mine waiting for the needed clarifications and streamlining that will cut costs and make this program more attractive. There are over 26 locations just like this one in my State alone—mostly in Yuma, Pinal, and western Maricopa Counties—that are suitable for this development. The Agri-Business Council of Arizona believes its members could produce enough low-cost clean energy to power nearly 5,000 homes simply by installing these small hydropower generators. That is a huge economic impact for the small rural communities these irrigators serve. They would provide a real economic boost and lower energy costs.

There are many solutions to our Nation's energy crisis, but hydropower is clearly part of our all-of-the-above plan. It already accounts for about 75 percent of this country's total renewable electricity generation, and we haven't even begun yet.

Early this Congress, the House unanimously passed the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act, which promotes development on privately owned infrastructure. We should do the same today on Congressman TIPTON's and my legislation that does the same for publicly owned infrastructure.

Congress would be doing the American people an injustice if we didn't move swiftly on this bill. Hydropower must be an integral component of the long-term all-of-the-above energy strategy in Arizona and for our Nation, and this bill will allow rural western communities to play a major role in that future. I will continue to work with Congressman TIPTON to ensure that this bill not only passes the House this year but gets through the Senate and is sent to the President's desk for his signature. Folks, it is that simple: commonsense utilization of infrastructure we already have.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I am glad that there are some visual effects here. It is important. But I don't know how all the canal and for the release, were there any levee issues. So it is important to have a NEPA review.

I would now like to yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentlelady from my own home State of California for yielding time.

Madam Chair, this bill is something that Democrats could support if proper environmental review were not made a problem. I really believe this Congress needs to get back to getting serious about discussing how we're going to put our country back to work.

The national unemployment rate is 7.6 percent, and in my own district it's nearly 11 percent. The Congress should be focused on putting Americans back to work. Democrats have a plan. It's called Make It In America. This plan, put together by Mr. HOYER from Maryland, addresses the most pressing crisis that our Nation faces, the jobs crisis, and it will put Americans back to work. It has four main points:

Number one, adopt and pursue a national manufacturing strategy;

Number two, promote the export of American goods;

Number three, encourage manufacturers to bring jobs and innovation back to America;

Number four, train and secure a 21st century workforce.

We have the tools at our disposal to do these things.

The legislation that I have introduced that is a part of the Make It In America plan is called the Jobs Skills for America's Students Act. It encourages partnerships between employers and educational institutions. Employers who participate are able to receive a $2,000 tax credit per student participating in a qualified technical training and skills program, with a total credit amount cap of $10,000 per year.

Many of America's fastest growing industries, industries that will benefit from the Make It In America plan, like advanced manufacturing and clean energy, require a highly skilled workforce. These industries struggle to find workers who possess the technical training that they require. The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that 600,000 manufacturing jobs remain unfilled due to a lack of qualified candidates. Just today, we learned from the Department of Labor that there are 3.9 million job openings in America, the most in almost 5 years. Many of these jobs are unfilled because of the lack of training.

The Job Skills for America's Students Act partners key industries with community colleges and other programs to offer students the opportunity to obtain the training they need to thrive in the field of their choice. To grow our middle class and create a workforce for the future, we must close the skills gap and we must make training affordable and effective.

I urge my Republican colleagues to work with Democrats to pass each piece of the Make It In America legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another member of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Chairman HASTINGS, thanks to you and to Mr. TIPTON for the opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 678 today. This bill reflects an issue that is of true importance to my home State of Montana.

You know, when most people think of our rivers and waterways in Montana, they think of celebrities like Brad Pitt standing in the Little Blackfoot River casting for trout in the movie ''A River Runs Through It.''

Back in Montana, we rely on our rivers and our natural resources as an important part of our way of life. However, I'm here today to focus on a very significant benefit of our waterways, and that's hydropower. Our waterways help power our homes, they irrigate our farms and ranches, and they water our livestock. In Montana, about a third of our energy comes from hydropower, generating 1,100 megawatts per year. To put this in perspective, 1 megawatt will power nearly 600 homes. Six of Montana's 10 largest generating plants run on hydroelectric power. But we're not here to talk about streams and rivers; we're here to talk about man-made canals and manmade waterways.

The Bureau of Reclamation has constructed 32 such projects in Montana, and with the improved ability to harness the energy of moving water in conduits, the Rural Jobs Act would allow each of these projects to generate more than 26 million kilowatts per hour of power. There is no reason red tape should tie up that much alternative energy potential.

This bill will help lower energy costs, create Montana jobs, and provide our Nation with a sustainable, renewable source of energy. This is common sense. I believe that H.R. 678, the Rural Jobs Act, is important for our country, and I strongly support its passage.

□ 1420

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), another member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, once in awhile a bill comes through that even makes great sense in Washington, D.C., and this is a really commonsense measure. I live on a farm in northern California where I'm surrounded by canals and ditches and water moving all about in my daily life in producing rice, and so there's all these opportunities we would have on installations like that. But we're talking today about Bureau installations to put renewable power in place that, according to this chart here, would affect many, many States with many installations and provide many American jobs.

The opportunities of this bill, just putting the bureaucracy and the red tape aside, for a commonsense measure to take advantage of an opportunity to do something that, on the heels of March Madness here, really, installations would be no harm, no foul. These facilities already exist. It would be easy to put in place. If we could put aside the red tape of NEPA requirements, it would be unnecessary.

As I drive up and down my canals and my ditches, again, no harm, no foul here. We're looking at an easy installation that would be a very valuable thing for, where I come from in California, a renewable energy portfolio, which is 33 percent kicking in. It's pretty hard to find renewable energy, especially when most of those sources are required to be solar or wind.

Hydropower is a very important component in my part of the State here. We have so much water that we can take advantage of to produce, why aren't we doing it in the commonsense areas?

H.R. 678—and I commend the chairman and Mr. TIPTON for bringing this bill forward. This is, again, something that's going to be very positive for rural America, for our renewable energy portfolio, which is affecting, I think, a lot of the country these days, because renewable energy in most cases is very expensive. So the same people that are saying we can't do this without NEPA, the same people that are saying we can't have fracturing, which is bringing very cost-effective electricity to many, many Americans now, the same people that want to remove hydroelectric dams in my part of the district in northern California are now wanting to oppose a commonsense measure like this.

Sometimes I just don't get it, but this one here is really an opportunity to move forward with opportunity for our rural States, for rural areas to produce these projects with American know-how and more American jobs. We hear a lot about that here today. Let's put Americans to work with commonsense, reachable measures that are environmentally sound and certainly good for our economy.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, may I inquire how many minutes we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. May I inquire of my colleague how many other speakers he has?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close general debate if the gentlelady is prepared to close.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I am. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, as I've said before, this is a good bill with one bad provision in it, and that is the NEPA waiver that is not needed. It is not good environmental policy, and it is not good energy policy.

NEPA is not just red tape. It is a chance for the Federal Government to consider alternatives, to listen to not only the opponent, but get input from everybody impacted and to consider any possible impacts to the area.

At the appropriate time, I will offer an amendment to fit the one flaw in this bill. I hope my amendment is adopted and we'll send this to the Senate for passage.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This debate has been rather interesting, because it sounds like on the floor there is widespread support for the concept of this bill. And why shouldn't there be? After all, there are 47,000 miles of canals and ditches that could be utilized for energy production.

There seems to be one problem, and that problem revolves around NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, which was put in place, by the way, in 1969. I'm not going do say there's a direct correlation between NEPA and the lack of Bureau of Reclamation projects, but it is very interesting that most of the great projects that were built in the West were built prior to NEPA.

There were environmental statutes on the book, Madam Chairwoman, back then, and they are all satisfied. I happen to live in central Washington. There are two great projects in central Washington—the Columbia Basin Project and the Yakima River Project; in total, probably over a million acres of irrigated land.

Here is the truism, Madam Chairwoman. What we are talking about are our facilities where water is running through them, water is running downhill. We all know that water running downhill creates a certain amount of energy. All we want to do is capture that energy. With the prior chart that the gentleman from California put up, most of the States that will benefit by this are from the West. That means that we can make the desert bloom even more in the West if we utilize these facilities.

Finally, I just want to make one other observation. My good friend from California was saying that, okay, this is like a bill we had last year. We passed it; the Senate didn't do anything. Well, I would just remind the gentlelady, and she should know this, and I know she does, we are two distinct bodies, the House and the Senate. If they have a different view, for goodness sake, pass something. If it's different than our view, then we'll figure out how to come together. But to simply say, this is a good piece of legislation but we don't like NEPA, therefore, don't pass it because the Senate won't take it up, is not doing our job.

Madam Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation. There are some amendments that will be following. We can get into more detail on those. But I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 678, the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act, of which I am a cosponsor, and I want to thank Mr. TIPTON for his efforts.

Expanding access to clean, affordable, reliable energy is one challenge facing our Nation today. And while visionaries are looking for solutions, outdated bureaucracy is stifling innovation.

Though its environmental impacts are negligible, small hydropower development remains a financial challenge.

By exempting small hydropower from NEPA requirements, this bill substantially reduces administrative costs and could help stimulate the economy of rural America at no cost to taxpayers.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chair, this bill, like hydropower legislation I introduced last Congress, is limited in scope.

We're not talking about waiving environmental regulations for large, new infrastructure projects; we're talking about streamlining the process of developing clean, renewable energy on existing conduits.

According to a Bureau of Reclamation's March 2012 report on conduit hydropower development, more than 30 irrigation sites in my home State of Nebraska contain more than 5,000 kilowatts of potential hydropower development.

This bill empowers local irrigation districts to produce emissions–free energy which could be used by producers or sold to help pay for aging infrastructure costs.

There are no government mandates and no hidden costs, Mr. Chair.

Sustainable, affordable energy is critical to growing our economy and this is commonsense policymaking.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 678

*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 ''Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act''.

**SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION.**

Section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts to furnish water'' and inserting the following:

''(1) The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts to furnish water'';

(2) by striking ''(1) shall'' and inserting ''(A) shall'';

(3) by striking ''(2) shall'' and inserting ''(B) shall'';

(4) by striking ''respecting the terms of sales of electric power and leases of power privileges shall be in addition and alternative to any authority in existing laws relating to particular projects'' and inserting ''respecting the sales of electric power and leases of power privileges shall be an authorization in addition to and alternative to any authority in existing laws related to particular projects, including small conduit hydropower development''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) When carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall first offer the lease of power privilege to an irrigation district or water users association operating the applicable transferred work, or to the irrigation district or water users association receiving water from the applicable reserved work. The Secretary shall determine a reasonable time frame for the irrigation district or water users association to accept or reject a lease of power privilege offer.

''(3) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to small conduit hydropower development, excluding siting of associated transmission on Federal lands, under this subsection.

''(4) The Power Resources Office of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be the lead office of small conduit hydropower activities conducted under this subsection.

''(5) Nothing in this subsection shall obligate the Western Area Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, or the Southwestern Power Administration to purchase or market any of the power produced by the facilities covered under this subsection and none of the costs associated with production or delivery of such power shall be assigned to project purposes for inclusion in project rates.

''(6) Nothing in this subsection shall alter or impede the delivery and management of water by Bureau of Reclamation facilities, as water used for conduit hydropower generation shall be deemed incidental to use of water for the original project purposes. Lease of power privilege shall be made only when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the exercise of the lease will not be incompatible with the purposes of the project or division involved, nor shall it create any unmitigated financial or physical impacts to the project or division involved, and shall be on such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the Secretary in consultation with the appropriate irrigation district or water users association, will adequately protect the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and other interests of the United States and the project or division involved.

''(7) Nothing in this subsection shall alter or affect any existing agreements for the development of conduit hydropower projects or disposition of revenues.

''(8) In this subsection:

''(A) CONDUIT.—The term 'conduit' means any Bureau of Reclamation tunnel, canal, pipeline, aqueduct, flume, ditch, or similar manmade water conveyance that is operated for the distribution of water for agricultural, municipal, or industrial consumption and not primarily for the generation of electricity.

''(B) IRRIGATION DISTRICT.—The term 'irrigation district' means any irrigation, water conservation, multicounty water conservation district, or any separate public entity composed of two or more such districts and jointly exercising powers of its member districts.

''(C) RESERVED WORK.—The term 'reserved work' means any conduit that is included in project works the care, operation, and maintenance of which has been reserved by the Secretary, through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

''(D) TRANSFERRED WORK.—The term 'transferred work' means any conduit that is included in project works the care, operation, and maintenance of which has been transferred to a legally organized water users association or irrigation district.

''(E) SMALL CONDUIT HYDROPOWER.—The term 'small conduit hydropower' means a facility capable of producing 5 megawatts or less of electric capacity.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those received for printing in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose dated at least 1 day before the day of consideration of the amendment and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate.

Each amendment so received may be offered only by the Member who submitted it for printing or a designee and shall be considered as read if printed.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike lines 14 through 18, and insert the following:

''(3) The Bureau of Reclamation shall apply its categorical exclusion process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to small conduit hydropower development under this subsection, excluding siting of associated transmission facilities on Federal lands.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairwoman, I offer this amendment in response to the concerns of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and at the request of the broad range of irrigation districts, water conservation and conservancy districts, and public utilities that are supporting this bill and this commonsense amendment. I'm pleased to have the support of my Democratic colleague JIM COSTA on this effort and the support of the National Hydropower Association, the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, and the American Public Power Association.

This amendment removes the NEPA waiver in the bill and instead codifies the application of the Bureau of Reclamation's categorical exclusion process under the National Environmental Policy Act for small hydropower projects covered by this bill.

This alternative provision would still ensure streamlining the approval process for clean renewable energy and help provide certainty for investors and job creators, while providing flexibility to the Bureau to adjust to changing circumstances moving forward. By advancing these projects under the Bureau's categorical exclusion process, we ensure that all of the elements in that process are retained, including agency discretion for examining extraordinary circumstances. In addition, the amendment specifically mentions codifying the categorical exclusion process for small conduit hydropower.

This is an approach that is supported by Trout Unlimited in its March 19, 2013 letter, which states:

> Congress should direct BOR to create a categorical exclusion for small conduit hydropower.

That's exactly what this amendment does.

The use of a categorical exclusion for small conduit hydropower development can mean the difference between private investment in a public good with a multitude of benefits, and unreasonable financial costs and lengthy delays that lead to untapped potential.

My hope is that this amendment, which is broadly supported by the diverse range of groups invested in the bill who are committed to ensuring continued environmental protection, will assuage any reservations about this effort to promote clean renewable energy and allow us to be able to move forward united in our support.

□ 1430

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIPTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I think it adds a great deal to all the work that you and your bipartisan cosponsors had put into this, and I support the amendment.

Mr. TIPTON. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to Tipton amendment No. 3 for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We are glad to see the author of the legislation recognizes that in developing conduit hydropower projects, NEPA is not the problem and that the flat NEPA waiver included in the base bill is not good policy.

We also welcome the apparent realization that insisting on an unwarranted and unwise NEPA waiver has been the anchor that has held this bill back and prohibited this largely noncontroversial measure from becoming law.

But to be clear, this amendment only tweaks language that should be removed from the bill entirely. The Tipton amendment circles around the edge of the problem while my amendment, which I'll offer in a few minutes, solves the problem by removing the waiver completely so we can move forward and support the bill.

Better yet, if the waiver is removed, there is no need for the artificially low cap on the size of these projects contained in the base bill, which is why my amendment will increase the cap from 5 to 15 megawatts. The Tipton amendment does nothing to raise the cap on these projects.

The Tipton amendment is a significant step in the right direction for the bill's sponsor, and we will not oppose it and will work with the sponsor and Senate to perfect the language. However, my amendment, which we'll see momentarily, is better energy policy and better environmental policy. The amendment is a start, this particular amendment, but I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment to really fix this legislation.

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Chair, the legislative process is a two way street. It's about listening and incorporating the concerns of our colleagues to improve a bill. This amendment does just that.

Environmental review is important, but it needs to be an appropriate level of review for the project involved. On these types of projects, there isn't much chance of damage, so there shouldn't be much cost involved for review.

Reclamation recognizes this and has made great strides in easing the way for small hydro development on the agency's projects. However, potential legal conflicts have prevented them from fully implementing this process.

This amendment would bridge the legal gap and clarify questions that have kept the Bureau from moving forward. Specifically, the amendment would codify the steps Reclamation is already taking to ease the way for responsible small conduit hydropower development while also resolving potential litigation concerns.

This is a commonsense amendment that has been endorsed by American Rivers, Trout Unlimited, the Family Farm Alliance, the National Water Resources Association, and the National Hydropower Association.

I urge you to support this amendment and support the underlying bill.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I rise to offer the Napolitano amendment identified as amendment No. 1 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Page 4, strike lines 14 through 18 (and redesignate subsequent provisions accordingly).
>
> Page 7, line 13, strike ''5'' and insert ''15''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, my amendment is very simple. It would strike the NEPA, known as the National Environmental Policy Act, waiver and give the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, the authority to apply Reclamation's directives and standards for lease of power privilege projects, which is known as LOPP.

The Bureau of Reclamation on its own accord has applied a categorical exclusion, known as CE, to small conduit hydropower projects. In fact, their CE went even further. It can be used to expedite a wide variety of low-impact hydropower projects built on Reclamation's water infrastructure. The main point of the legislation is to clarify that Reclamation has jurisdiction over the development of conduit projects on Reclamation facilities.

As I have mentioned before, the sponsor's amendment only tweaks the language that should be removed from the bill entirely. The Tipton amendment tinkers around the edge of the problem while my amendment solves the problem by removing the waiver completely.

As a compromise, my amendment also increases the megawatt limitation from 5 to 15 megawatts for small conduit hydro projects. This would allow for more power to be created at those existing facilities. Without the NEPA waiver, the agency can utilize its own categorical exclusion, which has no megawatt limitation, and therefore makes the cap on this legislation arbitrary. The NEPA waiver is unnecessary, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my amendment.

Let me point out that it is my understanding that there have been some projects built under the current—not the CE—that have taken a lot more time and have been costly. And with a categorical exclusion, there will be a cut not only in the cost but in time because it only involves staff and the cost will be diminished.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chair, I just want to make a point because at the end of the general debate, I brought up the issue of NEPA that everybody says this is a wonderful bill except this part. Of course, the gentlelady's amendment strikes the NEPA waiver, which I pointed out again at the end of the general debate there seems to be somewhat cause and effect of having NEPA and having projects go forward.

But here is the important point on this, Madam Chairman, from my point of view: this bill deals with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Reclamation that built ditches and conduits out of concrete generally. Again, I spoke of the Columbia Basin Project in my district and the Yakima Project in my district, and virtually all of the ditches are concrete. That means that the land has already been disturbed in order to put these facilities in place.

What the gentleman from Colorado's bill does is simply put a power source within the existing ditches that have gone through environmental review. Why, for goodness' sakes, would you have to jump through more hoops, unless you wanted to slow the process down? Why you'd want to do that, I don't know, because the end result of this is probably less expensive energy. It's certainly American jobs, and it probably adds to a growing economy. Yet there seems to be some idea that only NEPA can save us from all of that.

Well, I reject that, and that's why I oppose the gentlelady's amendment because it would waive that requirement.

Once again, Madam Chairman, this is on existing facilities that have gone through environmental review. It doesn't need to jump through that hoop one more time.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairman, we've heard talk today about creating American jobs on American soil to be able to create American energy. No bill better achieves that end than H.R. 678.

The Napolitano amendment, by striking the provision altogether that she is offering, will allow no alternative to be able to streamline the projects' approval process, and this amendment literally will ensure that small investment in small hydropower projects would not be able to be achieved. I think it's important to note we're spending $1.750 trillion per year in regulatory costs in this Nation.

Now, are all regulations bad? No, they aren't. But redundant regulations which drive up costs, which inhibit our ability to be able to create jobs to be able to put Americans back to work and to be able to create clean, affordable energy should not stand in the way.

Let's put Americans back to work. Let's work together.

The purpose of my amendment is to be able to reach a reasonable compromise between the two opposing ideas in regards to the NEPA provision on manmade projects. As Chairman HASTINGS just ably noted, these are manmade ditches. We have no impediment that's going to be looked at when it comes to endangered species, be it fish or wildlife. This has already gone through the desired process of environmental review. So does it make good common sense to say that an area that's been reviewed that was made by men does not have to go through an additional review process in order to be able to create those jobs and to be able to create American energy? I think that's a sensible approach for us to be able to pursue.

With that, I would urge opposition and defeat of the Napolitano amendment.

Let's get this job done and let's truly work to get Americans back to work.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, this amendment strikes the NEPA exclusion for small hydroelectric projects. That's the principal point of the bill.

As the Subcommittee on Water and Power has repeatedly been told, it is precisely this process that has doubled the cost of small hydro projects simply making them cost prohibitive. This is akin to having a full environmental review done when you build your home and then having to do it all over again when you want to install a microwave in your kitchen.

□ 1440

One witness testified that installing 15 very small hydropower units on a nearby Bureau of Reclamation canal system would cost over $450,000, or $30,000 per unit, for additional NEPA reviews that would ultimately conclude that there is no environmental impact.

That means the paperwork costs would be greater than the actual capital cost of the hydropower units. No one in his right mind would invest in a project with this kind of requirement. It simply makes no sense, and that's the primary reason conduit hydropower development is not happening.

It is true that the Bureau of Reclamation instituted a new NEPA Categorical Exclusion for small hydroelectric projects back in September of 2012, but 6 months later, this new policy has resulted in precisely zero new projects moving forward. Even if projects were moving forward today, this is only an administrative change and could be changed back at any time.

In addition, an expert witness who happens to be a litigator testified to our subcommittee that the current administrative process is full of legal holes that could be exploited by those wanting to stop these projects. Investors need certainty, and that requires a statutory and not an administrative fix.

I appreciate and support the gentlelady's effort to allow the Bureau to consider units with 15 megawatts, but I would remind her that zero projects times 15 megawatts still equals zero electricity. Indeed, there are practically no projects in this range to begin with, which makes the amendment somewhat disingenuous. Even if there were, if the current regulatory scheme isn't allowing 5-megawatt units, it certainly won't allow 15-megawatt units. That's the problem.

Mr. TIPTON's bill provides an automatic exclusion from this duplicative and destructive NEPA requirement. The gentlelady's amendment takes it back out again. That's not constructive and it's not helpful.

To assure us that one supports small hydropower but opposes the automatic exclusion in Mr. TIPTON's bill reminds me of Leo Tolstoy's observation when he said:

> I sit on a man's back, choking him and making him carry me, and all the while, I assure him and anyone who will listen that I am sympathetic for his plight and I am willing to do everything I can to help—except by getting off his back.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Page 4, line 4, insert ''(A)'' after ''(2)''.
>
> Page 4, lines 8 and 10, strike ''work'' and insert ''conduit''.
>
> Page 4, line 13, after ''offer'' insert ''for a small conduit hydropower project''.
>
> Page 4, after line 13, insert the following:
>
> ''(B) If the irrigation district or water users association elects not accept a lease of power privilege offer under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall offer the lease of power privilege to other parties in accordance with this subsection.''.

Page 4, line 21, after ''hydropower'' insert ''policy and procedure-setting''.

Page 5, line 18 strike ''involved, and'' and all that follows though line 25 and insert the following ''involved. The Secretary shall notify and consult with the irrigation district or water users association operating the transferred conduit before offering the lease of power privilege and shall prescribe terms and conditions that will adequately protect the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and other interests of the United States and the project or division involved.''.

Page 6, after line 4, insert the following:

''(8) Nothing in this subsection shall alter or affect any existing preliminary permit, license, or exemption issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under Part I of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792, et seq.) or any project for which an application has been filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as of the date of the enactment of the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act.''.

Page 6, line 5, strike ''(8)'' and insert ''(9)''.

Page 6, strike lines 14 through 20, and insert the following:

(B) IRRIGATION DISTRICT.—The term ''irrigation district'' means any irrigation, water conservation or conservancy, multicounty water conservation or conservancy district, or any separate public entity composed of two or more such districts and jointly exercising powers of its member districts.

Page 6, line 21, strike ''WORK'' and insert ''CONDUIT''.

Page 6, line 22, strike ''work'' and insert ''conduit''.

Page 7, line 3, strike ''WORK'' and insert ''CONDUIT''.

Page 7, line 4, strike ''work'' and insert ''conduit''.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chairwoman, I offer this amendment to provide technical corrections and to eliminate drafting inconsistencies between this year's bill and its counterpart in the 112th Congress.

This amendment reflects changes sought by the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to definitions, to more accurately cover intended matters and properly coincide with existing law and Bureau regulations. Furthermore, the amendment clarifies that nothing in the bill affects existing arrangements between irrigation and water districts and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you say, I think this is a technical amendment. It adds to the bill, and I support it.

Mr. TIPTON. With that, Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. The gentleman's amendment makes technical changes that staff has brought to our attention, and it addresses a few of the administration's concerns.

The amendment clarifies that the projects already permitted under FERC would not see any regulatory uncertainty with this bill's passage. We are also in agreement with the amendment changes that require greater consultation with irrigation districts and water user associations prior to the approval of the Lease of Power Privilege.

We have no objections to this technical amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—189

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

NOES—232

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Woodall | Yoho | Young (FL) |
| Yoder | Young (AK) | Young (IN) |

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bass | Hastings (FL) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Castor (FL) | Kinzinger (IL) | Walz |
| Collins (NY) | Lynch | |
| Franks (AZ) | Markey | |

□ 1514

Messrs. HENSARLING, LAMALFA, STEWART, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, and Messrs. DOGGETT and CICILLINE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 94, H.R. 678, Agreeing to the Amendment, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 678) to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydropower development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 140, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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'm opposed in its current form.

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. 678 to the Committee on Natural Resources 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. MAKE IT IN AMERICA.**

Any lease of power privilege offered pursuant to this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall require, to the extent practicable, that all materials used for conduit hydropower generation be manufactured in the United States.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I suspect that, Mr. Speaker, all of us would want to see more jobs in America. The great American manufacturing sector over the last 20 years has lost about 9 million jobs. Twenty-five years ago, no one throughout this world would doubt that the greatest manufacturing Nation in the world was America. Twenty-five years later, and 9 million jobs having been lost, America has lost its preeminence—or is about to lose its preeminence. It would seem to me it's our job here as representatives of the American public and the American economy to do everything we possibly can to rebuild and reestablish the great American manufacturing sector, to do everything we can to restore to America those 9 million middle class jobs that have been lost to outsourcing, to our companies moving overseas, and to some rather impractical and rather foolish laws that have been passed and are on the books.

□ 1520

There is something we can do today with this bill. This bill, while seeming to be small, ought to be our very first step this session to make sure that in every piece of legislation we pass there would be an incentive, an obligation, or an advantage for American manufacturers.

Small hydro, who's to care about small hydro? Well, there are four businesses in America that would care a great deal about small hydro. In New Mexico, the Elephant Butte Irrigation District develops low-cost small hydro. Canyon Hydro in Deming, Washington, manufactures and produces small hydro. NATEL Energy Company in Alameda, California, manufactures small hydro programs. And James Leffel & Company in Springfield, Ohio, manufactures the machinery for small hydro. This bill would provide an opportunity for these four American companies to build these small hydro projects, made in America, made by Americans.

The amendment that I'm proposing simply says, in addition to what is in this bill, that we add a simple paragraph that says:

In all practical purposes, the machinery that is to be constructed and used in these projects shall be made in America by American workers.

One small step, but a necessary step, and one step along the way to rebuilding the American manufacturing sector.

We can do this. There are those who say that, well, we're not making it. Well, we are making it. And when we write laws that require that it be made in America, guess what? Things are made in America.

In that stimulus bill—whatever you may think it, good or bad—there was a provision written in that Amtrak was to have some new locomotives. Someone put in an additional sentence that said these must be 100 percent made in America. Siemens, the German company, came forward and said: We can do that. And in Sacramento, California today, a half-billion-dollar contract is being executed for numerous electric locomotives for Amtrak, 100 percent American made.

We can establish the policies to make it in America and to rebuild the great American manufacturing sector. We ought to be using all of our tax money whenever we purchase something to be made in America. If we're going to subsidize solar panels or wind turbines or even hydro projects, then let it be American manufacturers that get that money—to be made in America. Simple, but it's up to us. It's up to 435 of us.

What is to be our policy? Are we going to encourage American manufacturing with something as simple as this amendment, or are we simply going to shrug our shoulders and ignore the fact that 9 million American manufacturing jobs have been lost? Are we to ignore our responsibility to bring those jobs back here? I don't think there's one of us among the 435 of us here, Mr. Speaker, that would say: not to worry, let it be. No, I think all of us, Mr. Speaker, would want to bring the American manufacturing jobs back.

This amendment—which would be the final amendment to the bill and which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee—this amendment, if adopted, would proceed immediately to passage and give to American workers a small but significant opportunity to have a well-paying middle class job and once again America being the undisputed leader in manufacturing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during the course of debate today, it was mentioned several times—which of course is true—that virtually identical legislation passed in the last Congress with bipartisan support. I find it rather ironic that the author of this motion to recommit last year voted for this bill without the motion to recommit language in it. So I think we have some common ground and we're making some progress, and I thank the gentleman for his vote on that.

But let's talk about what this bill does. This bill takes existing American facilities, like irrigation ditches, and says, my goodness, water running downhill has a sense of energy to it; we ought to somehow capture that energy. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) says: Why don't we put turbines in there and create American energy? Wonderful idea. So that's what this bill

is all about. Nothing in this bill prevents anything that the gentleman is proposing in his motion to recommit.

But I will just close by saying what this bill really does and what the essence of what we're talking about here today. This bill creates American jobs and American energy at no cost to the taxpayer. What else is there to say? Vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. The gentleman had 5 minutes to make his case. No, I will not yield to the gentleman.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 226, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—194

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

NAYS—226

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

NOT VOTING—11

Amodei
Bass
Castor (FL)
Collins (NY)
Cramer
Hastings (FL)
Kinzinger (IL)
Lynch
Markey
Ros-Lehtinen
Walz

□ 1536

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, H.R. 678, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 7, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—416

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson

Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—7

Dingell
Johnson (GA)
Levin
Maloney, Carolyn
Moore
Sires
Smith (WA)

NOT VOTING—8

Castor (FL)
Collins (NY)
Cramer
Hastings (FL)
Lynch
Markey
Ros-Lehtinen
Walz

□ 1546

Messrs. PALLONE, POCAN, SWALWELL of California and Ms. DUCKWORTH changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 96, H.R. 678, On Passage, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–3)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Thanks to the hard work and determination of the American people, we have made significant progress over the last 4 years. After a decade of war, our brave men and women in uniform are coming home. After years of recession, our businesses have created over six million new jobs. We buy more American cars than we have in 5 years, and less foreign oil than we have in 20 years. Our housing market is healing, our stock market is rebounding, and consumers, patients, and homeowners enjoy stronger protections than ever before.

But we know that there are millions of Americans whose hard work and dedication have not yet been rewarded. Our economy is adding jobs—but too many people still cannot find full-time employment. Corporate profits have skyrocketed to all-time highs—but for more than a decade, wages and incomes have barely budged.

It is our generation's task to reignite the true engine of America's economic growth—a rising, thriving middle class. It is our unfinished task to restore the basic bargain that built this country—the idea that if you work hard and meet your responsibilities, you can get ahead, no matter where you come from, no matter what you look like, or whom you love.

It is our unfinished task to make sure that this Government works on behalf of the many, and not just the few; that it encourages free enterprise, rewards individual initiative, and opens the doors of opportunity to every child across this great Nation.

A growing economy that creates good, middle class jobs—this must be the North Star that guides our efforts. Every day, we should ask ourselves three questions as a Nation: How do we attract more jobs to our shores? How do we equip our people with the skills they need to get those jobs? And how do we make sure that hard work leads to a decent living?

This Budget seeks to answer each of these questions.

Our first priority is making America a magnet for new jobs and manufacturing. After shedding jobs for more than 10 years, our manufacturers have added more than 500,000 jobs over the past 3 years. Companies large and small are increasingly deciding to bring jobs back to America.

To accelerate this trend, the Budget builds on the success of the manufacturing innovation institute we created in Youngstown, Ohio last year, and calls for the creation of a network of 15 of these hubs across the Nation. In these innovation hubs, businesses will partner with universities and Federal agencies to turn regions around our country into global centers of high-tech jobs.

The Budget also includes new initiatives to support manufacturing communities, including a new tax credit to strengthen their ability to attract investments and jobs. And it expands my Administration's SelectUSA initiative to help draw businesses and investment from around the world to our shores.

If we want to make the best products, we also have to invest in the best ideas. That is why the Budget maintains a world-class commitment to science and research, targeting resources to those areas most likely to contribute directly to the creation of transformational technologies that can create the businesses and jobs of the future.

No area holds more promise than our investments in American energy. The Budget continues to advance my ''all-of-the-above'' strategy on energy, investing in clean energy research and development; promoting energy efficiency in our cars, homes, and businesses; encouraging responsible domestic energy production; and launching new efforts to combat the threat of climate change.

Modeled after my successful Race to the Top education reform effort, the Budget includes a new Race to the Top energy efficiency challenge for States, rewarding those that implement the most effective policies to cut energy waste. And it establishes a new Energy Security Trust funded by royalty revenue from oil and gas leases to support initiatives to shift our cars and trucks off oil, cutting our Nation's reliance on foreign oil.

Over the last 4 years, we have begun the hard work of rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure. We have built or improved over 350,000 miles of road and more than 6,000 miles of rail. And we have repaired or replaced over 20,000 bridges. But to compete in the 21st Century economy and become a magnet for jobs, we must do more. We need to repair our existing infrastructure, and invest in the infrastructure of tomorrow, including high-speed rail, high-tech schools, and self-healing power grids. These investments will both lay the foundation for long-term economic growth and put workers back on the job now.

My Budget includes $50 billion for upfront infrastructure investments, including a ''Fix-it-First'' program that makes an immediate investment to put people to work as soon as possible on our most urgent repairs, like the nearly 70,000 structurally-deficient bridges across the country. And to make sure taxpayers do not shoulder the whole burden, the Budget creates a Rebuild America Partnership to attract private capital to upgrade what our businesses need most: modern ports to move our goods; modern pipelines to withstand a storm; and modern schools worthy of our children.

The Budget also supports efforts I announced earlier this year to modernize and improve the efficiency of the Federal permitting process, cutting through the red tape that has been holding back even some of the most carefully planned infrastructure projects. These efforts will help us to achieve the new goal I set to cut timelines in half for infrastructure projects, while creating new incentives for better outcomes for communities and the environment.

All of these initiatives in manufacturing, energy, and infrastructure will help entrepreneurs and small business owners expand and create new jobs. But none of it will matter unless we also equip our citizens with the skills and training to fill those jobs.

And that has to start at the earliest possible age. But today, fewer than 3 in 10 4-year-olds are enrolled in a high-quality preschool program, and the high cost of private preschool puts too much of a financial burden on middle class families.

The Budget therefore includes a proposal that ensures 4-year-olds across the country have access to high-quality preschool education through a landmark new initiative in partnership with the States. And it increases the availability of early learning for our youngest children to help their growth and development during the formative early years of life.

Providing a year of free, public preschool education for 4–year-old children is an important investment in our future. It will give all our kids the best start in life, helping them perform better in elementary school and ultimately helping them, and the country, be better prepared for the demands of the global economy. Not only that, it could save hard-working families thousands of dollars each year in child care costs. This is an investment we need to make, and it is fully paid for in this Budget by imposing a new tax on every pack of cigarettes sold.

The Budget also builds on the historic reforms made during my first term to improve our elementary and secondary school system by rewarding excellence and promoting innovation. To help ensure that our high schools are putting our kids on a path to college and a good job, the Budget includes a new competitive fund that will help redesign America's high schools to prepare students with the real world skills they need to find a job right away or go to college. The fund rewards schools that develop new partnerships with colleges and employers, and create classes focusing on science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM)—the skills today's employers seek to fill the jobs available right now and in the future.

Even with better high schools, most young people will still need some higher education. Through tax credits, grants, and better loans, we have made college more affordable for millions of students and families over the last 4 years. But skyrocketing costs are still pricing too many young people out of a higher education, or saddling them with unsustainable debt. And taxpayers cannot continue to subsidize higher and higher costs for higher education.

To encourage colleges to do their part to keep costs down, the Budget includes reforms that will ensure affordability and value are considered in determining which colleges receive certain types of Federal aid. My Administration has also released a new ''College Scorecard'' that parents and students can use to compare schools.

To further ensure our educational system is preparing students for careers in the 21st Century economy, the Budget includes additional measures to promote STEM education, such as launching a new STEM Master Teacher Corps, to leverage the expertise of some of America's best and brightest teachers in science and mathematics, and to elevate the teaching of these subjects nationwide. It also includes a reorganization and consolidation of STEM education programs to improve the effectiveness of Federal investments in this area.

The Budget takes other critical steps to grow our economy, create jobs, and strengthen the middle class. It implements the Affordable Care Act, giving every American access to the high-quality, affordable health care coverage they deserve, and reducing the deficit by more than $1 trillion over the next two decades. It implements Wall Street reform, ending too-big-to-fail and protecting consumers against the abuses and reckless behavior that contributed to the financial collapse in 2008. And it includes measures to strengthen our housing market and ensure that every responsible homeowner has the opportunity to refinance at today's rates, saving $3,000 a year on average.

Our economy is stronger when we harness the talents and ingenuity of striving, hopeful immigrants. That is why I have proposed a plan to fix our broken immigration system that secures our borders, cracks down on employers who hire undocumented workers, attracts highly-skilled entrepreneurs and engineers to help create jobs and drive economic growth, and establishes a responsible pathway to earned citizenship—a path that includes passing a background check, paying taxes and a meaningful penalty, learning English, and going to the back of the line behind the folks trying to come here legally. The Budget makes investments that will make our immigration system more efficient and fair and lay a foundation for this permanent, common-sense reform.

The Budget also builds on the progress made over the last 4 years to expand opportunity for every American and every community willing to do the work to lift themselves up. It creates new ladders opportunity to ensure that hard work leads to a decent living. It rewards hard work by increasing the minimum wage to $9 an hour so an honest day's work pays more. It partners with communities by identifying Promise Zones to help rebuild from the recession. It creates pathways to jobs for the long-term unemployed and youth who have been hardest hit by the downturn. And it strengthens families by removing financial deterrents to marriage and supporting the role of fathers.

We also know that economic growth can only be achieved and sustained if America is safe and secure, both at home and abroad. At home, the Budget supports my initiative to help protect our kids, reduce gun violence, and expand access to mental health services. We can protect our Second Amendment rights while coming together around reforms like eliminating background check loopholes to make it harder for criminals to get their hands on a gun—common-sense reforms that will help protect our kids from the scourge of gun violence that has plagued too many communities across the country.

To confront threats outside our borders, the Budget ensures our military remains the finest and best-equipped military force the world has ever known, even as we wind down more than a decade of war.

Already, we have brought home more than 30,000 of our brave servicemembers from Afghanistan. Our remaining forces are moving into a support role, with Afghan security forces taking the lead. And over the next year, another 34,000 American troops will come home. This drawdown will continue and, by the end of next year, our war in Afghanistan will be over. Beyond 2014, the Budget supports our continued commitment to a unified and sovereign Afghanistan.

To maintain our national security, the Budget supports our ongoing fight against terrorists, like al Qaeda. The organization that attacked us on 9/11 is a shadow of its former self. But different al Qaeda affiliates and extremist groups have emerged—from the Arabian Peninsula to Africa. We will confront these emerging security challenges through the full range of U.S. capabilities and tools, including diplomatic, security, intelligence, and economic development.

The Budget also provides the resources we need to act on our commitment to and interests in global development, by promoting food security that reduces dependence and increases prosperity; by investing in the increasingly successful drive toward an AIDS-free generation; and by maintaining our leadership as a global provider of humanitarian assistance that saves lives and reflects American values.

We must also confront new dangers, like cyber attacks, that threaten our Nation's infrastructure, businesses, and people. The Budget supports the expansion of Government-wide efforts to counter the full scope of cyber threats, and strengthens our ability to collaborate with State and local governments, our partners overseas, and the private sector to improve our overall cybersecurity.

The Budget also focuses resources on the Asia-Pacific region, reasserting American leadership and promoting security, stability, democracy, and economic growth.

Importantly, the Budget upholds our solemn obligation to take care of our servicemembers and veterans, and to protect our diplomats and civilians in the field. It keeps faith with our veterans, investing in world-class care, including mental health care for our wounded warriors, supporting our military families, and giving our veterans the benefits, education, and job opportunities that they have earned.

The Budget does all of these things as part of a comprehensive plan that reduces the deficit. All of these initiatives and ideas are fully paid for, to ensure they do not increase the deficit by a single dime.

By making investments in our people that we pay for responsibly, we will strengthen the middle class, make America a magnet for jobs and innovation, and grow our economy, which will in turn help us to reduce deficits. But economic growth alone will not solve our Nation's long-term fiscal challenges.

As we continue to grow our economy, we must take further action to cut our deficits. We do not have to choose between these two important priorities—we have to do both.

Over the last 4 years, both parties have worked together to reduce the deficit in a balanced way by more than $2.5 trillion. That is more than halfway toward the goal of $4 trillion in deficit reduction that economists say we need to stabilize our finances. As we wind down two wars, we have protected our military families and veterans while cutting defense spending on outdated military weapons systems. Domestic discretionary spending is approaching its lowest levels as a share of the economy since President Eisenhower was in office; and we have moved aggressively to cut waste, fraud, and abuse. And together, we have begun to ask the wealthy to do their fair share while keeping income taxes low for middle class families. Overall, we have cut the deficit in a balanced way that protects the investments in education, manufacturing, clean energy, and small businesses we need to grow the economy and strengthen the middle class. There is more work to do, and this Budget is designed to finish the job.

But we should not do it by making harsh and arbitrary cuts that jeopardize our military readiness, devastate priorities like education and energy, and cost jobs. That is not how to grow the economy. We should not ask middle class senior citizens and working families to pay down the rest of our deficit while the wealthiest are asked for nothing more. That does not grow our middle class.

The American people understand that we cannot just cut our way to prosperity. That is why I have repeatedly called for a balanced approach to deficit reduction. And that is why I have offered proposals on multiple occasions that cut wasteful spending, strengthen entitlements, and eliminate special tax breaks and loopholes so the wealthiest pay their fair share.

In my negotiations with House Speaker BOEHNER in December over the so-called ''fiscal cliff,'' I again offered a compromise proposal that was balanced and comprehensive, and would achieve our $4 trillion deficit reduction goal. That proposal is still on the table. I am including it in this Budget to demonstrate my commitment to making the kind of tough and balanced choices that are needed to put our Nation's finances in order.

To be clear, the package I am offering includes some difficult cuts that I do not particularly like. But these measures will only become law if congressional Republicans agree to meet me in the middle by eliminating special tax breaks and loopholes so millionaires and billionaires do their fair share to cut the deficit. I will not agree to any deal that seeks to cut the deficit on the backs of middle class Families. I am willing to make tough choices that may not be popular within my own party, because there can be no sacred cows for either party. And I look forward to working with any member of Congress who takes a similar, balanced approach. This plan is built on the kind of common ground that Democrats and Republicans should be able to reach.

In total, the Budget will cut the deficit by another $1.8 trillion over the next 10 years, bringing the deficit below 2 percent of GDP by 2023 and putting our debt on a declining path. This is not an end in and of itself—the best way to grow the economy and cut the deficit is by creating good middle class jobs. But this plan to reduce the deficit in a balanced way is a critical step toward ensuring that we have a solid foundation on which to build a strong economy and a thriving middle class for years to come.

Finally, this Budget continues my commitment to reforming and streamlining our Government for the 21st Century. It builds on my Campaign to Cut Waste by further targeting and eliminating wasteful spending wherever we find it. It reorganizes and consolidates agencies and programs to make them leaner and more efficient. It increases the use of evidence and evaluation to ensure we are making smart investments with our scarce taxpayer dollars. And it harnesses new technologies to allow us to do more with less.

No single Budget can solve every challenge and every problem facing the country. But this Budget shows how we can live within our means while growing our economy, strengthening the middle class, and securing our Nation's future. It is not a Democratic plan or a Republican plan. It is an American plan. And it is a plan that I hope can serve as an outline for us to write the next great chapter of the American story . . . together.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 10, 2013*.

## ACCESSING NATURAL GAS

(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, yesterday it was reported that the United States has 2.4 quadrillion cubic feet of natural gas that can be recovered by current drilling techniques, according to a study by companies working in various shale basins across the country. That's 26 percent higher than the previous assessment, and at current consumption rates, a 90-year supply. The Marcellus shale has the largest share of resources, with an estimated 741,320 billion cubic feet.

What has caused such a jump in resources and production? Not the Federal Government, that's for sure. According to the Congressional Research Service, production of natural gas has decreased on Federal lands by 33 percent. It's the hard work and innovation of private industry, a combination of technological and drilling advances that have allowed us to access resources that were previously inaccessible, all in a responsible and environmentally friendly way. In fact, just last week, the Energy Information Administration stated that expanded use of natural gas has driven down energy-related U.S. carbon dioxide emissions to their lowest level since 1994.

America is just beginning to realize the opportunity of this growing and economically beneficial resource.

□ 1610

## RECOGNIZING THE WORLD'S FOREMOST CLIMATOLOGIST, DR. JAMES HANSEN

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the storied career of America's foremost climatologist, and the world's, Dr. James Hansen. Last week Dr. Hansen retired from his position as head of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies. After 46 years at NASA, he's leaving the agency to focus his efforts on the political and legal efforts to limit greenhouse gases.

He started his career by working on the atmosphere of the planet Venus in the sixties. Luckily for the world, he changed his emphasis to the atmosphere of the Earth.

Dr. Hansen is perhaps known best for his 1988 testimony to the Senate committees that helped raise the initial broad awareness of global warming across the United States. He sounded the warning bell of the effects of climate change, and can be credited with bringing the issue to the forefront of the American conscience.

Dr. Hansen, who fittingly called the proposed building of the Keystone XL pipeline akin to the ''lighting of the carbon bomb,'' is one of the world's leading advocates of decreased fossil fuel consumption.

While his departure from the Federal climate research community will undoubtedly leave a gaping hole in NASA's climate program, I look forward to the role Dr. Hansen will take on his retirement as he pursues actions to limit emissions and his fight against the development of Keystone and other tar sands pipelines.

The future of our planet rests in the hands of scientists like Dr. Hansen, and I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him the best of luck in his retirement. I truly hope he can continue the work that he has successfully pursued throughout his storied career in this new capacity.

## THE SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments we just heard on the floor from my colleague from Tennessee talking about Dr. Hansen's retirement, a gentleman who has faced a great deal of criticism, including many from this Congress, because of his forceful presentation of his point of view. And time after time after time, Dr. Hansen has been proven correct.

This is the most important issue that we're really not debating in Congress. There are a group of us here who have formed the Safe Climate Caucus to be able to promote this discussion. Today we extended an invitation to the leadership of the Commerce and Energy Committee to join us on the floor of the House for a bipartisan debate, encouraging our Republican colleagues to come to the floor to be able to deal with this issue that, frankly, deserves to be in the spotlight.

We're not aware of any Republican Member who's spoken on the floor of the House about the dangers of climate change or the need to reduce emissions and prepare for its impact in this entire session of Congress. In fact, as near as we can determine, no Republican Member of Congress has even uttered the words ''climate change'' on the floor in this Congress.

It's, I suppose, better that they're not talking about it at all than what we had in the last Congress where the Republican-led House of Representatives voted 53 times to block action on climate change. My Republican colleagues voted to defund research, to block action by the EPA to control pollution, to prevent energy efficiency measures from going into effect.

Remember, one of the most comical was the assault on light bulb efficiency, an efficiency standard that was developed, admittedly, when Democrats were in charge, but signed with legislation that we worked out with the Bush administration. That was certainly a travesty.

It was interesting. The industry looked at them and shrugged and said, we're moving on, we're not going back to produce less energy-efficient light bulbs.

They voted to stop the administration from encouraging developing countries to do their part.

This year, the Republican members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, which is the committee of primary jurisdiction over energy policy, even voted against holding hearings with scientists who could explain the role of climate change in causing extreme weather, drought, heat waves and wildfires. That's why we've created the Safe Climate Caucus, to work to end the conspiracy of silence here in the House about the dangers of climate change.

But we hope, we sincerely hope, that our Republican colleagues would join us here on the floor of the House in one of these Special Orders to discuss our various approaches. If they don't agree with human-caused impacts of extreme weather events, engage in the debate to explain why. If they do agree that we are at least having extreme weather events, whether or not they're human-caused, let's debate what we should do to be protecting us from those impacts. The American public deserves no less.

So until we're able to engage our Republican colleagues in a spirited, thoughtful debate on the floor of the House, we will continue pointing out the problems that we face, the risks, the danger, the paths forward, because in 2012, there were over 3,500 weather-related records set due to extreme heat, rain, drought, cold and wind. The American public has seen that. They've suffered the consequences. They're concerned.

Hurricane Sandy was one of just 11 weather disasters last year in the United States that caused more than a billion dollars in losses, a total of over $60 billion, which taxpayers are being forced to help assume the burden.

Here in Washington, D.C., we set another record, 90 degrees today, for April 10. At the same time, there are snowstorms in Colorado.

2012 was the 36th consecutive year with a global temperature above the 20th century average. The last time there was a year with a global temperature that wasn't above average was 1976, before Jimmy Carter was elected President. We were celebrating the Bicentennial. Most of our staff here in Washington, D.C., on Capitol Hill, has never experienced a year where temperatures weren't above average.

Now, just because our Republican friends don't want to debate it, just because they have fought to prevent our initiative, doesn't mean that it's not having an economic impact. The United States Congress has appropriated $188 billion for climate-related disasters over the last 3 years.

Just 2 months ago, the Government Accountability Office released a GAO report listing the Federal Government's vulnerability to climate change impacts as one of its greatest areas of potential risk. Climate change could increase investment portfolio risk by 10 percent over the next 2 decades by disrupting supply chains.

Those of us in Congress who are noticing these problems, these changes, these challenges, are not alone. According to the Gallup poll last month, 58 percent of the American public worry a fair amount or a great deal about climate change and its impacts. Sixty-two percent of Republicans believe that America should take steps to address climate change.

Monday, Arnold Schwarzenegger joined the list of Republican politicians who now acknowledge that climate change is a serious concern, speaking at the Price School of Public Policy in California. Governor Schwarzenegger said, if we're smart, we listen to our doctors. If we're stupid, we ignore our doctors, and it takes a heart attack to realize that we should listen.

Schwarzenegger said the national climate assessment report is our physical, and these scientists can give us a prescription for what we need to do to improve our climate. It's our duty to listen to them and encourage action, action all over the country. And Republican Governor Schwarzenegger is to be commended for his vision and stepping forward.

Another of my colleagues from California is with us here this evening, and I notice that he may be willing to step in. He's been greatly concerned about infrastructure, climate, the environment in a long and distinguished career in California politics and now here in Congress.

□ 1620

We're honored that you would be willing to join us, and I would be happy to yield to you if you would like to join in this conversation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. BLUMENAUER, I would be honored to participate in this conversation. And, Mr. Speaker, it's always a great pleasure and, in fact, important that those of us 435 that have been elected to represent the American citizens rise on the floor to speak to issues of great importance.

When all is debated, at the end of those debates I suppose we ought to say, Was that important? We debated earlier about a piece of this puzzle, but this is the most consequential issue facing the entire globe. Climate change is a very, very real challenge for the human race.

In the early nineties, I was Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior and was asked by the President and Vice President at the time to join in developing a strategy for America at the Kyoto Conference, which was the second international effort to come to grips with this issue. We studied the various ramifications of climate change and we predicted that what you just described in your opening statement, Mr. BLUMENAUER, would happen. And, indeed, it is happening—the climate is changing. It is warmer.

There are more extreme events, and the impact is already being perceived in those things that are most unnoticed, which is the change in the vegetation and in the flora and fauna throughout the United States. As you hike through the mountains of the Sierras, you have to go a little higher to see species, both animal and fauna, that lived at a lower elevation. They're moving up the mountain, those that can. Those that can't, for example, some species of trees and plants that aren't able to remove their roots and move up the mountain, and they're simply going to become extinct.

Now, what do we do about it? Well, there are many things we can do without actually harming the economy. In fact, there are many things we can do that will cause the economy to grow, for example, conservation. Conservation of energy is an enormously important way to conserve our money, our energy supplies, and reduce carbon emissions, because much of the energy in the United States actually comes from carbon emissions.

For example, how about better mileage in our cars? Thankfully, we have President Obama and the Democratic administration that has taken very aggressive steps to reduce the consumption of gasoline and diesel in our automobiles and trucks, thereby conserving and saving us money and simultaneously reducing greenhouse gas emission.

There are many, many other things. One bill we took up on the floor today that passed—and my amendment wasn't adopted—but, nonetheless, it is the small hydro. It's using hydropower wisely where we can, without harming the environment, but also adding to the energy production. Moving away from coal, which we know to be the single biggest source of carbon from power plants as we generate electricity, moving initially to gas-fired power plants, which have significantly less carbon emissions, and in that process, taking the steps to move to renewable power sources of all kinds—hydro, where it makes sense.

How about wind turbines? I don't have the statistics with me today, but we've made an enormous advancement in wind energy and solar energy. And by the way, if we're going to do that in the United States with our tax policies and give a tax rebate or credit, then we ought to make it in America. Have those turbines and solar panels made in America so that we not only do what is right by the environment, but we also do what it right by the American workers so that we can rebuild our American manufacturing.

There are many, many other concepts, all of which grow the economy. They don't harm the economy at all but, rather, grow the economy. Reducing emissions, not only carbon emissions, but from the coal-fired power plants, reducing rather dangerous substances like mercury and arsenic.

So we should move these things forward. Unfortunately, we are running up against a block of votes on the right side of this House—not right on policy but, rather, in location—where they are blocking the efforts that we must make to come to grips with this. My point here is that, while this is a fundamental problem for this Nation, it's also a fundamental opportunity for America to grow a new economy.

We just heard read here on the floor not more than 30 minutes ago the statement by the President of his new budget in which he makes the point that, by addressing climate change, we also address the need to rebuild the American economy and to set it on a path where we can compete and sell these technologies and products all around the world. Because this is not just an American problem, this is a national-international problem, and all of us, wherever we are, whatever country we are in, we must take action. We must take action. We cannot let this slide.

And my plea, as you made yours, Mr. BLUMENAUER, to our Republicans colleagues is: let's debate this. If you don't believe this is a problem, come to the floor and tell us why this is not a problem. If you do not believe that we should manufacture wind turbines and solar panels here in the United States and deploy them rather than continuing with the coal-based economy, then tell us why. I wait for that debate, and I'll join you in it, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Thank you for the privilege of joining you. I see that we have another colleague. We may reopen the West Coast-East Coast show, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI. Thank you for your comments and for your leadership in your native State of California on so many different levels in pressing this point. Your observation is that there's a great deal of economic opportunity. The installed wind energy has exploded in recent years. In fact, not only are we producing the energy here in the United States, it's American wind. It's not dollars that we're exporting.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might interrupt you for a second, there are those that would claim that this place is also a windy Chamber.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. And part of what we need to be harvesting. That's why I have a small wind energy tax credit that I think we can install here in the House Chamber. But part of what we've done with the Recovery Act has increased dramatically the amount of manufacturing that's here in the United States for that installed energy.

We are joined by one of our colleagues, Congressman TONKO from New York. Before he came to Congress, where he's been very active in these areas, he's had his own series of activities providing leadership and technology and energy efficiency.

We'd be honored for you to join in the conversation.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative BLUMENAUER, for leading us in this discussion. I appreciate the fact that you've brought together this thoughtful discussion, this dialogue on how we need to embrace a stronger sense of stewardship with our environment that ties to our energy policy, that ties to our economic recovery opportunities.

I have to first and foremost mention that you're right; I headed the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority in the State of New York, my last workstation before serving here in the House. I was totally surrounded by consummate professionals who make it their role, their job, their advocacy, their vocation to make a difference with energy policy that allows us to be stronger stewards of our environment and to advance this effort for renewables, for innovation that allows us to reduce that mountain of electrons that we require for the workplace, the home place, for quality of life, and allows us to use that in much more useful, measured terms so that energy efficiency is seen as our fuel of choice and that that comes before any of our energy thinking. And that provides for a greener outcome that allows us to address this phenomenon of climate change.

Now, whether or not you believe in climate change—and to me, the scientific evidence is insurmountable—but see it as an opportunity for good-paying jobs, jobs that advance research and innovation and intellect and ideas as an economy that can then transition us into a very powerful economic recovery.

But I want to make certain that I introduce onto this floor the discussion about Mother Nature and its grip on the 20th Congressional District and, before redistricting, when I represented the 21st, as major storms Irene and Lee impacted my region. People had lost,

Representative BLUMENAUER, everything for which they ever worked—houses swept into the river through storms that just, through the force of Mother Nature, overpowered communities.

□ 1630

Many houses were destroyed. Heritage crown jewel items in the region that were visitation centers and destinations, destroyed. Covered bridge, historic in nature, wiped away through the ravages of water.

This was a profound impact. Lives lost, many injured. Communities are still rebuilding, businesses are coming back, households are still abandoned. The efforts have been powerful. We've witnessed volunteerism to the Nth degree, a tremendous statement about the human heart to respond to the needs of neighbors and at times total strangers. And then this year, seeing what had happened with the ravages of Sandy, Superstorm Sandy, that impacted New England, impacted metro New York, New Jersey and beyond, Pennsylvania. These are atypical situations. Tornadoes, tropical storms, hurricanes as far north as upstate New York had been unheard of.

So there is a statement that Mother Nature is making. We are faced with this climate change phenomenon, a concept that we need to address in scientific measure, in ways that allow us to constructively build a plan that allows us to move forward, again, by enhancing the opportunities for job creation.

What I had seen through the advocacy at NYSERDA, the State Energy Research and Development Authority, was this effort for us to be the keepers of the funds that would go towards innovating and transitioning into a better reliance on renewables, using in a benign way the environment qualities that surround us—the winds, the sun, the soil, the water—in a way that allows us to respond to the needs that we have as a society for energy and to do it through intellect. The intellectual capacity of our Nation is something we constantly cultivate through education, training, higher ed, apprenticeship programs. These are forces that can then bear good news of invention, of innovation.

I have the renewable center for GE, the international center in the heart of my district. We have the R&D lab in Niskayuna. All of these places are working in a way to allow for us to look at new battery design, the linchpin to innovation that allows us to embrace, perhaps, storage of intermittence power, that it makes it more predictable and of more useful capacity. Investment in cable that allows for less line loss in the delivery, in the transporting of electrons to the source.

There are many, many ways that we can be significantly sensitive to the demands on our society for energy and not to be wasteful, to be innovative in our approach, and to green up our thinking.

I'll say this—and I know we have others that want to speak. When I first arrived here in 2009, after the 2008 election for my first term to serve in the House, I was able to sit at the table when we formed, as Democrats, SEEC, the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition. It's a group of like-minded thinkers who want to take us in a green direction, with progressive politics, and enable us to think outside the barrel, to be able to be clever in our approach to provide for new ways to meet society's needs, to open the door to job creation, to provide for soundness of outcomes in a sustainable way that allows us to make a very bold and noble statement, and that is typically this: that we inherit this environment for the moment, and it is our task, I believe, morally to hand it over to the next generations in even better stead.

That is a daunting challenge these days. It's a daunting challenge. But in my heart I believe that we can accomplish what we need to accomplish. We can respond to the challenge by opening up to new thinking, and to not be restrained and restricted by status quo or by the disbelief that these things are happening right before our very eyes, right in the heart of our communities.

I wanted to make certain that I shared the impact on my district of Mother Nature and the clarion call to respond with urgency and with in-depth knowledge, driven by the passion to make a difference because there is always that pioneer spirit in America, and we're at our best when we embrace that inspiration and move forward as a Nation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Congressman TONKO. I appreciate your comments. I appreciate your leadership on this issue before and after you joined Congress. And I like the notion about thinking outside the barrel.

Mr. TONKO. You're a great leader also, so thank you for leading us in this discussion and leading us routinely on sound transportation quarters, including those bicycles that don't pollute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Indeed. Well, the cheapest electron is one that we don't have to use. If we just double American energy efficiency, we can cut carbon emissions 22 percent by 2020—and, by the way, that would save American consumers $327 billion a year. This is a tremendous opportunity to achieve savings, generate economic activity, and pay a dividend, economically as well as environmentally.

Mr. TONKO. Representative, if I might just add to that statement, the many discussions I have had with constituents who say where is the wisdom in sending hundreds of billions of dollars to foreign nations—oftentimes enemies of this country—who are using American energy consumer dollars to train troops to fight our son and daughters on the battlefield.

This is a no-brainer. This gluttonous dependency on fossil-based fuels, imported to keep our energy agenda alive, has got to stop. We need to move forward—again, with the progressive thinking that I know we can embrace in this House. Get it done. So I thank you again for your leadership in this dimension.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. That last element is one that makes it so surprising that my Republican friends don't want to talk about dealing with climate change, energy efficiency on the floor, especially given the fact that an amazing stellar array of distinguished foreign policy and military experts who have identified climate change and fossil fuel dependency as a strategic vulnerability for this country, and why they have argued that we ought to move forward aggressively dealing with climate change, dealing with energy efficiency because it strengthens America, rather than sending dollars, as you point out, to people who don't necessarily share our interests or our beliefs. It has been pointed out more than once that we are financing both sides of the war on terror.

But I would like to turn, if I could, to my friend from Memphis, Congressman COHEN, who started us off this evening with a terrific 1-minute observation about Dr. Hanson's retirement. We would welcome your thoughts and further observations about our moving forward.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. I appreciate your leadership on this issue and your scheduling this Special Order.

Dr. James Hansen did retire. He is considered the foremost climatologist in the world. As I understand it, he shared in a Nobel Prize in 2007 on this general type of issue. He's been the leading proponent of watching out for the future.

The Keystone pipeline, he's the clarion call, I guess, on the problems that that would cause to the environment in the future. Because the tar sands, to mine, is a very carbon-intensive activity. You take away the forest. You also have to use a lot of water and a lot of energy in the production. Just the production of the tar sands causes great damage to the environment, let alone the potential for damage to our country when they would travel through the pipelines. Then, when they're burnt, that's, I guess, lighting the carbon bomb and letting it go off. But Dr. Hanson studied climate and was one of the first to warn on this issue. He has retired, so we will have his voice.

I live in Memphis. It's kind of the center of the region, Oklahoma over, for tornadoes. Tornadoes have been much, much more prominent in the United States. This just isn't a quirk. Mother Nature can have her times and certain variances in her schedule, but it's obvious what's been happening with the increase in tornadoes, the droughts, the floods. The Mississippi River, it's been the lowest it's ever been in spots—and it's flooded. It had the worst floods in Memphis ever about 2 or 3 years ago, and this year the river

was its lowest. We've gone from its highest to its lowest, and something's happening; it's obvious something is happening. Scientists, almost to one, tell us that this is because of what we've done to the environment.

□ 1640

There might be two out of 100 scientists. It seems so unfortunate that the other side always grabs one or two of those people, rather than the 98.

We all have a debt and a duty to protect the Earth and, I think, looking out for issues where we do conserve, as you've said. I've got a company in Memphis I met with last week—they're really in Mississippi—called Griffin, and they have found a way to come up with a system that when a vehicle idles—and they're talking about, in their specific situation, armored cars that have a lot of going around and they idle their engines when they pick up their financial deposits—it costs a lot to the environment in burning of oil when the car is running. They've got a way where the car can be turned off and the idling of the engine can stop, but, nevertheless, the vehicle still gets air-conditioning and power. It can save a tremendous amount of gasoline and protect the environment. Hopefully, they can come within some grants that are already available to make companies that need to retrofit their vehicles to use that, but it is like raising our CAFE standards. The best way to save energy is not to have to use it and to conserve on that.

There are opportunities we have. Obviously, we have to concentrate on this. We've got to look to alternatives, and wind and solar are two of them. It's a disaster waiting to happen, and we just can't close our eyes to it. It's important that we take a leadership role in the world.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, I would like to ask you, the Defense Department that raised those issues about it being important to our national defense, were they referring to the droughts that they foresaw coming in the future with climate change and what might happen in some of those countries where they have less opportunity to produce food and have water, et cetera?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well, the threats are manyfold.

One is just when we are subjecting our armed services to try and deal with the extremes that you talked about, it's unpredictable. They have to be dealing with drought and with flood extreme weather events. When we find the disruption that occurs in other parts of the world with drought and with famine, it provides an instability that creates a security challenge for us. And the fact that we are vulnerable still, in terms of energy supply for the United States and for our allies and the world economy can be held hostage, all of these were part of this challenge.

Last but not least, the Department of Defense, the United States military, is the largest consumer of energy in the world. Energy supply, energy cost, energy efficiency is a matter of military readiness and operational efficiency. When we spend $18 billion for air-conditioning in Iraq and Afghanistan, that's a drain on the budget. When we are sending to the front tanker trucks, because we are so dependent on fossil fuel, they might as well have a great big bull's-eye on them. We've lost thousands of Americans on these fuel convoys.

Being able to be energy efficient, being able to stretch the dollars, being able to promote American security is all part of an equation where these experts are saying, it ought to be a no-brainer to move forward with energy efficiency. Security experts are deeply concerned about the disruptive impact globally of this uncertain climate effect.

I notice that we are joined by my colleague from the State of Oregon, Congresswoman BONAMICI, who has long exercised leadership in areas of environment and energy in her previous career as a distinguished State legislator in Oregon. I welcome her and would invite comments in conversation with us.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you so much, Mr. BLUMENAUER, for leading this discussion about such an important topic.

The reality of what we are talking about is really impossible to deny. We've had numerous scientists testify in Congress. You mentioned Dr. Hansen. I want to mention that his first testimony in Congress was 25 years ago. 1988 was the first time that Dr. Hansen, a well-renowned NASA scientist, testified about the problems of climate change—25 years ago. Since, so many peer-reviewed studies have shown the reality of what we are facing and the human impact, a significant contributing factor.

Not only do we have a lot of impacts on the planet, from glacial withdrawal and loss of sea ice, ocean acidification, rising temperatures and rising sea levels, we are feeling the impact here in our country with record droughts in the American Southwest and historic severe weather events. You probably have already mentioned that, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, and NASA, last year, 2012, was the warmest year on record for the United States. The 9 warmest years on record have all occurred since 1998.

I want to talk for a minute, Mr. BLUMENAUER, about some of the effects we are feeling in our home State of Oregon. We have a reputation for quality wine grapes, including the world-renowned pinot noir grape. The quality of wine is attributable to the climate in Oregon. The pinot grapes grow in a temperature range between 57 and 61 degrees, and a minor variation threatens the quality of the grapes and the value, significant value, to Oregon's economy.

Also, the district that I represent, and I know you've been out to our Oregon coast frequently, includes the shellfish industry. There's a thriving fishing community there. There's dungeness for sale on the commercial market and recreational crabbing that helps draw tourists over to the coast. In recent years, the changes have caused low oxygen content in the water. Hypoxia is the condition that results. It is creating dead zones in our ocean that kill fish, crab, and other marine life.

This is a serious problem that's affecting the industry over there. There's a shellfish hatchery, Whiskey Creek, over in Tillamook that supplies three-quarters of the oyster seed used to produce shellfish up and down the West Coast. It's an industry worth $110 million annually. Their stock of oyster seed is being threatened by the rising acidity of the ocean, which is, again, a serious impact of climate change. So right there in Oregon there's two examples, economic examples, of how our local industry is being affected.

Oregonians, I know, as well as people around this country, they're looking to us for solutions. They're looking to us for leadership. So we need to discuss how we are going to mitigate and begin to reverse these environmental and economic effects. We have a great responsibility, not only to our own home States, but to our country and the rest of the world, and we need to take a leadership role.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate that comment. I was just thinking, as you were describing the threats on our Oregon coast, to what we just read in the Washington Post a couple of days ago here where the impacts of climate change are having a profound effect on the blue crab, breeding a super crab that's actually growing more rapidly; at the same time, climate impacts are weakening the oysters, making them more vulnerable, so the potential here of completely disrupting this critical part of the ecosystem in the Chesapeake Bay.

I appreciate very much your joining in this conversation. I wish that my Republican friends would join us in the invitation to actually debate this issue in the finest tradition of the House of Representatives. There was a time when, in this Chamber, there were echoes of great challenge, debate, where people went back and forth with ideas to be able to bring out the best in us. We actually saw that when the Republicans took control 23 months ago, one of the first things they did was abolish the Special Committee on Climate Change and Global Warming, and since then we haven't really had an opportunity to engage in this fashion.

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate your bringing up the idea of the hottest year. In Memphis, it does occasionally get hot, but it also does in Washington. I think it's supposed to be 90 today. I suspect, and somebody is going to be able to prove me wrong, but this may be the hottest——

□ 1650

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is an all-time record for today.

Mr. COHEN. I figured it was, and it's just unbelievable. And last week it was cold. I mean, I had my winter suit when I went home, and I brought my summer stuff here today.

The heat does have effects, and you brought up some of the other issues. It's not just the polar bears. I'm a big fan of the polar bears, but they're going to be eliminated because they're going to lose their ability to survive in their natural climate. Also, the flora and the fauna are at risk.

What Mr. BLUMENAUER mentioned about defense made me think of a long time ago when I was in college. There was a man I thought a lot of named Don Wolfson. He was a smart man from a family that had knowledge of power in this country. We were talking about who was the most powerful person in the country and what were the most powerful interests. I had said something about the military industrial complex and how President Eisenhower had warned us in his last address about the military industrial complex. What he warned us about really was the impact they would have on the budget and all those things. But what Don Wolfson told me was the military industrial complex is all tied to one thing: oil. That's what it's about.

The military runs on oil. And as Mr. BLUMENAUER so well pointed out, they're the most consuming user of oil, and they also at the same time are spending much of their efforts defending the trade routes to get oil. That's why the 5th Fleet is over there in Bahrain, and it is defending the Strait of Hormuz and why Iran has particular significance in the Middle East.

It's amazing what President Eisenhower warned us about, and I don't know if that was part of his warning, but maybe there was more truth to what he said and we probably should spend a part of each day reflecting on President Eisenhower's warning about the military industrial complex and what it has done to our Nation, because that's where the budget has really got a great problem, and that all goes back to our dependence on foreign oil.

Ms. BONAMICI. If I may add, too, that it calls out for continued investment in alternative technologies and energy from electric vehicles to hybrid vehicles to alternative fuels, solar power, wind power, and bicycles. We need to continue that research and investment in those alternative technologies to decrease our dependence on foreign fuel.

One of the things that I want to mention too and what we have debated here on the floor is how much we're going to spend to clean up after disasters. That is something that we have debated here on the floor.

I want to point out that a recent GAO report for the first time lists climate change as a significant financial risk to the Federal Government. We're not well positioned to address the fiscal exposure presented by climate change.

As a Nation, we've become too familiar with the consequences of waiting until the 11th hour to develop solutions. The time is now to work together, to begin to reverse these changes, to develop alternative technologies, to come up with policies that will begin to take on this very serious problem and build our economy at the same time.

And even for those who dispute or ignore the scientific evidence of climate change, we can still discuss the economic gains we can make by investing in a clean-energy economy and modernizing our infrastructure and seeking energy independence, which is also a national security issue, as you had mentioned, as well.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Absolutely.

Those 11 weather disasters last year cost us over $60 billion. It's also creating uncertainty in agriculture and in the business of insurance where it's more difficult for them to be able to calculate what they're doing. It places more burden on the Federal Government because in many cases there aren't private alternatives available. That's why we had to create flood insurance. You're touching on an area that has profound economic consequences because of this environmental instability.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. BLUMENAUER, let me ask you this—and we've worked together on the Keystone XL issue—When people come to you and say that it's going to create all these jobs, we need jobs and they can get this oil, these tar sands to China if they need to by going to the West, what do you tell folks about those jobs and the effect it will have on the future?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It's very important for us to take a step back and evaluate exactly what the economic employment opportunities are because things that we do to rebuild and renew America in a sustainable way—Keystone has a few thousand temporary construction jobs and maybe a handful—I've heard various estimates—a few dozen, a couple hundred permanent jobs and has, as you pointed out, significant environmental consequences.

But when we're investing in wind, solar, geothermal, these are areas that are producing far more jobs already and that they are using a sustainable source of energy that pays a continuing dividend over time. This wind is American. This geothermal energy is American. It's renewable, and it doesn't cost us anything.

Mr. COHEN. Memphis borders Arkansas, and there was some kind of a pipeline problem over there recently. I think it might have been Exxon. They had a leak. That's kind of an expensive process. That's similar to the Keystone pipeline; isn't it? It gives us kind of a warning of what could occur.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well, energy transmission is something that is a part of the broader equation.

Pipeline reliability is something that we all need to be concerned about. More fundamentally, we need to deal with the sources of energy, what is driving them, how we reduce carbon emissions, not sort of how we shift the pieces around. The priority, I think, ought to be sustainable energy, more economic investment, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, not cooking the planet.

I recently had my first two grandchildren in a course of a few months. It was interesting to me—some of these dry debates that we have that talk about by 2100, sea levels may rise 3 or 4—that always seemed kind of remote to me until I realized that these two young men, if they live as long as their great-grandmother, will be alive in the year 2100, and what we do as a Congress helps shape the world that they inherit.

That's our responsibility. That's why I deeply appreciate both of you being a part of this discussion this evening and why I hope that our Republican friends will join us in an actual debate of these policies, practices, what the choices are. Hopefully, it may actually lead to action in the floor of the House for a more sustainable future.

Ms. BONAMICI. I know we join you in that.

I also wanted to mention, while you're talking about renewable energy, the great promise of wave energy as well with the coast.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

The gentlewoman may continue.

Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know that Mr. BLUMENAUER has grandchildren. I don't yet. We owe it not only to the current generation, but to future generations to take action on these important issues.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I'm prepared to yield back, unless my friend from Memphis wants any concluding comment.

Mr. COHEN. I just want to thank you for your leadership, and it's been an honor to join you today on the floor on this issue. It's important to be addressed.

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

## CLEARING THE NAMES OF JOHN BROW AND BROOKS GRUBER

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, which was 2 days ago, 13 years ago, 19 marines crashed and burned in Marana, Arizona. It was a very tragic time.

The Osprey, Mr. Speaker, is the plane that goes from a helicopter mode to a plane mode. At the time of the accident, it was actually in an experimental phase.

Two years after the accident—I was here at the time the accident took place—I received a letter from the wife of Brooks Gruber. He's on my far left. He was the copilot. At the time of the accident, Colonel John Brow was flying the plane. The sad thing about it is why they had 19 marines on the back. The families do not know. And quite frankly, the former commandant of the Marine Corps during the time of this accident, General Jim Jones, not a relation to me, but I think the world of him, he said to me, I don't know why in the world they did not have sacks of weight in the back instead of those 17 marines sitting back there.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, the problem is the lawsuits are over. I've spoken to the lawyer in Texas, Jim Furman, himself a helicopter pilot during the Vietnam war, and he represented the families of Connie Gruber and Trish Brow. In addition, Brian Alexander of New York represented 17 families. Mr. Speaker, I always believe this—I might be wrong because I'm not an attorney—that when a substantial settlement is made, then somebody was seen as being at fault.

The press release has created the problem. On July 27 of the year 2000, in the release, they make reference to a combination of human factors that caused the April 8 accident. Further stated by Marine Corps Commandant General James Jones:

> The tragedy is that these were all good marines joined in a challenging mission. Unfortunately, the pilots' drive to accomplish that mission appears to have been the fatal factor.

What the family and myself have been battling for since the year 2000 is that the experts have said that the pilots did not understand vortex ring state and how it impacts the V–22. Vortex ring state is understood in most helicopters, but the V–22 was new, and they had not done any testing at all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read the paragraph from Connie Gruber when she asked me to look into this. This was dated December 10 of 2002:

> With so many wrongs in the world we cannot make right, I ask that you prayerfully consider an injustice that you can help make right. I realize you alone may not be able to amend the report, but you can certainly support my efforts to permanently remove this black mark from my husband's honorable military service record. Military leaders continue to refuse to amend this report, but I am certain there must be other means of making this change. Given the controversy of this aircraft and the Marine Corps' vested interest, surely there is an unbiased, ethical way to rightfully absolve these pilots. Please help me by not only forwarding my request but by also supporting it.

When I received that letter from Mrs. Gruber, I called and told her that I am a strong man of faith, and there was some reason that God put my name in her letter and that I would do everything I could to clear the names of Colonel John Brow and Major Brooks Gruber.

I'm not a pilot, Mr. Speaker—and I don't know—but I cannot really understand being a pilot or a copilot in a situation where you have not been trained, where you didn't understand the vortex ring state and how it would impact the V–22 and what you should do. That's the fault of the United States Marine Corps, and that's the fault of Bell-Boeing. Again, the lawsuits are settled, and Bell-Boeing settled for big bucks, if I can say it that way.

I want to give you just another idea. I have talked to so many people in 10 years that sometimes it gets confusing; but I think what I'm going to read, Mr. Speaker, probably tells the story as well as anything. It's from a publication called ''V–22: Wonder Weapon or Widow Maker.'' I'll read:

> That the tests addressing flying qualities and a phenomenon called ''vortex ring state'' were reduced from 103 mandated test conditions to the 33 actually flown represents a cancellation of almost 68 percent of the tests in this key area, including the crucial two at 20 and 40 knots at high gross weight specifically applicable in this accident.

This article further states:

> That aircrews were tasked with participating in that April 8 night operation without benefit of such highly relevant test results and experience represents real—and what some might label criminal—negligence on the part of those NAVAIR and Marine Corps leaders who knew both the parameters of the missing tests and the nature of this nighttime exercise. Without this prior testing experience, data and subsequent analysis, these pilots should not have been flying such a mission.

Mr. Speaker, what makes this so ironic is that, as I've shared with you, I'm in my 12th year of trying to get a letter from the United States Marine Corps that clearly states—and the facts support this—that Colonel John Brow, pilot, and Major Brooks Gruber, copilot, were not prepared to handle vortex ring state in the V–22 Osprey. That's all the wives want. You would think that we were going to be sued or something. I've got letters from the lawyers who say, No more suits. It's over.

Trish has two young boys, Michael and Matthew, and Connie has a little girl who is just as precious as she can be. It's just one of those things that, as a man of faith, you just wonder: Where is the guilt of those who ordered that mission that night? It made no sense. Dick Cheney was opposed to the Osprey, and he was really trying to scrap the program. He was Secretary of Defense at the time. So the Marine Corps ordered a mission where these three planes would go to Marana, Arizona, and they would play that they were going to recapture some Americans being held by terrorists. Really, sometimes you just wonder: Where is the heart? Where is the feeling? These gentlemen, truthfully, were known as two of the best Osprey pilots that the Marine Corps had at that time.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I actually contacted the three marine investigators for the JAGMAN report. That is the official evaluation of the accident. Major Phil Stackhouse, Colonel Ron Radish, and Colonel Mike Morgan have all given me letters in the last year. Each one clearly states that nothing in the JAGMAN report should indicate that the pilots did anything in a deliberate way, because the pilots had not been trained.

Bell-Boeing, after being sued, hired an experimental test pilot, Tom MacDonald, who is pretty well known in the area of planes. Tom MacDonald spent 700 hours studying one issue: What happens when the V–22 gets in the vortex ring state? In 700 hours, he discovered how they should handle it, and he received a national award known as the Kincheloe.

I've talked to a lot of people in the 12 years on this issue, and the one thing that God has allowed me to understand is that His children deserve to be cleared. I am hopeful. We have back and forth sent a letter that the Marine Corps is reviewing and that the two wives have said they would be satisfied with, and our hope is that sometime in the next few weeks we will get that letter. I will go to the Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, whom I know and have a friendship with, and I will ask him to assign someone on his immediate staff to work with me on this issue.

I hope that the Marine Corps understands that I do not want to do that, because it would bring more peace to Trish and Connie if the Marine Corps writes the letter. Again, we're probably talking about at most three sentences. Trish has said, for the public, I do not want my children, Michael and Matthew, to go on Google and read that pilot error was the cause of this accident on April 8 of 2000.

□ 1710

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is what would happen if any of us on this floor tonight Googled ''Osprey'' and ''April 8,'' you would see that. It indicates it was pilot error.

Sometimes I have some kids in my office, as I did today from my district, some 4–Hers, and they were asking about the things that a Member of Congress gets involved in. And I said not everything we get involved in should be or needs to be in the press. Some things that we get involved in, it's simply because our heart tells us that if you don't do it, who is going to do it? Who's going to do it if you, Congressman WALTER JONES, don't take it up?

I hope and pray that John Brow and Brooks Gruber and the 17 marines in the back will be able to rest in peace, Mr. Speaker.

Voltaire said:

> We owe the living respect; we owe the dead the truth.

That's all we're asking, is that these two marines can rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I have said if this comes to be a reality, that I want to go to the

graves—John is buried in Arlington—with his wife and their two boys, and say, Colonel Brow, it's over. Then with Major Gruber, with his wife and little girl—he's buried in Jacksonville—is to go with them and say, Sleep, you're not at fault. Sleep.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for getting emotional, but I just feel so passionate about this.

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

## HONORING GENERAL JAMES MATTIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Twenty-two minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And this is probably appropriate coming after Mr. JONES speaking about the United States Marine Corps. I come before you today, Mr. Speaker, to talk about a great marine, a marine who was just in charge of Central Command and has retired and resigned after decades of service to this Nation, and let me start at the point where I was able to meet him.

Ten years ago today, the war in Iraq was under way. Nineteen days after the invasion, marines and soldiers had dismantled Saddam Hussein's regime. The takedown of Baghdad and Iraq was precise and supremely coordinated, much to the credit of Marine General James Mattis, who led the 1st Marine Division in Baghdad, and just recently completed his tour as the commander of Central Command.

On March 20, 2003, Mattis led the 1st Marine Division to the borders of Iraq. The marines' success and effectiveness, sustaining light casualties, was due to the intellect and the skill of one of the most cerebral warfighters of our lifetime, General Mattis. General Mattis is a tough man, exactly what you would expect from a United States Marine. He's practical in combat while laser-focused on securing the objective.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. On the march to Baghdad, General Mattis landed C–130s on the highway to keep vehicles and tanks moving. Mattis' marines outsmarted and overpowered Saddam's forces. In the aftermath, Mattis took a totally different tactic. It was harder to win the peace in Iraq to a certain extent than it was to win the war, but that is when Mattis let his intelligence and his outside-of-the-box thinking show through. In the aftermath, General Mattis and his commanders, working to build trust, establish alliances, and support projects that were important to the Iraqi people, befriended what some thought were the worst people in Iraq in the Anbar province where the bloody battles of Fallujah and Ramadi roared.

General Mattis was able to make friends with those sheiks and with those elders and brought about the awakening where those local tribes realized that al Qaeda was their enemy and not the Americans, and they then turned on al Qaeda in Iraq and that was able to precipitate the surge and the drawdown from Iraq where we won, largely as a testament to General Mattis' leadership.

There were a lot of other great generals—General Odierno, General Petraeus, General McChrystal, General Kelly, General Dunford, who's now in Afghanistan in charge of the International Security Assistance Force, a lot of great generals. But General Mattis stands out to me, and I would like to relay a quick experience.

When I got to Iraq in 2003, I was driving north to join the 1st Marine Division, and we got ambushed. My marine that was on the Mark 19 in the gun turret got shot in the arm. And at that point as a lieutenant, we were taught to drive out of an ambush as quick as possible and link up and go back and prosecute the enemy if we were able to. We weren't able to at this point. It was 2003. There was no radio communication at this point in time. We couldn't talk with higher headquarters. So me being the highest ranking officer in this convoy, and I was brand new in Iraq and, frankly, didn't know much about anything, we continued north to where the 1st Marine Division was headquartered in a little place called Diwaniyah.

General Mattis happened to be in the command operations center when I got there and dressed me down for not prosecuting the enemy that had ambushed my convoy. He was angry not that a marine was shot or not that we had escaped; he was angry because we didn't get after the guy that got after us. That's a real trait of General Mattis. But for a lieutenant like me who had been in country for a few hours, it was a stark awakening to, hey, you're in the war, and you have to live up to the expectations and the presence and the example set by people like Jim Mattis.

I got to meet General Mattis again in 2004 when I returned to Iraq in the battle of Fallujah. We would call General Mattis ''Chaos.'' That was his call sign because not only was he the cerebral and intellectual architect regarding a lot of what the Marine Corps did in the Anbar province, but he was also fearless. He would drive alone and unafraid by himself in his own light-armored vehicle, and he would show up anywhere he wanted to, day or night, in any kind of situation, whether there was a fire fight going on or not. And I tell you, he earned the respect, rightfully so, of every single marine and every single soldier who saw him on the front lines during those wars.

General Mattis is now CENTCOM commander. Through his leadership, CENTCOM has overseen the Afghan war with a level of confidence and strategy that is indicative of General Mattis' touch. Aspiring leaders would be smart to take a lesson from General Mattis. He well served the United States Marine Corps and America for more than 40 years.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that this administration with this Commander in Chief likes military leaders who agree with it, military leaders that give this administration the answers that they like to get about the way that the world is today. And they are opposed, frankly, to military leaders who give their honest opinions, regardless of who is Commander in Chief.

General Mattis is the type of person that our military needs now more than ever before. And as he prepares to leave CENTCOM, for reasons that appear to possibly hinge on politics and this administration and General Mattis' take on Iran, I can say that I speak for the marines who have served under Mattis that a leader of his kind is near impossible to replace.

I would like to read a couple of quotes. This book is called ''Victory in Iraq: How America Won.''

□ 1720

The opening page, General Mattis is featured speaking to his Marines, the 1st Marine Division, in Iraq, or in Kuwait before the invasion. Here's what he said:

> When I give you the word, we will cross the line into Iraq. For the mission's sake, our country's sake, and the sake of the men who carried the division's colors in past battles, who fought for life and never lost their nerve, carry out your mission and keep your honor clean. Demonstrate to the world that there is no better friend, no worse enemy than a United States Marine.

I would like to give General Mattis the appreciation of the entire United States House of Representatives and every single Marine, past, present and future, and every single American that owes, at least partly, the safety of this Nation to people like him and to him, literally and explicitly, for what he's done for this Nation.

Semper Fi, General Mattis. We hope that retirement treats you as well as your Marine Corps did.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1120, PREVENTING GREATER UNCERTAINTY IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–32) on the resolution (H. Res. 146) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1120) to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from taking any action that requires a quorum of the members of the Board until such time as Board constituting a quorum

shall have been confirmed by the Senate, the Supreme Court issues a decision on the constitutionality of the appointments to the Board made in January 2012, or the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 113th Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. We are re-establishing the 30-Something Working Group, which some may remember. Many—it seems like many years ago, Congressman Kendrick Meek and I and Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ came to this floor in 2003 and 2004 and 2005 and 2006, and we were talking about issues of the day and how they applied to people in their thirties or people in their twenties, and tried to take, at that point, some of President Bush's policies and make them understandable to young people in our society.

And so we had many conversations, many late night conversations here on this House floor, sometimes an hour a night, sometimes 2 hours a night, sometimes 3, 4, 5 hours a week, coming to help deliver the message. And at that time, back in 2004 and 2005 and 2006—and let me just take a second to thank all the staff that was here for those late hours, for always being around for us, and some are still here today, as we are still here today. But today, we want to re-establish this.

Back then it was the privatization of Social Security, Mr. Speaker. And President Bush wanted to take the Social Security program and privatize it, put it in the stock market and allow that to be a part of the private investment system and not the insurance system that we have with regard to Social Security. And fortunately, we were able, through the leadership of Minority Leader PELOSI, at that time, before she was Speaker, encouraged us to go out and do this, and we were able, with her leadership, the 30-Something Group and other Members going out across the country, we were able to put a stop to the privatization of Social Security.

And fast forward just a few years, to 2008, 2009, I think there were a lot of Americans who were very happy that we did not, at that time, have the Social Security program in the stock market. Many people would have lost their retirements.

So today, we have a whole new set of challenges, and we have a new crop of very talented, young Members of Congress, members of the Democratic Caucus, who want to come to the floor and talk about the issues of the day as they pertain to young people and people who have been around a little bit, and how some of these proposals that are coming from the Republican Conference, the Republican Study Committee, the Republican Budget Committee, how some of these policies will hit the ground.

In my opinion, we seem to be governing by bumper sticker. So we want smaller government, we want less of this and less of that, and more of this and more of that, that can be phrased to sound really good on a bumper sticker to where you would drive by and you would look at the bumper sticker and you'd think, it makes a lot of sense.

But what we want to do with this working group and the folks who will be joining me here tonight and over the next several weeks and months is to say, how does this hit the ground? How does the Republican budget hit the ground?

How does it affect you? How does it affect your family? How does it affect your mom and dad? How does it affect your grandma and grandpa? And that's what we would like to talk about here today.

I think, and say this, knowing that many of the folks on the other side of the aisle are friends of mine, dear friends, good friends. Some I like to hang out with, some I don't get an opportunity to hang out with, but are all good people trying to do good things.

But why we need to come here and have this debate and discussion and conversation is that we need to figure out how we're going to move forward as a country. And our arguments on our side are that the Republican budget, the Republican approach, the Republican philosophy has caused a lot of the problems that we have in our economy today. The financial deregulation, looking the other way while Wall Street turned into a crap game, without any regulation at all, no cops on the beat keeping an eye on things.

We saw two wars put on a credit card, Afghanistan and Iraq, no taxpayer, no citizen, other than the families of the military, were asked to make any sacrifice at all, and funding for the two wars was put on a credit card. And then you throw in a prescription drug bill that was not paid for on the credit card.

So this is what happened from 2000 to 2008, where we were running up the deficit, running up the national debt. And here we arrived in 2009, after having to save the banks and do the TARP program in order to plug this trillions of dollars of a hole in our economy to make sure that the banks don't lock up and not loan money and everything else, so we had to go to the taxpayer, and the taxpayer had to foot the bill for the two wars, the prescription drug bill, and the massive deregulation of the financial markets, the too-big-to-fail, and then they failed. And so the taxpayer was asked to foot the bill.

What we are saying here on our side is that that's the wrong approach. Cutting taxes for the wealthiest in our society, this is not to punish the wealthy, this is—our approach is not to punish anybody, but what we're saying is, when the income for the top 1 percent goes up over the last 10, 15, 20 years so dramatically that the average CEO is making 300-plus times what the average worker is making, when you have the rich people that are making hundreds of millions of dollars, the top 1 percent, but then you also have the top .1 percent of the Americans who are making massive amounts of money, hedge funds and whatnot.

□ 1730

What we're saying is, when you have that imbalance and that level of inequality or it becomes a threat to the democratic way of life, that's the democracy piece, but we also have the economic piece. When you get a high concentration of wealth, then the average person doesn't have the amount of money in their pocket to be able to go out and spend in the economy.

So this is a supply side argument, cut taxes for the wealthy, this approach that our friends on the other side, the Republican Party, the Tea Party, has been pitching since 1980: cut taxes for the rich and hopefully something positive will happen for the middle class.

Democrats are saying we've got to invest in the middle class. We've got to help the middle class with health care costs, with the cost of going to school and going to college, getting a trade, going to a community college, helping poor school districts, making sure that families who send their kids to college and take out a student loan, that those loan repayment rates are reasonable. Those are the reforms we made as Democrats here while the Democrats were in charge of the Chamber in 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010, and those are the investments we made.

We're talking about two separate philosophies. One philosophy on the Republican Tea Party side is to cut taxes for the wealthy, deregulate Wall Street, and look the other way while there's a crap game going on on Wall Street; have two wars, one of them very questionable in why it started in the first place, and a prescription drug bill that all went on the credit card.

So cut taxes, start two wars, and put a prescription drug bill on the credit card, drive up the debt, deregulate the financial markets until the taxpayer has to come in and bail out and the economy collapses, that's what happened. And so we don't really have to have the argument. Those are the facts of a Republican Presidency, House, and Senate that got to implement their tax package. They got to implement their financial regulatory packages. They got to pass budgets that did or did not make certain investments. And what happened is, after a decade of that philosophy being implemented, the economy collapsed. It was not just a normal recession, it was a financial recession, which a lot of economists now are telling us how difficult and how much longer it takes to get out of these financial recessions.

So the discussion that we've had in the last Presidential election and the discussion that we want to have here in this Chamber as to what philosophy should prevail in the United States of House of Representatives, the body that is most directly elected—the Federal piece, anyway—most directly elected, every 2 years, by the people of this country, what philosophy shall we take? And the Democrats are offering, under the leadership of Leader PELOSI, a different world view, a world view that says we make investments in the infrastructure, we make investments in education, we make sure that we have a fair Tax Code that is simpler and fairer, that it doesn't take forever to fill out your taxes. Keep it simple. And at the same time, we ask those people who have benefited so much over the last decade or two, whose income went up and they now make 300-plus times what the average worker makes, that they help pay their fair share and help us pay for the debts that the Republican Party has incurred by putting two wars on a credit card and a prescription drug bill.

So that's the discussion. That's what we want to do. And the President and the Democrats have made these investments. And if you think that things like only paying a certain percentage of your income back for your student loan is what is part of your philosophy, then you fall in our camp on that issue. If you think that the CEO that's making 300 times more, or $300 for every dollar the person on the factory floor is making, needs to be balanced out, maybe they need to help us pay down the debt more and shouldn't have all kinds of tax loopholes, then you're going to side with what the Democrats want to do.

So long story short, we are now in a position where we can talk about the Republican budget. And we all are in agreement, I think, Democrats and Republicans, that budgets are documents that represent our values. And we all are in agreement that we need to take care of our long-term debt. We need to reduce our deficits. It is an issue, and one that we all need to take very seriously.

Now, the Republican plan is presented to the American people, and it is taking needed investments and cutting them so deeply that we are going to get leapfrogged by China and India and Europe in some of the coming industries. These cuts, in order to try to balance the budget in a short period of time, are going to be pushed off. The burden of these cuts will be on the middle class—education, economic development, which are the kind of investments that we need to make. Also, these cuts are going to be cut out of programs that help the poorest among us, and that is not a recipe for success.

We have 300-plus million people in the United States. We are competing against India and China on who's going to determine who's going to shape the future of the global economy. Is it going to be the United States? Is it going to be China? Is it going to be India? Is it going to be Europe? That's the question. Who's going to shape this future? And America has always had a recipe, from post-World War II until roughly in the 1980s, where we made investments in infrastructure, we made investments in research and development, we made investments in education, because we knew that those were public investments that would yield huge benefits for the United States of America.

And now we have a Republican philosophy that says those investments are a waste of money and that any investment that the government makes must be a bad one; that the space program, that the research investments that we make, that making sure that school is affordable, the public-private partnerships that lead to new developments, the research that no one company will make must be made by the public. Those are quality investments that help build our economy for a generation, whether it was post-World War II with the GI Bill and we take all of these soldiers and we make sure that they can go to college, we make sure they can go to law school, we make sure that they can go to medical school, we make sure they can become engineers.

□ 1740

Or the space program, in which public money, with private ingenuity and know-how, came together. That investment in the space program led to a booming economy in the high-tech sector, the other public investments that led to the Internet and satellites and all of these other things, and private companies come in and benefit from that and then invest in a workforce that can take those technologies and make them better and increase productivity so that we have a strong middle class.

Invest in our infrastructure, make sure that we rebuild our country. We've got combined sewer systems, we've got roads, we've got bridges that need done. We need to make sure that we invest in the smart power grids so that we can get alternative energy pumped into our grids, so that we can have a more conservative approach to how we expend energy, a smarter approach because of a smart grid where we're wasting less energy. These are the kind of investments that we need to make, and all the while protecting what's happening and what may happen if the Republican budget would be signed into law.

The dramatic cuts in the Medicare program, asking those going into their senior years to not have a guaranteed benefit that they paid into. Many of those folks who would be hurt by the program, the Republican budget program, would be women, many of them older women. Fifty-five percent of the Medicare population—women. The oldest Medicare beneficiaries, 85 and over, 70 percent of those are women. So as we age, women will see those cuts.

We have proposals from the other side about abolishing Planned Parenthood, about saying that Planned Parenthood does not serve women well. It's many, many women who get basic health care from Planned Parenthood—screenings, birth control, family planning, all done through Planned Parenthood. The other side wants to abolish it, defund it completely.

These are some basic things that we need to do in order to protect the middle class.

So here we are, in the next few weeks and months, we're going to have a discussion about where this country goes and where the House of Representatives goes and what's our philosophy. So we will be coming here week after week after week to compare this philosophy, the philosophy of cut taxes for the top 1 percent, to keep the Tax Code very complicated so the wealthiest benefit from it, or Democratic philosophies and Democratic proposals that say we want a fairer Tax Code, we want a simpler Tax Code, and we want a Tax Code that doesn't have so many loopholes that only if you have high-powered accountants will you be able to take advantage of the Tax Code.

The Tax Code should benefit middle class families. We all need to contribute, but it shouldn't be so complicated that if you have a lot of money or you're a big corporation you're somehow going to get out of paying taxes or you're somehow going to be able to hide your taxes overseas and not pay your fair share. That's one group's philosophy versus ours.

We are saying that, yes, we need to balance the budget, but we want to do it like President Clinton did it and the Democrats did it in 1993. We want to do it in a fair way that continues to make investments in those essential investments that will lead to long-term economic growth.

One of the things we're doing in Youngstown, in my congressional district, is a program that President Obama had to put together administratively—that we want to push for more of these—public-private partnerships and innovative institutes. The innovation institute that we have now in Youngstown is in additive manufacturing, three-dimensional printing, the cutting edge of manufacturing, the cutting edge of additive manufacturing, partnering with big companies like Lockheed and Boeing and other smaller companies in the Mahoning Valley. But public money from the Department of Defense or Department of Energy, the Department of Commerce, public-private partnerships to help position America—not just our region—in the next generation of additive manufacturing help drive the cost down for these printers so that everyone that has a desktop computer now can have a desktop printer that prints products that could revolutionize health care, revolutionize energy, revolutionize

manufacturing in the defense industry. But this is a public-private partnership.

What we cannot do is say, ''Oh, my God, that's government money; it's got to be bad,'' these investments that we make for the poor in the Medicaid program so we can make sure that these kids have basic health care in the United States of America.

And, yes, we do need education reform; yes, we do need innovation within the health care system. We've got a long way to go, even with the health care reform bill and how we can revolutionize health care, how we can revolutionize education, how we can revolutionize the way we take care of our veterans. I will be back on this floor talking about some of those ways that we can go about doing that.

But the issue I have with the Republican proposals are they're all about the budget. Listen, we all know we have a demographic problem—we all know we have the baby boomers moving into the Social Security and the Medicare system—but how are we going to drive down Medicare costs? How are we going to drive down health care costs? That's the question. That's what's important. Of course we need to bring the cost down of health care, but you just don't say, well, we're not going to have any reforms, the free market is somehow going to take care of it and it should be pushed off on the backs of the citizens. That's not going to work. That's not humane. There is a better way to go about it, when you look at the field of integrative health care, for example, how you can help prevent a lot of issues from arising that make people sick.

When you look at 70 or 75 percent of health care costs are caused by things that are behavioral in nature, so how do we shift the health care system to even more prevention like we tried to do in the health care reform bill? How do we make investments into areas in medical schools and hospitals that are looking into driving down health care costs in these other ways? Not just talk about, oh, we're going to have draconian cuts to the Medicare program and then we're going to push it all off on the Medicare recipient to foot the bill and we're going to give them a voucher.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is what happens with this Republican Tea Party budget. You will get a voucher, Mr. Speaker. These folks will get a voucher. My friends on the other side say, well, yeah, but that voucher will help you pay for it. The problem is the voucher that the seniors will get doesn't go up, doesn't rise with the cost of health care. So the voucher only goes up a small bit while health care costs have been going up four, five, six, seven, depending on the plan, more percent. So you get a voucher today and it's worth $100 and your health care bill is $150, but next year your voucher is worth $102 and health care costs are $170. That happens every single year. That voucher becomes worthless at some point. The cost will be pushed off onto seniors. They're going to have to come out of pocket. Their kids are going to have to help them.

You see these huge cuts in the Medicaid program, which in many States help senior citizens get into a nursing home and pay for a nursing home.

□ 1750

So the middle class, again, people 40, 50, 60 years old who have parents in a nursing home, are going to have to come out of pocket. That's bad for the economy, less consumer demand.

All of these things fit together. We're going to come back and continue to talk about many of these issues over the course of the next few weeks and months and compare. As I said at the beginning, I've got a lot of Republican friends in this Chamber, I've got a lot of Republican friends in my congressional district, but I also have a lot of Republican friends in my congressional district that would disagree with the approach of the disinvestment in the United States that's coming from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to coming back in the next week and months, and I'm sure you're excited for that, too.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address this Chamber and to address an issue of great concern to me. I just heard my colleague and friend from Ohio and what he had to say, and certainly there is a debate that's going on that's worth being had, a debate about the progression of this great country, the greatest on this Earth, in the history of this Earth, a country that has distinguished itself in just a few short years, 236, 237, as a Nation that understands what liberty is about, but also understands the authority that we come under.

Mr. Speaker, I have wrestled with coming to the floor tonight, because since I first began my legislative career back in 1982 in the Michigan House of Representatives, and when I stood in front of people and asked for their opportunity or their support to give me a privileged position in that great body, I stated clearly, and I have from that point in 1982 to this very day, I've stated that, as a Christian and as a former pastor, while I would not flaunt my religion, I would not hide my faith.

I've continued that in coming to the U.S. House of Representatives as well. I truly believe that all laws are moral. Some of us would consider morality one way and others of us would consider it another. We all come through filters in life. I understand that, and I respect that. I believe that the Framers and Founders of this great country, its ideals that were based upon truth as they determined truth to be, as they understood it, truth coming from the revealed word of God that they declared to be found in the Bible at that time, and they were not ashamed to say that and quoted many times from Scripture, even without reference, because it was clearly understood by the citizens of that day that the basic ideals that this new government was established upon were ideals found and written down in the Bible and clearly understood to be the word of God.

I'd wrestle with the fact that I understand that there are filters, and the moment that I let it out of the bag, as it were, Mr. Speaker, that I'm a pastor, I'm a Christian, I come from a Judeo-Christian value system, that that's my filter, that I would lose the opportunity to speak to society in general. Well, I assume that risk this evening, because we have come to a time in our history where the unified understanding, whether we acknowledged it or fully agreed with it or certainly lived by it, because I know, as one who has feet of clay, that though I understand truth, I don't always live by it, yet our country is at crossroads in a battle along those principles.

I read in this greatest man-made document ever penned, the Constitution of the United States, I read the First Amendment, the Second Amendment, the Third Amendment, and on through the Tenth Amendment, which are classified as the Bill of Rights, Bill of Rights that were given and acknowledged by the Framers and Founders and the implementers of these amendments, the Bill of Rights, as really stemming from God, Himself, unalienable rights, God given, not man given, recognizing these rights as above simple human reasoning.

In recent days, I've read and reread our First Amendment that says:

> 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 people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for redress of grievances.

And I go on to the final, the 10th, that gives the States the authority that they should have. And I see what's taking place in relationship at this point in time to one complex bill that was passed, called the Affordable Health Care Act, but with specifically one mandate that I clearly believe runs roughshod of this First Amendment when it, in fact, is a law that prohibits the free exercise thereof of religious beliefs. Now, again, that's my perspective, but it's a perspective I think is backed up by the Framers and Founders in their writings and their speeches and their beliefs that they implemented into this great, great country.

Just recently I read an article that, more than just simply being an article, gave names of fellow citizens,

businesspeople, who through no fault of their own, except for the fact that they were religious, they were people of faith that had firm convictions, convictions that they believed went beyond themselves but went to the God that they honored, people like Chris and Paul Griesedieck—I hope I pronounced that name right. I don't know them personally, but I know they run a 105-year-old company started by their great-grandfather, a company in St. Louis that employs 150 people. They are sincere Christians that believe to be forced to supply health insurance that provides abortifacient coverage, agents that will produce abortions, is against their firmly held Christian beliefs and would be a violation of their responsibility to their God.

Now, that's their morality, that's their filter, but from the inception of this country, believed that that, along with all other religious beliefs, was protected under the Bill of Rights.

They are at a point right now, if they violate the mandate of the law, which they are attempting to get an injunction and attempting ultimately to see themselves covered just like churches and Christian colleges, but if they aren't, they're looking at a $5 million fine under that mandate, annually. They've indicated that that will put them out of business.

There's another company run by David Green—we all know it well—Hobby Lobby. We've seen their ads at Easter and Christmastime, full-page ads that he pays for with his own money, to declare the meaning of Christmas and the meaning of Easter in his faith. He pays for it, longstanding, and yet if he doesn't fall under this mandate and bow the knee to the government and not keep his knees bowed to his God that he serves, he'll pay a $1.3 million per day fine, which will take the 13,000 employees that he employs and potentially put them out of a job, many of whom agree with his personal strong faith.

□ 1800

He said, It's come down to the point that I'm forced to either abandon my beliefs in order to stay in business or abandon my business in order to stay true to my belief. That's not the America that was founded by people who put the Bill of Rights together, and specifically the First Amendment.

I could go on with other illustrations about other business owners. Well, let me point out one business owner here who is doing significant work not only as a very successful 85-year-old insurance executive of an insurance company, but he's taken those resources—like Mr. Green, who has given over $500 million to charitable causes, living out his faith—but this gentleman has done the same thing in reaching out to many needy people and developing a business that impacts peoples' lives who are in difficult circumstances. His name is Charles Sharpe. He is 85 years old. He founded Heartland Ministries with the money that he developed to provide a Christian rehabilitation program for men and women battling drug and alcohol addiction, and a boarding school for troubled youth, with his own money. Yet, if he falls under the mandate, the employees that are employed running this organization, but more importantly the lives that are impacted positively by this ministry, will be impacted and the ministry will go under.

As I said, I could go on and on with other illustrations of how this First Amendment liberty is being violated by a country that made this as the first of the Bill of Rights.

Just recently we all heard, I believe, a concern that a briefing had been given to U.S. Army Reserve recruits which classified Catholics, some Jews, evangelical Christians and Sunni Muslims as religious extremists along with the KKK, Al Qaeda and Hamas. In America, religions strongly held, firmly believed religious beliefs, are being attacked as extremist, along with terrorist organizations like Al Qaeda, Hamas and KKK.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you this is not America. I don't care what the courts have said at this point. They've ruled on a tax. But on a constitutional question, I think it's clear for us who read it to understand it is more than just the document, but to understand it as a warning to us and a reminder that the blessings of the freedom of this great Nation come with a commitment to ideals that are beyond us, that are timeless, that are important, that we often call religion but are beyond that. They are faith that goes to our integrity, our convictions, our character.

John Adams, one of the Founders of our country, John Adams, who defended liberty even when he defended the Red Coats under the same premise that we believe that all people deserve a hearing and a just trial, John Adams, who was willing to give his life, his fortune, his sacred honor, said:

> Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.

Why in the world would he say that? There is huge wisdom there, but it came from an understanding that humanity wasn't enough in itself. Human beings weren't wise enough in their own right, but rather had to flow from some truth wiser than that.

Social critic Irving Kristol I think encapsulated it when he said:

> This appears to be a sociological truth. It is religion that reassures people that this world of ours is a home, not just a habitat, and that the tragedies and unfairness we all experience are features of a more benign, if not necessarily comprehensible, whole. It is religion that restrains the self-seeking hedonistic impulse so easily engendered by a successful market economy.

We are a successful market economy here in the United States, and I'm grateful for that, and we need to do a lot of work to continue that. But our faith beliefs—and I'm not talking about one religion over another. I certainly come from a Judeo-Christian viewpoint, and I believe it to be true. I would not have given my life to that belief if it weren't. It impacts society as a whole.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn understood it with his life. He said:

> All individual human rights are granted because man is God's creature; that is, freedom was given to the individual conditionally in the assumption of his constant religious responsibility. Two hundred or even 50 years ago, it would have seemed quite impossible in America that an individual could be granted boundless freedom simply for the satisfaction of his instincts and whims.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that seems to be the point in time where we're at right now, where we're willing for our whims, our instincts, our desires, our own purposes to give in to the baseness of those hedonistic philosophies. And it's proven to be true. The results are there. Here are just a few of them.

Since 1960, we have the end of the so-called ''Christian America,'' as the media has called it in Newsweek. The U.S. illegitimacy rate has rocketed from 5 percent of all births to 41 percent. Among African Americans, the share of births out of wedlock is 71 percent. That's up from 23 percent in 1960. The percentage of households that were married couple families with children under 18 had plummeted by 2006 to just 21.6 percent. Since Roe v. Wade, 50 million-plus abortions have been performed. The Declaration of Independence? We are all endowed with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Between 1960 and 1990, the teenage suicide rate tripled, though the number then fell. As of 2006, suicide was the third leading cause of death of young adults and adolescents age 15 to 24, just behind homicide.

And I could go on with the tragic results of going away from religious belief, faith belief, truth, a moral character. Again, all laws are moral—right, wrong or indifferent. We all have filters.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are challenged economically, we are challenged socially, we are challenged in our security and we are challenged in our liberty because we have wantonly walked away from or in complacency have given away the underpinnings that allowed God to bless this great country, which is still receiving the results of much of that blessing.

The Founders argued very clearly that ''virtue derived from religion is indispensable to limited government.'' The American model of religious liberty takes a strongly positive view of religious practice, both private and public. Far from privatizing religion, it assumes that religious believers and institutions will take active roles in society, including ministers, including engaging in politics and policymaking and helping form the public's moral

consensus. In fact, the American Founders considered religious engagement in shaping the public morality essential to ordered liberty and the success of their experiment in self-government.

□ 1810

John Witherspoon, a minister who signed the Declaration of Independence, said in talking about our Republic, ''a republic once equally poised must either preserve its virtue or lose its liberty.''

Mr. Speaker, as I began, I will never intend to flaunt my religion, but I will not hide my faith; and I believe, in this country where we've given the greatest amount of freedom to all religious beliefs, we would do well to remember that ourselves—to not hold it back but to encourage faith and to encourage laws that respect that to the fullest degree and say to people like David Green or to the Griesediecks or others: we respect you for what you do, your beliefs, and we will certainly honor your freedom. We will not impinge upon you by mandates, no matter how good the law might seem, because there is something higher than health, physical health—and that's our spiritual health, our character health, in this country.

There is a stone above you, Mr. Speaker, that's there tonight and that has been here since this great Chamber was put together, and it's a quote of Daniel Webster's. I read it often, and it says simply this:

''Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests—'' Daniel Webster could be speaking to us tonight and to our country, Mr. Speaker— ''and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.''

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we would restore liberty and justice for all, if we were to restore the opportunity to live under our spiritual liberties and beliefs and not mandate people to go against that—bow their knees to almighty government as opposed to bowing to Almighty God—this Nation will be a blessed Nation under God, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

## RESTORING THE RULE OF LAW AND REESTABLISHING THE PILLARS OF AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As always, it's an honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I come to this floor very troubled here this evening. I am troubled at the current inertia that seems to have been created in the minds and in the positions of a number of people who are here in the House and in the Senate, primarily those on my side of the aisle, who seemed to wake up on the morning of November 7 and decided that Mitt Romney would be President-elect if he just hadn't said two words, ''self-deport,'' and if he hadn't said two other words, ''47 percent.'' They had done this analysis, apparently, before there were any kind of exit polls that could have been considered.

They persist in sticking with this opinion that something must be done about immigration in this country and that there needs to be comprehensive immigration reform passed and that, if that doesn't happen, then there's going to be a kind of calamity that might eliminate or badly weaken the bipartisan, two-party system that we have in this country.

I reject those principles or those opinions, Mr. Speaker, because what I know about the facts refutes them completely. There are no facts that uphold such a position. It is true that the people in my party have lost a growing share of the vote of the list of minority coalitions that there are in the country. It's also true that the other party has demagogued this issue mercilessly, and the effect of their tens of millions of dollars has shown in the polls. My colleagues on my side of the aisle don't seem to recognize that. Perhaps they haven't thought this through, and I hope they do, Mr. Speaker. But the most essential pillar of American exceptionalism that is affected by this debate over immigration is the rule of law.

It appears to me that there are a number of people on my side of the aisle who say—even though they recognize that the comprehensive immigration reform agenda, which has been around since the George W. Bush administration and perhaps before—they believe that somehow, even though it's fifth or sixth on the list of issues that would be important and relevant to minorities that look at the path to citizenship and at a path to staying in the United States and working and raising their families and being productive here, that jobs and the economy are more important. A whole list of things are more important, but it's fifth or sixth on that priority list. Those who advocate for this Gang of Eight's version, which seems to be emerging from the Senate in comprehensive immigration reform, seem to think that we should do something, that we should pass some type of amnesty because that's what's required to ''start the conversation.''

I took an oath to uphold this Constitution. This Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and the rule of law is an essential pillar of American exceptionalism; and if there are people in this Congress, House or Senate, who are prepared to sacrifice the rule of law in order to start a conversation, that's enough to get me to come here to the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, to start the conversation about restoring the rule of law and reestablishing the pillars of American exceptionalism and making sure that this great Nation that we are can go on to our destiny beyond the shining city on the hill to a place that actually does realize American destiny with all of the pillars of American exceptionalism intact, not sacrificing the rule of law for political expediency, which is the bargain that is being negotiated over on the Senate side and behind closed doors here on the House side, although not even publicly admitted to.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the earlier part of this discussion, I would be very pleased to yield to a very strong leader on the rule of law, to one who has led within his own community in Hazleton and who has been a clear and articulate voice on protecting and defending America's rule of law destiny, and that's the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you, Congressman KING.

Recently, there has been a lot of talk in Washington about illegal immigration. As the mayor of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, after it was estimated that 10 percent of our entire population was there illegally, I created the first law of its kind in the country. Now, I don't need to be briefed about illegal immigration—I have lived it. Because Washington has failed to protect our borders, cities like mine have been overcome. I had to deal with it myself because of Washington's failure.

Our immigration laws were created for two reasons: one, to protect the American people and our national security; and two, to protect American workers.

Now, in 1986, Ronald Reagan had promised the American people that if we'd give amnesty to 1.5 million illegal aliens that we would secure our borders and that this would never happen again. After the declaration of amnesty, that 1.5 million actually doubled to over 3 million. Now, a quarter of a century later, over 11 million people are in our country illegally, and our borders are still not secured.

This isn't just about the southern border. There is a lot of focus about, if we secure the southern border, our borders are secure. Forty percent of the people who are in the country illegally did not cross a border—they didn't cross the southern border; they didn't come across Canada. Forty percent of the people who are in the country illegally came on visas and overstayed their visas. In fact, one of the men who was granted amnesty in 1986 was involved in the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center. Now, my city is 2,000 miles away from the nearest southern border, and I have an illegal immigration problem. Any State that has an international airport is a border State.

□ 1820

There are 22 million Americans who are out of work. We should not be encouraging millions more to come here illegally when so many Americans cannot find jobs. Medicare and Social Security are going broke, and yet the Heritage Foundation did a study that said that if we give a pathway to citizenship to the 11 million or more who are here, it will cost over $2.6 trillion over the next 20 years. We should not even be talking about offering amnesty. There should be no bill that talks about a pathway to citizenship. We should be securing our borders first.

This is something that we should all be able to agree upon, Democrats and Republicans, the Senate and the House, if we are sincere, if we're not trying to fool the American people a second time. We promised them that we would secure our borders before we give amnesty. Offering a pathway to citizenship will make matters worse. It will encourage millions more to come here illegally.

You know, you don't replace your carpet at home when you still have a hole in the roof.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for coming to the floor to deliver this presentation, this hands-on presentation from the gentleman, Mr. BARLETTA. If you would yield to a question, I'm curious as to the percentage of the population of Hazleton that is a minority population, perhaps Hispanic population, and how your election results turned out the last time you ran for mayor of Hazleton?

Mr. BARLETTA. Sure. When I was mayor of Hazleton, over 40 percent of the entire population of Hazleton was Hispanic, and I won with over 90 percent of the vote. And I don't know of anyone at the time who took a harder stance against illegal immigration than I had at that time. So this talk that you cannot stand up for the rule of law, that you cannot stand up against illegal immigration and still welcome new immigrants, new American citizens, is totally false.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, just doing a quick calculation off of that, 40 percent of the population of Hazleton being Hispanic, presuming that represented a percentage of the voting population that was Hispanic, and you carried 90 percent of the vote, which would indicate that somewhere in the area of 75 percent of the Hispanic population voted for LOU BARLETTA for mayor of Hazleton; would that be close to correct?

Mr. BARLETTA. I believe it would. And again, what I found in my hands-on experience as a mayor in dealing with the problem of illegal immigration, plus a city whose Hispanic population had exploded, for example, to show you how fast our population had grown, in the year 2000, English as a Second Language, the budget for English as a Second Language was $500. Just 5 years later, it was $1.5 million. So as our immigrant population grew, we also realized that the most important issues to those that were there were good opportunities, were good jobs. It wasn't about granting amnesty or a pathway to citizenship. They wanted good jobs and a good education for their children. They came to America for that better life. Offering amnesty wasn't going to make their life any better, and they understood that. They also understand that allowing 20 or 30 million more people to come into this country illegally is not helpful for people who are starting out, who need the jobs that they came here for, or many Americans who can't find work.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'm curious, since you came to Congress here, Mr. BARLETTA, and I'm going to presuppose that you have strong personal relationships among the entire spectrum of the community of Hazleton, have any of them in any appreciable number changed their position on the immigration issue since they sent you to Congress? And can you speak on some of your relationships with your constituents today and those who were your constituents when you were mayor?

Mr. BARLETTA. The position has not changed. And, in fact, I believe the fact that I stood up for the rule of law and I speak for the importance of protecting our national security and our American jobs here, it has allowed me to win elections, getting both Democrat and Republican support. I ran in a district that was 2:1 Democrat, and I won by over 10 percent of the vote. I really believe the fact that I was able to stand up when Washington had let us down was really the reason why Democrats, Republicans, immigrants, and non-immigrants supported me.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, the individuals that come here to this Congress from various districts, and surely there are many that come from blue collar-type districts—I'm going to presume that's a fair amount of the Democrat constituency that you represent, me being a blue collar kind of a guy and a hands-on fellow—I started out as an earth-moving contractor, actually in the labor part of the construction business—how do you suppose the constituents of other Members of Congress that don't have this same position that you have on the rule of law and immigration and protecting legal immigrants, what are they hearing do you suppose in those similar districts to the one you have?

Mr. BARLETTA. I believe that people all over the country understand what I'm saying, that illegal immigration is crushing our cities. Our population in Hazleton grew by 50 percent, but our tax revenue remained the same. Our population grew by 50 percent, but our tax revenue remained the same. Small cities, small towns like Hazleton, Pennsylvania, are crushed by the burden of illegal immigration.

I was sued for creating the first law of its kind in the country, and I couldn't find politicians to come near me, to be honest with you. It was pretty refreshing because nobody came to Hazleton. And I thought I was standing there alone until I started getting cards and letters and checks from people all over the United States. In fact, I got checks from every State, including Alaska and Hawaii, to help defend our city in that lawsuit. We raised over half a million dollars, most of it in $10 and $20 donations, from people all over America who felt the same way. I am not alone. The American people understand what illegal immigration means. It doesn't mean that we roll up the welcome mat to new immigrants. We ask them to come here through the proper channels, respect the rule of law, and then give them the opportunity that they came to America for.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I remain curious to the wealth of experience that the former mayor and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has provided here, Mr. Speaker. I would ask also, of the illegal drug distribution links that exist in this country and that which I'm going to presume also shows up in Hazleton, illegal drugs and violence, and I will make this statement into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, and that is, in my meetings with the Drug Enforcement Agency and a number of others that are involved in enforcing the laws against illegal drugs, they tell me that at least one link in every illegal drug distribution chain in America, at least one link in that chain, is carried out by someone who is unlawfully present in the United States. The cost of those illegal drugs to our society, I don't know has been quantified. That trade itself has been estimated to be something above $40 billion, perhaps something above $60 billion a year, and I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if his experience would reflect that to be true?

Mr. BARLETTA. Well, it is absolutely true. I'll give you an example. We had arrested a young man for selling cocaine on a playground. The man was in the country illegally. It took our detectives 5 hours to determine who he was. He had five Social Security cards. He had five identities. Law enforcement has no idea who they are dealing with; many, many are here under fraudulent documentation. Those who are involved in the criminal element, in the gangs or drug trade, I don't believe will be coming forward no matter what laws we pass here. And we can pass all the laws in the world; if we don't enforce the laws of this country and if we don't allow States and local law enforcement to work in harmony with the Federal Government, we will never stop the problem of illegal immigration. But what we shouldn't do is make the same mistake we made in 1986 and give a green light to people all over the world to come here illegally while our borders are still open.

□ 1830

If you were a family waiting to come to the United States because you wanted to obey the law, but you hear a declaration like we're hearing here in Washington, offering a pathway to citizenship and protection while you're here, why would you wait? Why would you wait with your family?

It would be a green light for people to come. That's why the problem will become worse.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And reclaiming my time, it was reported to me today here on the floor, a Representative that represents an area very near the southern border said to me that the illegal border crossings are up 20 percent since the dialog on comprehensive immigration reform, that euphemism began.

So the encouragement for people to get into the United States on the chance that this Congress will pass some kind of an act that would ultimately be amnesty is bringing more people into the United States.

But I wanted to circle back and ask another question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and that is that there's a GAO study, a General Accountability Office study, of about 2 years ago that went back through our prison system and asked the question, a number of questions about the population of our prison system that are criminal aliens. And that number was at least 28 percent. Some numbers show 30, depending on how you define that.

But there also was a number in there that was stark to me. The people in prisons in the United States, both Federal and State, all together, who have been convicted of homicide, now that prison population, according to that study, was 25,064. And when I think of a number that large, multiples of all of our casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan, that is American population, most of it, that's a number, but it's human. It's very, very personal.

And I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he would have any personal accounts that might reflect a component of that 25,064.

Mr. BARLETTA. Well I did, actually. The final straw for me that made me realize that I needed to do something to protect the people in my town actually happened on May 10, 2006. It was a day that I'll never forget.

Earlier in the day we had arrested a 14-year-old for shooting a gun into a crowded playground. The 14-year-old was in the country illegally. And it was interesting: he had his lawyer on speed dial on his cell phone, which I thought I don't know how many 14-year-olds carry their lawyer on a speed dial.

I remember going home that day and telling my wife that I had—I didn't know what to do anymore. We were losing control of the city. We didn't have the resources to deal with the problem.

That same night I got a call from the chief of police, 1 o'clock in the morning, a 29-year-old city man, father of three children, was shot in the head. He was shot by one of the gang members in the city.

That one homicide, it took our police department 36 hours to bring the people forward that committed that crime. We spent half of our yearly budget in overtime in the police department on that one murder.

And enough was enough. If the Federal Government wasn't going to do anything, then I had to. I took an oath, and I had an obligation to do so. And that's what began my crusade.

I was sued, by the way. I was sued for creating the law. In fact, the plaintiffs that sued the city of Hazelton, many of the plaintiffs were admitted illegal aliens who sued the city. They had their identities kept confidential. They had asked if their identities could be kept confidential, which they were. We were not allowed to ask their names.

They then asked if they could be excused from showing up at the trial because they were in the country illegally and didn't want to go to a Federal courthouse. It was granted.

I never saw our accusers. I took the stand for 2 days. I testified for 2 days, but never saw the people that sued the city of Hazelton. I felt that illegal aliens were given more rights than a United States citizen would be given. You cannot sue your city and remain anonymous.

I vowed to appeal this and fight this to the Supreme Court, which we did.

So what brings me here is a life of experience as a mayor who tries to balance a budget, provide a good quality of life for the people that live there, and realize what happens when illegal immigration, not at the border, not just at the border, not just in Texas. I'm 2,000 miles away from that southern border.

We have good reason to enforce our immigration laws, and we should not be encouraging people to come to this country illegally by granting amnesty. We did it in 1986, and we're talking about this again.

Why obey our immigration laws if we have an administration that won't enforce the laws and a Congress that wants to give amnesty every time the problem comes up again?

We need to enforce our laws. We need to make E-verify mandatory. Protect American jobs. We need to make sure we're protecting our national security. There are people around the world that want to harm us.

And we need to give the immigrants that come here the opportunity that they waited for, those immigrants that stood and waited because they wanted to obey America's laws and they are here, and we are stealing that opportunity away from them. Yet we're telling them we're doing this for the immigrants that are here.

They're smarter than that. And that's why immigration is not the most important issue to the people that are here. They want that education; let's give it to them.

All the programs that the Heritage Foundation talks about that will be impacted by this pathway to citizenship are programs that the most needy need to live. Why are we going to hurt people that need these programs?

I feel very strongly about this issue. I feel very strongly, and that's why I'm here to speak up.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I very much thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for coming to the floor and voicing his opinion. And I know that he's also occupied with a very tight schedule, so I appreciate that a great deal.

Mr. Speaker, the attention that I've given Mr. BARLETTA, I hope that you and America have given LOU BARLETTA as well. And I hope that he's rewarded, not only by his constituents, but by a policy of protection of the rule of law that can be re-established here in this country.

The idea that we should somehow suspend our good judgment, and we should waive the rule of law, all for some idea of political expediency, is not compatible with the principles of our political party. And sacrificing the rule of law for political expediency seems, to me, to be a foolish idea.

It needs to be precious to be an American citizen. Citizenship should be valuable. And throughout all of the years that people have come into the United States legally—and the distinction between legal and illegal has been conflated by the open-borders crowd, both Republicans and Democrats.

But you'll watch, Mr. Speaker, how they conflate the language. A few years ago they started blending the term ''health care'' and ''health insurance'' till it became one thing, and we got ObamaCare out of that, because people could no longer draw the distinction between health care and health insurance.

And we've also watched during a similar period of time, as the dialog of the distinction between illegal immigrant and immigrant, the distinction—immigrant means someone who came to the United States legally and followed our laws, that saw the image of the Statue of Liberty, was inspired by that image, and found a way to come to America to exercise all the God-given liberties that are here, that were defined so well in our Declaration of Independence and protected in our Constitution. That's ''immigrant.''

That's where the vigor comes from, for the American population and civilization, among our brothers. It's God-given liberty, but it's also the vigor of those who were inspired to come to America.

So, Mr. Speaker, I recognize there are only about 3 minutes left, but I'd be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas, who is very reliable and a very clear voice, as much time as there may remain.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, thank you. And I'll just take a moment because what you're talking about is so very critical.

And just to reiterate the point that's been coming out in a couple of hearings, I was shocked that 34.9 percent of all prosecutions by this administration were not for drugs; they were for people reentering this country after they've been deported.

□ 1840

They're prosecuting people for illegal entries. You don't even prosecute—this administration—people that just come across one time. And when you think about all the detention, all the prison, the jail space, the prosecutors. We pay for the defense attorneys. You think about all of the prisons around America which contain so many people who came in illegally, when this administration says it cannot afford to secure the border, then they have not taken stock of how much money that this country is having to spend on prisons, prosecutors, jails, defense attorneys, all of the costs that come with that, because they're not doing their job.

And I know it goes back to the Bush administration. That is not a defense. And they need to take care of their job—and I hope and pray they will—instead of using the issue of a secure border as ransom. No, we will only secure the border if you will give us amnesty so people can vote for Democrats. That is outrageous. And Jay Leno had it right.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and thanking the gentleman from Texas, I add up those numbers and it looks like a number approaching 60 percent of the resources used by the Federal Government to prosecute have to do with something coming cross the border, whether it's people, or it's 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America is the other component of that presentation. So if we control this border, Mr. Speaker, we can control the 34.9 percent of the prosecutions about reentry. We have roughly a quarter of that prosecution that has to do with illegal drugs. And the Drug Enforcement Agency does tell us that between 80 and 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico.

If there's a universal position on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, it has to do with secure the border, prove you secured the border, establish that, reestablish respect for the rule of law. At that point, we can have a conversation about some of the ideas that are emerging over on the Senate side and in the secret meetings here in the House of Representatives.

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

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 11, 2013, at 10 a.m. 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:

999. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Castor Oil, Polymer with Adipic Acid, Linoleic Acid, Oleic Acid and Ricinoleic Acid Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP–2013–0057; FRL–9381–2] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1000. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Brigadier General Thomas W. Bergeson and Colonel David B. Been, United States Air Force, to wear the authorized insignia of the major general and brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1001. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the National Defense Stockpile (NDS) Annual Materials Plan (AMP) for Fiscal Year 2014, along with proposed plans for FY 2015 through 2018, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1002. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adequacy of Oregon Municipal Solid Waste Landfil Permit Program [EPA–R10–RCRA–2013–0105; FRL–9796–6] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1003. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Ohio Ambient Air Quality Standards; Correction [EPA-R05–OAR–2009–0807; FRL–9783–6] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1004. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Determinations of Attainment of the 1997 8–Hour Ozone Standard for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley Moderate Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03–OAR–2012–0409; FRL–9797–8] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1005. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Pennsylvania Counties in the Philadelphia-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE 1997 Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03–OAR–2012–0954; FRL–9796–3] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1006. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Prong 3 of Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) Infrastructrue Requirement for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04–OAR–2012–0814; FRL–9797–4] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1007. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho: Sandpoint PM 10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [Docket No: EPA-R10–OAR–2012–0017; FRL–9796–5] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1008. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina: New Source Review-Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R04–OAR–2012–0837; FRL–9797–1] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1009. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Kentucky and Louisiana, Correcting Amendments [EPA-R06–OAR–2006–0851; FRL–9796–8] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1010. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: Revision to Best Available Monitoring Method Request Submission Deadline for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems Source Category (Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule) [EPA-HQ-OAR–2011–0417; FRL–9796–9] received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1011. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Adjustments to the Allowance System for Controlling HCFC Production, Import, and Export [EPA-HQ-OAR–2011–3454; FRL–9797–5] (RIN: 2060–AQ98) received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1012. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Reconsideration of Certain New Source Issues: National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants from Coal- and Oil-fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR–2009–0234; EPA-HQ-OAR–2011–0044; FRL–9789–5] (RIN: 2060–AR62) received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1013. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13–0A, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1014. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting report on Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1015. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 804 of the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101–246)), and Sections 603–604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002)

and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107–228), the functions of which have been delegated to the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1016. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with the United Kingdom Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110–07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1017. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report prepared in accordance with section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. No. 107–174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1018. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics and Regulations, Department of the Treasury, transmitting five reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1019. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's annual 2012 report of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1020. A letter from the Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity, National Archives, transmitting a copy of the Administration's Fiscal Year 2012 Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act Annual Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1021. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Audit of the Fraud Prevention Fund''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1022. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Residential, Business, and Wind and Solar Resource Leases on Indian Land (RIN: 1076–AE73) received March 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1023. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report entitled, ''Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2012'' for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1024. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2012 Report to the Congress on U.S. Government Receivables and Debt Collection Activities of Federal Agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1025. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a Report on Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Aviation Consumer Protection as Required by Public Law 112–95, Section 411; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1026. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA–2013–0247; Directorate Identifier 2013–CE–001–AD; Amendment 39–17397; AD 2013–06–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1027. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA–2013–0210; Directorate Identifier 2012–NM–053–AD] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1028. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Water Quality Standards; Withdrawal of Certain Federal Water Quality Critera Applicable to California, New Jersey and Puerto Rico [EPA-HQ-OW–2012–0095; FRL–9795–8] (RIN: 2040–AF33) received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 146. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1120) to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from taking any action that requires a quorum of the members of the Board until such time as Board constituting a quorum shall have been confirmed by the Senate, the Supreme Court issues a decision on the constitutionality of the appointments to the Board made in January 2012, or the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 113th Congress. (Rept. 113–32). Referred to the House Calendar.

## 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. CLEAVER (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H.R. 1454. A bill to make supplemental agricultural disaster assistance available for fiscal years 2012 and 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1455. A bill to prohibit subsidiaries of foreign owned corporations from obtaining contracts for the performance of passenger and baggage security screening at domestic commercial airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 1456. A bill to make improvements to the Children's Gasoline Burn Prevention Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 1457. A bill to provide that certain establishments of the Federal Government shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations budget plans that reflect a 5 percent reduction from the amount proposed for such an establishment in the President's budget submission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 1458. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 1459. A bill to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 1460. A bill to direct the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers to revise certain authorized purposes described in the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 1461. A bill to repeal the renewable fuel program of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HURT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LONG, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 1462. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate certain requirements under the renewable fuel program, to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from approving the introduction into commerce of gasoline that contains greater than 10-volume-percent ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. ENYART):

H.R. 1463. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the mental health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces deployed in support of a contingency operation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1464. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide notice to members of the Armed Forces, beginning with recruit basic training and the initial training of officer candidates, regarding the availability of mental health services, to help eliminate perceived stigma associated with seeking and receiving mental health services, and to clarify the extent to which information regarding a member seeking and receiving mental health services may be disclosed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an energy investment credit for energy storage property

connected to the grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1466. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues associated with recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 1467. A bill to reduce the annual rates of pay of Members of Congress by 20 percent and prohibit further adjustments to such rates; to the Committee on House Administration, 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 Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 1468. A bill to improve information security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1469. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the Clean Air Act relating to the expansion of the renewable fuel program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the safety of America's schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1471. A bill to designate the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor as ''The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 1472. A bill to restore the longstanding partnership between States and the Federal Government in managing the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1473. A bill to prevent certain Federal health care laws from establishing health care provider standards of care in medical malpractice cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1474. A bill to reauthorize the ban on undetectable firearms, and to extend the ban to undetectable firearm receivers and undetectable ammunition magazines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 1475. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for supplemental estimates of certain revenue bills or joint resolutions that incorporates the macroeconomic effects of that measure; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement plans for adoption expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1477. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1478. A bill to amend part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to include the pay of Members of Congress within the coverage of the provisions of such Act which provide for budget enforcement through sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the deduction for charitable contributions from the overall limitation on itemized deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 1480. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (commonly known as the Buy American Act), to require each department or independent establishment to conduct an annual audit of its contracts for compliance with such chapter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 1481. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to reprogram amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2013 for the Department of Defense for the Medium Extended Air Defense System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 1482. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate certain requirements under the renewable fuel program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should resume normal diplomatic relations with Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RADEL (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 65th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H. Res. 145. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the sinking of U.S.S. Thresher (SSN 593); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. JONES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 147. A resolution calling for the release of United States citizen Saeed Abedini and condemning the Government of Iran for its persecution of religious minorities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 148. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Youth HIV & AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 149. A resolution expressing support for designation of April as Parkinson's Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RADEL:

H. Res. 150. A resolution congratulating the Florida Gulf Coast University Eagles for becoming the first 15 seed to advance to the ''Sweet 16'' 4th Round in the NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## 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. CLEAVER:

H.R. 1454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 which allows Congress to ''fix the

Standard of Weights and Measures.'' This legislation would set the standards of portable fuel containers.

Additionally, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 allows Congress to ''regulate Commerce . . . among the several states.'' As portable fuel containers are objects of interstate commerce, it is appropriate for Federal standards to be set.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 1457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 (''To establish Post Offices and post Roads'') and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereon.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1459.

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 IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

''Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes''

The management of the Missouri river by the Army Corps of Engineers directly impacts commerce. The river is a source of barge traffic carrying a variety of goods.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3. Because the federal government has stretched Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the commerce clause) beyond its intended boundaries, it follows that efforts to rein in excessive federal government encroachment in this area can be justified by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3. Because the federal government has stretched Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the commerce clause) beyond its intended boundaries, it follows that efforts to rein in excessive federal government encroachment in this area can be justified by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.''

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1466.

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 Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 1467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is required by Article I, Section 6, of the Constitution to determine its own pay.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 1468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached legislation falls under Congress' enumerated constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 3.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce, as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 1 and Article IV, section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 1472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 1473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress has power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers'' when the need exists to clarify existing law.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I. Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 1475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Authorization

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 6 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8. Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 1480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 1481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 1482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the United States Constitution.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 24: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 79: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 139: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 147: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 164: Mr. DAINES and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 176: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 180: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 182: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 184: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 197: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 198: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 207: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 262: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 274: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 303: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MASSIE
H.R. 311: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 411: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 421: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 435: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 447: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 450: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 485: Mr. FARR and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 503: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 508: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 517: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 519: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 523: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 543: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 544: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 556: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 559: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 565: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 574: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 580: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 597: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 627: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. HURT.
H.R. 630: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 633: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 647: Mr. POCAN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HALL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COLE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 655: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 656: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 659: Mr. TIBERI and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 661: Mr. POCAN and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 669: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 675: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 679: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. BROWN, of Florida and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 684: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 705: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 714: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 724: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 725: Mr. FARR and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 728: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 732: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 742: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 755: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 783: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 784: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 786: Mr. HOLT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 792: Mr. COBLE and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 794: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 808: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 812: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 828: Mr. PERRY, Mr. HALL, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 845: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 850: Mr. KILMER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 853: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 863: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 864: Mr. COBLE and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 868: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 880: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 918: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 935: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, MR. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. YODER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 940: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 946: Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 949: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 958: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 960: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 961: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ENYART, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 973: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 974: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 975: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 997: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1007: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1008: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1014: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1020: Mr. LATTA and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 1025: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1026: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1028: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1029: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1030: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1078: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1081: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1087: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1090: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1097: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 1122: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 1124: Ms. CLARKE, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1146: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 1148: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 1150: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. Rangel, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MOORE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1151: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HOLDING, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1155: Mr. HURT and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1179: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1187: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1205: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1243: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1250: Mr. YODER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HARRIS, MR. ROYCE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 1288: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RYAN, of Ohio and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1304: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1314: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1331: Mr. LONG and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1333: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1340: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1389: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1406: Ms. FOXX, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. REED, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CULBERSON, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1420: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 1433: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1449: Mr. GERLACH.
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. PITTS.
H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H. Res. 19: Mr. PETERS of California.
H. Res. 24: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H. Res. 36: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. PEARCE.
H. Res. 69: Mr. SCHIFF and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 89: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HALL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COOK, Ms. CHU, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. SIRES.
H. Res. 90: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. TITUS, Mrs.

MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BASS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CHU, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 94: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 95: Mr. SALMON.

H. Res. 108: Mr. MORAN.

H. Res. 109: Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 112: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. GOSAR.

H. Res. 134: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LONG, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. COBLE.

H. Res. 135: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 136: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. TSONGAS.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1175: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.