



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2013

No. 67

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 14, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER 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 1:50 p.m.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is farm bill week. Today, the Senate Agriculture Committee is marking up their version of the farm bill, and tomorrow the House Agriculture Committee will do the same. Although one bill is written by a Republican and the other is written by a Democrat, these two bills have one thing in common: they make hunger worse in America.

There are 50 million hungry Americans; 17 million are kids. Yet the Sen-

ate is going to mark up a bill that cuts over \$4 billion from SNAP, our Nation's main antihunger program. But that cut pales in comparison to the cuts included in H.R. 1947, the House farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to mark up a farm bill that includes a \$20 billion cut in SNAP—\$20 billion. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have 50 million hungry Americans, at a time when we have 17 million hungry kids, a Republican-led Congress is going to mark up a farm bill with \$20 billion cuts in SNAP.

Mr. Speaker, we were elected to solve problems and help people, not make things worse. We were elected to help make lives better. We were elected to do the right thing. Cutting SNAP, making it harder for hungry Americans to put food on their tables, is the wrong thing. Taking \$20 billion out of this program will do real harm to Americans who simply are trying to make ends meet.

Now, there are some in this House, some on the Agriculture Committee, who say this is about reducing error rates in the program, that this is good getting at fraud. Well, let me remind them that SNAP has one of the lowest error rates, in the Federal Government. That is something that we should be proud of, and it is something that we should celebrate.

Mr. Speaker, these cuts do not get at fraud. These cuts do not make the program more efficient. These cuts don't help reduce or end hunger in America. These cuts in this bill will make things worse. That's because the cuts in this bill will kick 2 million people off of SNAP. That's 2 million hungry Americans who currently rely on SNAP to help feed themselves and their families, and that's 2 million low-income Americans who are having trouble making ends meet.

These cuts will cause 850,000 households to see their SNAP benefit re-

duced by \$90 a month—\$90 a month. That's a big cut for poor families struggling to get by.

The cuts in this bill will cause 210,000 children to lose access to their free school meals. These 210,000 poor children currently receive free school meals because their parents can't afford to pay for their meals. But the cuts in this bill will result in 210,000 losing access to free school meals.

This bill even cuts the nutrition education program, a program that is designed to help educate SNAP beneficiaries about how to buy and prepare more nutritious foods. Imagine cutting this critical education program while obesity and access to unhealthy food is on the rise.

To put this in proper context, these cuts would come on top of an across-the-board cut in SNAP that every recipient will experience starting on November 1, 2013. Because SNAP has been used as an ATM to offset other worthy programs, a family of four will already be seeing their SNAP benefit cut by an average of \$25.

So, to recap, not only will we see automatic cuts in SNAP this November, the House farm bill will make things worse by cutting \$20 billion additionally from the program. This simply cannot stand.

Tomorrow, during the farm bill markup, I will offer an amendment that will restore these cuts. I hope that all my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee will vote for my amendment, and, if it fails, I hope they'll vote against the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot just indiscriminately make hunger worse in the name of fiscal austerity. No, Mr. Speaker, we should look at these programs and ask ourselves: Are these programs working? Are they doing the job that they were designed to do? Are they succeeding or failing? And how can we make them work better? But that's not what we're doing.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2577

Do you know how many hearings we've had on SNAP in this Congress? Do you know how many the Agriculture Committee has held? None. That's right, the Agriculture Committee is about to cut \$20 billion from SNAP, and we haven't had one single hearing. Yet there are 20 new members of the Agriculture Committee in this Congress, 20 new members who deserve the right to learn about these issues, including the details of SNAP and the impact of these cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this is not how we should be approaching this program. We should be holding hearings; we should ask questions; we should be thoughtful; and we should look at the program in an honest way, and our goal should be to end hunger now. Unfortunately, this bill, as written, is more about protecting big agribusiness and corporate welfare than it is about protecting hungry Americans who need help today.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do something about hunger in America. I've urged the administration to host a White House conference on food and nutrition to come up with a plan to end hunger now. Hopefully, they will act on that soon. But for today and tomorrow, we must protect SNAP from needless, unnecessary, and harmful cuts. We must stand for the most vulnerable in our country, and we must end hunger now and not make it worse.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given. Help them to meet their responsibilities, enlightened by Your eternal spirit.

We gather after celebrating Mother's Day. We thank You for the gift of self modeled by our mothers, who chose to place each of us before themselves in giving birth to us and nurturing us as we grew. May we all earn the pride of our mothers in the service we provide to the benefit of this Nation.

There are many serious issues confronting our Nation these days. May the truth be served and the Nation's interests be met in the proceedings of this day.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama 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.

OVERSIGHT IS A PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week was very revealing about misstatements of truth from the White House. On Wednesday, the administration was heavily criticized as the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform held a hearing, led by Chairman DARRELL ISSA, to investigate the Benghazi terrorist attack. Additionally, on Friday, the IRS secret operation to target conservative groups was admitted after 3 years of denial.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest."

As a congressional body, the Members of the United States House and Congress have an obligation to carry out oversight responsibilities. When situations arise where there is administration misconduct, we must pursue investigations to protect the American people. I look forward to working with my colleagues by demanding answers to the countless questions of intentional misrepresentations.

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

SCOTTSBORO BOYS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I applaud the Alabama Legislature's Scottsboro Boys Act, which granted posthumous pardons to eight African American young men wrongfully accused in Alabama in 1931. The Scottsboro Boys case profoundly impacted America's civil rights movement and American law.

In two different landmark decisions, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the Constitution requires legal counsel for criminal defendants and held that arbitrarily excluding African Americans from jury pools was unconstitutional.

It is never too late to call wrong by its name. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote in his "Letter from Birmingham Jail":

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

I pray that the families of Olen Montgomery, Haywood Patterson, Ozie Powell, Willie Roberson, Charlie Weems, Eugene Williams, and Andy and Roy Wright may take comfort in Alabama's full acknowledgement of the innocence of these wrongfully accused young men.

OBAMACARE'S THREAT

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today not only as a Member of Congress, but as a concerned business owner angered by the fact that ObamaCare may be putting my companies at financial risk. Currently, those businesses employ over 120 people in the State of Oklahoma. Because of the size of these companies, when ObamaCare is fully implemented, it will mean an immediate cost of over \$200,000 to that business.

I ran for Congress because I got fed up with the Federal Government becoming my biggest threat.

The President says he wants to grow the economy and encourage job creation, but in reality he is punishing those who are trying to thrive. As a business owner, you are penalized \$100,000 for hiring that 50th employee.

ObamaCare is the number one threat to businesses in Oklahoma and across this country. This week we'll vote to repeal this law, along with its harmful new mandates and tax hikes.

For the sake of this country's job creators, we must repeal ObamaCare. I urge my colleagues to join me and America in putting America back in business.

SECRETARY SEBELIUS CONTINUES TO VIOLATE CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution allows the Congress, specifically the House of Representatives, to hold the purse strings of the Federal Government—not the executive branch, not the Federal agencies.

This week, we've heard reports that the Secretary of Health and Human Services has been calling executives

from the industries that she regulates asking them to donate money to a group called “Enroll America,” a private organization that makes the President’s health care law a success by signing individuals up for coverage through exchanges.

The Antideficiency Act prohibits the Federal Government departments from making greater expenditures in a fiscal year than those provided by the Congress. So it begs the question: What is the Secretary promising to corporate executives in exchange for their funding of this ACA implementation? This continues the line of questionably ethical conduct by the Secretary all to further the administration’s controversial agenda.

Let’s review: in 2012, the U.S. Office of Special Counsel concluded that Secretary Sebelius violated the Hatch Act by campaigning for President Obama while traveling on official business; then they raided the ACA’s Prevention and Public Health Fund; and now she is seeking money from businesses that she regulates to prop up the President’s takeover of American health care.

ARE YOU KIDDING ME?

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

Mr. MESSER. What a week, Mr. Speaker. A Benghazi coverup, the IRS targeting conservative groups, and now the Department of Justice found spying on the Associated Press. The scandals from this administration are coming so fast that the American people can barely keep up, and this pattern of arrogance, lies, and outright lawlessness should be disturbing to every American.

Mr. Speaker, the American people demand the truth, and this Congress is duty bound to make sure they get it. Congress must act now and investigate each of these scandals.

Some may call it political, but there is nothing political about keeping the oath of every Member of this Chamber to protect and defend the United States Constitution. And there is nothing political about working to ensure that none of these scandals gets swept under the rug.

□ 1410

IRS ACTIONS VIOLATE PUBLIC TRUST

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage at the behavior of the IRS.

Last week, the IRS admitted that it targeted organizations based on group names and political ideologies. Based on their conservative leanings, these

organizations were often forced to divulge their donor lists and answer invasive questions about their affiliations, requirements the IRS did not extend to other groups seeking similar treatment under the Tax Code.

These actions are unacceptable. IRS officials cannot infringe on any person or organization’s constitutional rights simply because of a difference in political ideology.

We expect our government to be a guardian of rights. Those responsible for this violation of the public’s trust must be held accountable. IRS employees and officials are public servants, and those involved with this scandal have violated a fundamental precept of public service.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1703

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 5 o’clock and 3 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT OF 2013

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 180) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 180

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 “National Blue Alert Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COORDINATOR.**—The term “Coordinator” means the Blue Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice designated under section 4(a).

(2) **BLUE ALERT.**—The term “Blue Alert” means information relating to the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer in the line of duty sent through the network.

(3) **BLUE ALERT PLAN.**—The term “Blue Alert plan” means the plan of a State, unit of local government, or Federal agency participating in the network for the dissemination of information received as a Blue Alert.

(4) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “law enforcement officer” shall have the same meaning as in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b).

(5) **NETWORK.**—The term “network” means the Blue Alert communications network established by the Attorney General under section 3.

(6) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 3. BLUE ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

The Attorney General shall establish a national Blue Alert communications network within the Department of Justice to issue Blue Alerts through the initiation, facilitation, and promotion of Blue Alert plans, in coordination with States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other appropriate entities.

SEC. 4. BLUE ALERT COORDINATOR; GUIDELINES.

(a) **COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.**—The Attorney General shall assign an existing officer of the Department of Justice to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert communications network.

(b) **DUTIES OF THE COORDINATOR.**—The Coordinator shall—

(1) provide assistance to States and units of local government that are using Blue Alert plans;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for States and units of local government to use in developing Blue Alert plans that will promote compatible and integrated Blue Alert plans throughout the United States, including—

(A) a list of the resources necessary to establish a Blue Alert plan;

(B) criteria for evaluating whether a situation warrants issuing a Blue Alert;

(C) guidelines to protect the privacy, dignity, independence, and autonomy of any law enforcement officer who may be the subject of a Blue Alert and the family of the law enforcement officer;

(D) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) the law enforcement agency involved—

(I) confirms—

(aa) the death or serious injury of the law enforcement officer; or

(bb) the attack on the law enforcement officer and that there is an indication of the death or serious injury of the officer; or

(II) concludes that the law enforcement officer is missing in the line of duty;

(ii) there is an indication of serious injury to or death of the law enforcement officer;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(E) guidelines—

(i) that information relating to a law enforcement officer who is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty should be provided to the National Crime Information Center database operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and any relevant crime information repository of the State involved;

(ii) that a Blue Alert should, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local governments), be limited to the geographic areas most likely to facilitate the apprehension of the suspect involved or which the suspect could reasonably reach, which should not be limited to State lines;

(iii) for law enforcement agencies of States or units of local government to develop plans to communicate information to neighboring States to provide for seamless communication of a Blue Alert; and

(iv) providing that a Blue Alert should be suspended when the suspect involved is apprehended or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective; and

(F) guidelines for—

(i) the issuance of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(ii) the extent of the dissemination of alerts issued through the network;

(3) develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects that address activities during the period beginning at the time of the initial notification of a law enforcement agency that a suspect has not been apprehended and ending at the time of apprehension of a suspect or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective, including protocols regulating—

(A) the use of public safety communications;

(B) command center operations; and

(C) incident review, evaluation, debriefing, and public information procedures;

(4) work with States to ensure appropriate regional coordination of various elements of the network;

(5) establish an advisory group to assist States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other entities involved in the network with initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alert plans, which shall include—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, representation from the various geographic regions of the United States; and

(B) members who are—

(i) representatives of a law enforcement organization representing rank-and-file officers;

(ii) representatives of other law enforcement agencies and public safety communications;

(iii) broadcasters, first responders, dispatchers, and radio station personnel; and

(iv) representatives of any other individuals or organizations that the Coordinator determines are necessary to the success of the network;

(6) act as the nationwide point of contact for—

(A) the development of the network; and

(B) regional coordination of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(7) determine—

(A) what procedures and practices are in use for notifying law enforcement and the public when a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty; and

(B) which of the procedures and practices are effective and that do not require the expenditure of additional resources to implement.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2), protocols developed under subsection (b)(3), and other programs established under subsection (b), shall not be mandatory.

(2) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2) shall, to the maximum extent practicable (as

determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government), provide that appropriate information relating to a Blue Alert is disseminated to the appropriate officials of law enforcement agencies, public health agencies, and other agencies.

(3) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS.—The guidelines established under subsection (b) shall—

(A) provide mechanisms that ensure that Blue Alerts comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations; and

(B) include standards that specifically provide for the protection of the civil liberties, including the privacy, of law enforcement officers who are seriously injured or killed in the line of duty and the families of the officers.

(d) COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Coordinator shall cooperate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and appropriate offices of the Department of Justice in carrying out activities under this Act.

(e) RESTRICTIONS ON COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator may not—

(1) perform any official travel for the sole purpose of carrying out the duties of the Coordinator;

(2) lobby any officer of a State regarding the funding or implementation of a Blue Alert plan; or

(3) host a conference focused solely on the Blue Alert program that requires the expenditure of Federal funds.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Coordinator and the effectiveness and status of the Blue Alert plans that are in effect or being developed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 180, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Tomorrow, on the west front of the Capitol, we will honor those law enforcement officers killed last year in the line of duty. In 2012, 127 officers gave their lives while protecting America's public safety, including three officers in my home State of Virginia.

Although officer fatalities nationwide decreased by 23 percent from the previous year, 66 of those officers were killed in violent or deliberate attacks. Ambush attacks on police officers were the leading cause in fatal shootings, followed by traffic stops or pursuits, drug-related crimes, and robberies.

H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Act of 2013, encourages an enhanced nationwide system for distribution of time-sensitive information to help identify a violent suspect when a law enforcement officer is injured or killed in the line of duty.

A Blue Alert broadcasts information and speeds apprehension. Blue Alerts use the same principle as Amber Alerts for missing children and Silver Alerts for missing seniors. The Blue Alert system is a cooperative effort among local, State, and Federal authorities, law enforcement agencies, and the general public.

A Blue Alert provides a description of an offender who is still at large and may include a description of the offender's vehicle and license plate information. Like Amber Alerts, Blue Alerts will help hinder the offender's ability to escape and will facilitate their capture.

This bill directs the Department of Justice to designate an existing officer as the Blue Alert national coordinator who will encourage those States that have not already done so to develop Blue Alert plans and establish voluntary guidelines. As of today, 18 States have Blue Alert networks in place. However, there are many examples where an integrated, nationwide Blue Alert system would save lives and help bring fugitive suspects to justice.

Following the tragic Boston Marathon bombing last month, one of the suspects shot and killed Patrol Officer Sean Collier of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Police Department. One of the subjects approached Officer Collier as he sat in his patrol car and opened fire on him without warning, striking him several times. The subjects then attempted to steal his service weapon but were thwarted by his secured holster.

The suspects then carjacked a vehicle and led police on a pursuit while throwing explosive devices at pursuing units. The pursuit ended in Watertown, Massachusetts, where one suspect was killed and a Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority police officer was shot and seriously wounded in a gun battle. The second suspect was captured in Watertown the following evening after another tense standoff.

The immediate aftermath of the Boston Marathon bombing demonstrates how criminals are becoming even more violent, and their contempt for law enforcement and the rule of law is more evident than ever. This year is already shaping up to be a devastating year for law enforcement fatalities. As compared with this time last year, line-of-duty deaths this year are up 21 percent. Law enforcement deaths by gunfire are up 7 percent compared with May 2012.

This bill encourages expansion of an integrated Blue Alert communications network throughout the United States, which would ensure that when tragedy strikes, the public is on notice and suspects can be more quickly apprehended and brought to justice. A nationwide

Blue Alert network will be particularly effective when a suspect flees across State lines.

I thank Mr. GRIMM of New York and Mr. REICHERT of Washington for their work on this bipartisan, bicameral legislation. An identical Senate measure is pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Supporters of this legislation include the National Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Sergeants Benevolent Association, and the National Association of Police Organizations.

This bill reaffirms our commitment to ensure the safety of our law enforcement men and women and the communities they serve to protect every day.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Act. H.R. 180 will establish a coordinator within the Department of Justice to facilitate the issuance of Blue Alerts to help apprehend individuals suspected of killing or seriously injuring police officers. I support the bill because it provides critical support for a system that protects police officers and the public.

It's particularly timely that we consider this measure during National Police Week. National Police Week is a special occasion during which we recognize law enforcement officers and honor those who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

Since the first known line-of-duty death in 1791, more than 1,900 U.S. law enforcement officers have made the ultimate sacrifice. Today, there are more than 900,000 sworn law enforcement officers serving in the United States and, regrettably, on average one is killed in the line of duty every 57 hours.

Currently, 15 States, including my home State of Virginia, have Blue Alert systems that use media broadcasts and roadside message signs to disseminate, within their respective borders, time-sensitive information about those suspected of killing or seriously injuring Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers. In addition to those States, two more States are establishing Blue Alert systems this year.

The information disseminated by these systems—which can include descriptions of the suspect, the vehicle, and the license plate number—enables the public to assist the police in locating these perpetrators. H.R. 180 will enable more States to institute these valuable programs and require the Department of Justice to facilitate the dissemination of Blue Alerts across State lines and throughout specific geographic areas.

□ 1710

The Blue Alert program is similar to the Amber Alert program that helps us

find missing children, and it makes sense that we would encourage similar expansion for the Blue Alert programs.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this important public safety measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM) and thank him for his authorship and sponsorship of this legislation.

Mr. GRIMM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of my bill, H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Act of 2013. As a former FBI special agent, it is a very unique honor for me to have the House consider this important legislation during National Police Week, where thousands of law enforcement officers from around the world converge on our Nation's Capitol to honor those that have paid the ultimate sacrifice to protect our citizens here at home.

On a personal note, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to New York Police Commissioner Ray Kelly and to all the brave men and women of the NYPD for their service to our great city. I encourage all my colleagues to treat every week as if it were National Police Week.

Truly, it is the sacrifices made by these great individuals that inspired me to introduce this important legislation. During my career as a special agent in the FBI, I witnessed firsthand the danger posed by criminals who attack law enforcement officers, and the particular danger they pose on our communities. Time and time again, we have seen that if criminals are willing to attack a police officer to avoid apprehension, then there is absolutely no limit to the lengths they will go or the victims they will target to avoid justice.

According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, 127 officers have been killed in the line of duty during 2012. We can take a look at States that had officers killed in the line of duty from Texas to Pennsylvania.

While it is impossible to completely transform the hazardous nature of the work our law enforcement officers do day in and day out, there are steps that we can take to enhance their safety and quickly apprehend those who put them at risk. The National Blue Alert Act does this by creating a national Blue Alert communications network within the United States Department of Justice. This will disseminate information on suspects who are being sought in connection with the death or injury of law enforcement officers.

I have had the distinct pleasure of working with some of the bravest men and women this country has to offer. I really believe that, similar to Amber Alert, Blue Alert would rapidly notify our law enforcement agencies. It will

notify the media and the public so that we can have the help that we need to aid in the apprehension of some of the most violent criminals.

Additionally, this legislation would further encourage the expansion of the Blue Alert program beyond the handful of States where it is currently existing by helping the development of Blue Alert plans, regional coordination, and the development and implementation of new technologies to improve Blue Alert technologies.

This legislation is supported by many. It's supported by a number of law enforcement organizations, including the Sergeants Benevolent Association, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Association of Police Officers, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, as well as the Fraternal Order of Police.

I am certain that the National Blue Alert Act will enhance the safety of our communities as well as the law enforcement officers who protect them, and I encourage its swift passage today in the full House of Representatives.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Does my colleague from Virginia have further speakers?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I do not have any further speakers at this time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM), my colleague from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CONYERS, for their cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor during National Police Week.

As we join together on this bill, it is my hope that we can continue to work in a bipartisan fashion on other measures that will assist law enforcement officers and find sensible solutions to the problems of crime that face our communities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I thank my friend and colleague from Virginia, the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, for his leadership on this bipartisan effort, as well as Ranking Member CONYERS, Mr. GRIMM, and Chairman SENSENBRENNER of the subcommittee as well for their efforts.

I can't think of a more appropriate time to honor police, during National Police Week, or in a more appropriate way than by passage of this legislation, which will not only allow law enforcement to more effectively communicate in these situations where police officers are in jeopardy or have been harmed, but also in circumstances that will allow everyone in this country to become involved.

With the availability of smartphones and other devices and social media like Twitter and Facebook and YouTube

and other means that people now have of communicating that they didn't have just a few years ago, the word can get out to everyone to be on the lookout for people who are committing crimes. This will help us to apprehend criminals and prevent crimes, and we very much urge our colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the representative from Houston, which lays claim to one of the most effective police departments in the nation, and a co-sponsor of the legislation, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 180, the "National Blue Alert Act of 2013." I support this bill as a good and necessary measure. Everyday, more than 900,000 officers protect and serve the people of the United States. Every 57 hours, one of these men and women die in the line of duty. These officers deserve nothing less than a system that ensures an efficient method to support and protect them, and to bring justice to those who would harm them. It is for this reason that I support the legislation before us.

The National Blue Alert Act directs the Attorney General to establish a national communications network within the Department of Justice to disseminate information when an officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, and assign a Department of Justice officer to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert Network. The Blue Alert system is modeled after the Amber Alert and the Silver Alert programs, which have been very successful in finding abducted children and missing seniors. Currently 18 states, including my home state of Texas, have local Blue Alert programs in operation.

The National Blue Alert Coordinator will provide assistance to states and local governments using Blue Alert plans; establish voluntary guidelines for states and local governments for developing these plans; develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects; work with states to ensure regional coordination of various elements of the network; and establish advisory groups, to assist states, local governments, law enforcement agencies and other entities in initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alerts through the network.

The National Blue Alert Coordinator will determine what procedures and practices to use in notifying law enforcement and the public when a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty and which procedures and practices are the most cost effective to implement.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that this legislation enjoys the strong support of the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Sheriffs Association. As I stated, 18 states currently have a Blue Alert program in place, and it is time to expand this excellent program nationwide.

This bill will enhance officer safety, which should always be one of our major concerns. Since the first recorded line-of-duty death in 1791, more than 19,000 men and women have died in the line of duty. It saddens me that 1,665 of the names on the National Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington D.C. come from Texas. That is more than any other state. My city of Houston has lost 112 officers in the line of duty.

It should be clear to everyone that the regular dangers our officers face have only in-

creased. The 40 deaths that have occurred in 2013 represent a 21% increase over the comparable period in 2012; and gun related deaths are up 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 180, the Blue Alert Notice Act of 2013, will not prevent brave law enforcement officials from falling in the line of duty in the future, but it will help. If it saves the life of at least one policeman and enables him or her to return safely home to his loved ones, this legislation will have proven its value.

I urge all members of the House to join me in supporting H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Notification Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 180, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

POLICY REGARDING INTERNET GOVERNANCE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1580) to affirm the policy of the United States regarding Internet governance.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1580

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Given the importance of the Internet to the global economy, it is essential that the Internet remain stable, secure, and free from government control.

(2) The world deserves the access to knowledge, services, commerce, and communication, the accompanying benefits to economic development, education, and health care, and the informed discussion that is the bedrock of democratic self-government that the Internet provides.

(3) The structure of Internet governance has profound implications for competition and trade, democratization, free expression, and access to information.

(4) Countries have obligations to protect human rights, whether exercised online or offline.

(5) The ability to innovate, develop technical capacity, grasp economic opportunities, and promote freedom of expression online is best realized in cooperation with all stakeholders.

(6) Proposals have been, and will likely continue to be, put forward at international regulatory bodies that would fundamentally alter the governance and operation of the Internet.

(7) The proposals would attempt to justify increased government control over the Internet and could undermine the current multi-stakeholder model that has enabled the

Internet to flourish and under which the private sector, civil society, academia, and individual users play an important role in charting its direction.

(8) The proposals would diminish the freedom of expression on the Internet in favor of government control over content.

(9) The position of the United States Government has been and is to advocate for the flow of information free from government control.

(10) This Administration and past Administrations have made a strong commitment to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and the promotion of the global benefits of the Internet.

SEC. 2. POLICY REGARDING INTERNET GOVERNANCE.

It is the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1580, sometimes called the Internet Freedom Bill.

The Internet is possibly the most important technological advancement since the printing press. Governments' hands-off approach has enabled the Internet's rapid growth and made it a powerful engine of social and economic freedom. This bipartisan bill is designed to combat recent efforts by some in the international community to regulate the Internet, which could jeopardize not only its vibrancy, but also the benefits that it brings to the entire world.

Nations from across the globe met at the December 2012 World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai. They considered changes to the international telecommunications regulations. The treaty negotiations were billed as a routine review of rules governing ordinary international telephone service. A number of countries, such as Russia, China, and Iran, sought to use the negotiations, however, to pursue regulation of the Internet through the International Telecommunication Union, a United Nations agency. None other than Russian President Vladimir Putin has been clear in his objective of "establishing international control over the Internet using the monitoring and supervisory capabilities of the International Telecommunication Union."

The developments in Dubai were not unanticipated. That is why leading up to the conference last year, the House

and Senate unanimously passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 50. That resolution expressed the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce should advocate “the consistent and unequivocal policy of the United States to promote a global Internet free from government control and preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet today.”

□ 1720

Now, under that multi-stakeholder model, non-regulatory institutions seek input from the public and private sectors to develop best practices for managing the content, applications, and networks that make up the Internet. The Internet is organized from the ground up and not from the government handed down. This is not to say that government has no role in policing unlawful behavior. Illegal activity is no less illegal simply because someone has used digital tools to perpetrate the act. Child pornography, for example, is no less illegal if it is disseminated over the Internet rather than in photographs or magazines. There is a big difference, however, between punishing illegal acts committed over the Internet and government control of its management and operation. Refraining from regulating the underpinning of the Internet has allowed it to evolve quickly to meet the diverse needs of users around the world and to keep governmental or non-governmental actors from controlling the design of the network or the content it carries.

Buttressed by the unanimous passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 50, the United States and 54 other countries left Dubai without signing the treaty. Unfortunately, 89 nations did sign. The revised ITRs will be implemented by those nations, and that begins in January of 2015. Now, a number of upcoming conferences will present additional opportunities for countries to pursue international regulation of the Internet, including the World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum in Geneva, which starts today, and the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in Busan, South Korea, in 2014.

The growing threat of such regulation prompted the subcommittee of which I chair, the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, to hold a joint hearing earlier this year with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Just as international opponents of an unregulated Internet are redoubling their efforts, so must we. That is why the hearing we held focused on draft legislation elevating the language of last year’s resolution from a mere sense of Congress aimed at particular treaty negotiations to a generalized statement of U.S. law.

I want to thank Foreign Affairs Chairman ED ROYCE; Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee Chairman CHRIS SMITH; and

Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee Chairman TED POE for their leadership and their help in calling attention to this important legislation and the issue broadly.

I also want to address the elephant in the room, if you will: the FCC’s network neutrality regulations. As the legislation we consider today was moving through the subcommittee and then the full committee, some of my colleagues expressed concern that transforming the exact language of last year’s unanimous resolution into law would somehow interfere with the FCC’s network neutrality rules. In particular, they saw a conflict with the language in making it U.S. policy “to promote a global Internet free from government control.”

Let me be clear: while I oppose the FCC’s rules regulating the Internet, this legislation does not address those regulations. While statements of policy can help delineate the contours of statutory authority, they don’t create statutorily mandated responsibilities. Nonetheless, in the interest of reaching bipartisan consensus and moving this important legislation forward, I agreed to drop the “government control” language. The result is the language you see today in H.R. 1580, which I introduced with Ranking Member ESHOO. This bill would make it U.S. policy “to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet.”

Passing H.R. 1580 will show we are united against efforts by authoritarian nations to exert their grip on the Internet. For the sake of the Internet and the social and economic freedoms that it brings, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

To my colleague and my chair on the subcommittee, thank you for your fine leadership and for your leadership on this legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 1580. As my colleague mentioned, it is a bill to affirm the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet. It has worked. If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it. The Internet has been a unique and powerful driver of social and economic progress, and it is changing nearly every part of the American economy and society, everything from education to health care delivery to agriculture.

This is especially true for rural communities, where communications technology can have an even greater impact in areas where populations are small and distances are vast. The Internet enables connections from even the most far-flung corners of our country to people, goods, and services around the globe, allowing rural America to compete just as effectively in the 21st century digital economy.

A critical element of the Internet’s success story has been the open man-

ner in which the Internet is governed. Rather than relying on centralized control by governments, the Internet instead adopts a multi-stakeholder model in which all who have an interest can have a voice in the Internet’s operation. Lately, however, the multi-stakeholder model towards Internet governance has been under assault on the global stage.

At the World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai last December, as my colleague mentioned, the International Telecommunication Union adopted several proposals that could fundamentally alter the way the Internet operates. These proposals undermine the successful decentralized approach to Internet governance and impose a government-controlled management regime, thereby threatening citizens’ access to content and information via the Internet as well as the global free flow of information online.

I am pleased that Congress unanimously passed a resolution last year urging the administration to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model. That’s what governs the Internet today. That’s what we want to govern the Internet tomorrow. I applaud the decision by the U.S. delegation not to sign that final treaty, but efforts to bring the Internet under the control of international regulatory bodies continues. This week, member-states of the International Telecommunication Union will meet again in Geneva to debate issues surrounding global Internet governance. The passage of H.R. 1580 will be timely in, once again, demonstrating the unwavering support of our Congress of the multi-stakeholder Internet governance model.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON, and I want to thank Chairman WALDEN, and their staff, for working with us on the Democratic side to address the concerns. Ranking Member WAXMAN and Ranking Member ESHOO raised these concerns during the bill’s markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee. We worked it out.

Mr. WALDEN, thank you.

I appreciate the modifications made to the bill, which make it clear that this policy statement will not implicate the legitimate activities of the U.S. Government online or the authorities of Federal agencies. Because of these changes, Democrats and Republicans in Congress once again stand united with the administration in its efforts to resist proposals that would undermine the existing multi-stakeholder approach.

I join my colleague Mr. WALDEN in urging my colleagues on the Democratic side to vote for this bill so we can once again demonstrate that there is support across the entire political spectrum for continuing the multi-stakeholder model that allows the Internet to thrive, which is for the benefit of every American and citizens around the world.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WALDEN. In closing, Mr. Speaker, freedom of the Internet is as essential as America's long held constitutional belief in freedom of the press, and we don't need governments—ours or others—infringing on how the Internet is managed and governed, nor in terms of maintaining the freedom of the press.

So, with that, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1580, which reaffirms current policy to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet, which is so very critical to our economic and social well-being.

In June 2011, the thirty-four member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, business representatives, and technical experts agreed on principles that included a commitment to promote the open, distributed and interconnected nature of the Internet. The 34 OECD members range from the United States to France to South Korea to Mexico.

This landmark OECD communiqué recognized the importance of the multi-stakeholder approach, stating that “The Internet's openness to new devices, applications and services has played an important role in its success in fostering innovation, creativity and economic growth.” That's right.

Yet somehow the United Nations missed the memo. In December 2012, the U.N.'s International Telecommunications Union—a government-only membership body—took a vote on a binding global treaty that would establish the ITU as the forum for Internet standard setting. Despite U.S. opposition, 89 of 144 countries voted for the revised International Telecommunications Regulations. They included China, Cuba, Russia and other countries hostile to political freedom.

In a UN system where each country has one vote—no matter how undemocratic—this UN overreach could shift the idea of Internet governance from what is best for netizens to what is best for a group of governments. There is no need for a UN Internet treaty. The Internet is flourishing in the current multi-stakeholder framework just fine.

In addition, there are serious concerns around the lack of transparency and inclusivity of the UN's ITU process. The Internet has transformed our ability to access and share information—surely Internet policy should not be developed behind the closed doors of the UN.

The U.S. State Department, Commerce Department, business community and civil society leaders must step up their outreach. We must clearly explain the huge economic and social benefits that are derived from the Internet and the policy framework that is needed to maximize those benefits. Going forward, a concerted effort must be made to turn around as many as possible of the 89 votes for the International Telecommunications Regulations.

Congress is unified in our support of an open Internet—we recognize the importance of the Internet to our economy and society. We recognize the threat of proposed international control of the Internet. It is now time to rally the international community against this dangerous policy.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN for his work on H.R. 1580 and want to recognize the

excellent cooperation between the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs committee on Internet governance. Our committees held a joint hearing in February entitled “Fighting for Internet Freedom: Dubai and Beyond.” We will continue to coordinate. And we will certainly continue to fight for Internet Freedom.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, as the World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (WTPF) begins in Geneva, Switzerland today, it's fitting that the House is considering legislation that affirms the support of the United States for the multi-stakeholder process of global Internet governance.

As we've debated before the Communications and Technology Subcommittee time and time again, H.R. 1580 is not about our views on domestic Internet policy. The legality of the FCC's 2010 Open Internet Order will be decided by the Courts. H.R. 1580 is about ensuring that this week and at future conferences, the international community knows that the U.S. Congress stands behind the multi-stakeholder process and the importance of a free and open Internet.

The Internet continues to advance rapidly and with this growth, billions around the world will experience the innovation, openness and transparency that have enabled the Internet to flourish. I thank Chairman WALDEN for bringing this legislation to the floor in a bipartisan manner and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1580.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to support H.R. 1580, a bill to affirm the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet.

Democrats and Republicans in Congress and the Administration have been united in our support for a global open Internet governed from the bottom up. We worked together last Congress on a bipartisan, bicameral basis to express our support for that successful approach to Internet governance.

On some domestic issues, I have strong differences with the majority over Internet policy. One example is my support for a domestic Internet policy that prevents Internet service providers from acting as “gatekeepers” that control what American citizens can do online. But those differences appropriately stop at the water's edge.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN for listening to the concerns we had about the initial draft of this bill. They worked with me and other Committee Democrats to address those issues by removing certain language from the draft and assuring us that the legislation is in no way intended to direct domestic Internet policy. With these changes and the assurances of my colleagues, I am pleased that we stand together on a bipartisan basis in support of our diplomats and the multistakeholder model for global Internet governance.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure so we can send a strong, united signal to the global community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1580.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1730

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 10

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 9, 2013, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support, Mr. Speaker, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall on June 9 to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, a legendary figure in Hawaiian history and culture.

On June 11, the people of Hawaii will celebrate the 97th annual Kamehameha Day commemorating the life of Kamehameha the Great, who between 1795 and 1810 unified the islands into the Kingdom of Hawaii.

Known for being a fierce warrior who fought for unity and independence, King Kamehameha was highly regarded for ruling with fairness and compassion. He's remembered for his law

known as the “law of the splintered paddle,” which specifically protects civilians in wartime. It is a model for human rights throughout the world today.

The statue of King Kamehameha, prominently displayed in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center, was added to the National Statuary Hall collection by Hawaii in 1969.

Every year, as part of the King Kamehameha celebration, the statue is draped in long beautiful strands of lei. In adopting the resolution, Mr. Speaker, we will authorize the use of this space for the celebration of his life and great accomplishments.

I certainly want to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Ms. HIRONO, for introducing this concurrent resolution; and I certainly would urge my colleagues to support it, as well.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member BRADY for allowing this bill to be heard on the floor today.

As was stated, the Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 would permit use of Emancipation Hall to allow us to celebrate King Kamehameha and the lei-draping ceremony.

King Kamehameha has a unique history; and, as you know, Hawaii is the only kingdom that is part of the United States. This is going to be the 44th time such a celebration has taken place in the United States Capitol.

June 11 is a State holiday in Hawaii, a day of celebration honoring King Kamehameha. He was believed to have been born around 1758 and is credited with unifying the major islands by the year 1810. By uniting the Hawaiian Islands, King Kamehameha secured Hawaii's future as a viable and recognized political entity.

King Kamehameha was the first in a long line of Hawaiian—what we call “ali'i,” which is our royalty—who held the needs and well-being of their people as their foremost priority. Kamehameha's legacy and commitment to Hawaii's people is evident today through organizations created by his prodigy, like Kamehameha Schools, the Queen Lili'uokalani Children's Trust, Lunalilo Home, and the Queen's Hospital. These organizations are the bedrock foundations in Hawaii and provide crucial services to native Hawaiians while ensuring the maintenance of our State's uniquely Hawaiian identity.

The Hawaiian lei that we'll be draping is a special bond, or relationship, between two people that is figuratively represented by the stringing of flowers together in a circle. The Kamehameha lei-draping ceremony emphasizes the strong bond Hawaii's people have with each other and our State's rich history.

Honoring King Kamehameha in this lei-draping ceremony acknowledges our deep appreciation for his sacrifice and

success in unifying our island home and reaffirms our connections with one another and the responsibility we all share to care for one another.

The significance of holding this ceremony in the Capitol of the United States cannot be overemphasized as it demonstrates to the Nation and the world that the rights and needs of the people should always be at the heart of the work that we do here. This is the legacy of King Kamehameha and his prodigy, and we should honor that by approving this event.

The celebration of King Kamehameha has been honored for over 140 years in Hawaii. It was first recognized in 1871, when Hawaii was still a kingdom, by Kamehameha V, his great-grandson. It was the first holiday proclaimed by the Governor and legislature when Hawaii became a State in 1959.

The statue of King Kamehameha and the traditional lei draping is over 100 years old itself. In Hawaii, the lei-draping ceremony is celebrated as a 2-day festivity in tribute to the great King. We celebrate it with parades, hula, music, chanting, storytelling, and arts. It is the way for Hawaiians to celebrate our history.

The American sculptor, Thomas Gould, was commissioned by the Kingdom of Hawaii to create the statue. It was sculpted in 1879 from his studio in Rome. It was completed in 1880, but the ship that was transporting the original from Germany sank. In 1883, the second statue made its way to Hawaii. The first statue was ultimately recovered and erected on North Kohala on the Big Island, and that is where King Kamehameha's birthplace is.

The statue stands 8½ feet tall with the King in his royal clothing. In it, King Kamehameha wears a mahiole, which is the helmet, and the 'ahu 'ula, which is the cloak. They are finished with gold leaf, reminiscent of the rare yellow feathers from the mamo bird the King wore. The spear in his left hand is the symbol of his kingdom and the fact that he is willing to defend it himself, and his right hand is extended towards the direction of the Hawaiian Islands.

The statue in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is a mold of the second statue which stands in front of our Ali'iolani Hale, the home of the Hawaii Supreme Court. This was dedicated as a gift to the National Statuary Hall from Hawaii in the year 1969.

As everyone knows, President Obama was born in Hawaii. And on June 20, 2010, President Obama issued Proclamation 8534 in honor of the bicentennial of the unification of Hawaii.

President Obama said:

On this bicentennial King Kamehameha Day, we celebrate the history and the heritage of the Aloha State, which has immeasurably enriched our national life and culture. The Hawaiian narrative is one of both profound triumph and, sadly, deep injustice. It is the story of native Hawaiians oppressed by crippling disease, aborted treaties and the eventual conquest of their sovereign kingdom. These grim milestones remind us of an

unjust time in our history, as well as the many pitfalls in our Nation's long and difficult journey to perfect itself. Yet through the peaks and valleys of our American story, Hawaii's steadfast sense of community and mutual support shows the progress that results when we are united in the spirit of limitless possibility.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this celebration means to us. It is a symbol of how the Hawaiian people have the spirit of limitless possibility.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

□ 1740

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Hawaii for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, which authorizes the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

On June 11 of every year, the State of Hawaii celebrates King Kamehameha Day. It's a beautiful State holiday, filled with parades and lei draping at the statues that exist in his honor. One of these statues stands proudly here in Washington, D.C., in the Capitol Visitor Center; and for the last 43 years, we have celebrated King Kamehameha's birthday in our Nation's capital.

Kamehameha I, sometimes called Kamehameha the Great, was a skilled and fierce warrior and an intelligent leader. He established his dynasty and reputation by uniting the eight major islands of the Hawaiian chain under his rule in 1910. By uniting the Hawaiian Islands into a viable and recognized political entity, Kamehameha helped protect his people during a time of great cultural change.

King Kamehameha I is known for his prowess in war, but he is also remembered for his humanity.

We honor King Kamehameha on his birthday, and we welcome visitors both to Hawaii and here to our Nation's Capitol, and appreciate the opportunity to tell a little bit about one of our great heroes.

His Kānawāi Māmalahoe, or Law of the on in the Hawaii State Constitution and is a model for human rights policies on civilians and other non-combatants today. When attacked by fishermen trying to protect their land and family, rather than punishing them, King Kamehameha declared, “Let every elderly person, woman and child lie by the roadside in safety.” This decree lives on in Hawaii and is a living symbol of this ruler's concern for public safety.

After uniting the islands, Kamehameha also focused on governing his kingdom. He appointed governors for each island, made laws for the protection of all, built houses and irrigation ditches, managed natural resources such as sandalwood, and traded shrewdly with foreigners. Otto Von Kotzebue, a Russian explorer, said, “The king is a man of great wisdom and tries to give his people anything he considers useful. He wishes to increase the happiness and not the wants of his people.”

I ask my colleagues for their support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 so that we can honor one of Hawaii's great leaders.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge all of my colleagues to support this very bipartisan legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, a resolution that would authorize the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha in the annual Kamehameha Day Lei Draping Ceremony. I thank Senator MAZIE HIRONO for sponsoring this resolution, and I thank my fellow members of Congress who join me in support of this important resolution.

Kamehameha the Great was one of the greatest Polynesian warrior-kings who ever lived. As a young man, Kamehameha was trained by one of the greatest warrior chiefs of his time, Kekuhaupio. He was knowledgeable of military tactics and was fearless in armed combat, and he was determined to bring all of the Hawaiian Islands under his rule, a monumental task that took him about ten years to achieve.

Kamehameha, also seen as a great leader by his Pacific neighbors—including the Samoan islands—developed political alliances to maintain Hawaiian independence under his rule.

Along with being a bold leader and skilled warrior, Kamehameha was a humanitarian with a heart for the people of Hawaii. He is also remembered for the Kanawai Mamalahoe, the "Law of Splintered Paddle", which ensured that during times of battle, every man, woman, and child would be able to travel freely and in peace, with the right "to lie down to sleep by the roadside without fear of harm. . ." This law, which was later preserved in Hawaii's State Constitution, has become a model of human rights law.

Since 1872, every June 11th in Hawaii is honored as Kamehameha Day. It is tradition that the three statues of King Kamehameha placed at Ali'iolani Hale in downtown Honolulu, at King Kamehameha's home island, the Big Island of Hawaii, and lastly at the United States Capitol in the Capitol Visitor Center, are draped with long strands of flower garlands, or leis, every Kamehameha Day in his honor.

This year, the Capitol Visitor Center will welcome guests from across the nation as we gather once again to celebrate the life and accomplishments of a revered leader and today I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to honor Kamehameha the Great.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 10.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 180, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1580, by the yeas and nays;

S. Con. Res. 10, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 180) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—406

Aderholt	Berishek	Brady (PA)	Green, Al	McDermott
Alexander	Bentivolio	Brady (TX)	Green, Gene	McGovern
Amodei	Bera (CA)	Braley (IA)	Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Andrews	Bilirakis	Bridenstine	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (AL)	Grimm	McKeon
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	McKinley
Barber	Bishop (UT)	Brown (GA)	Gutierrez	McMorris
Barr	Black	Brown (FL)	Hahn	Rodgers
Barrow (GA)	Blackburn	Brownley (CA)	Hall	McNerney
Barton	Blumenauer	Buchanan	Hanabusa	Meadows
Bass	Bonamici	Bucshon	Hanna	Meehan
Beatty	Bonner	Burgess	Harper	Meeks
Becerra	Boustany	Bustos	Harris	Meng
			Hartzler	Messer
			Hastings (FL)	Mica
			Hastings (WA)	Michaud
			Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)
			Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)
			Hensarling	Miller, Gary
			Herrera Beutler	Miller, George
			Higgins	Moore
			Himes	Mullin
			Holding	Mulvaney
			Holt	Murphy (FL)
			Honda	Murphy (PA)
			Horsford	Nadler
			Hoyer	Napolitano
			Hudson	Neal
			Huelskamp	Negrete McLeod
			Huffman	Neugebauer
			Huizenga (MI)	Noem
			Hultgren	Nolan
			Hunter	Nugent
			Hurt	Nunes
			Israel	Nunnelee
			Issa	O'Rourke
			Jackson Lee	Olson
			Jenkins	Owens
			Johnson (GA)	Palazzo
			Johnson (OH)	Pallone
			Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
			Johnson, Sam	Pastor (AZ)
			Jones	Paulsen
			Jordan	Payne
			Joyce	Pearce
			Kaptur	Pelosi
			Keating	Perry
			Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)
			Kelly (PA)	Peters (MI)
			Kennedy	Peterson
			Kildee	Petri
			Kilmer	Pingree (ME)
			Kind	Pittenger
			King (IA)	Pitts
			King (NY)	Pocan
			Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)
			Kirkpatrick	Polis
			Kline	Pompeo
			Kuster	Posey
			Labrador	Price (GA)
			LaMalfa	Price (NC)
			Lamborn	Radel
			Lance	Rahall
			Langevin	Rangel
			Lankford	Reed
			Larsen (WA)	Reichert
			Larson (CT)	Renacci
			Latham	Ribble
			Latta	Rice (SC)
			Lee (CA)	Richmond
			Levin	Rigell
			Lewis	Roby
			Lipinski	Roe (TN)
			LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
			Loeb sack	Rogers (KY)
			Lofgren	Rogers (MI)
			Long	Rokita
			Lowenthal	Rooney
			Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
			Lucas	Roskam
			Luetkemeyer	Ross
			Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rothfus
			Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Roybal-Allard
			Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Royce
			Lummis	Ruiz
			Maffei	Runyan
			Maloney	Ruppersberger
			Malone y, Carolyn	Ryan (OH)
			Maloney, Sean	Ryan (WI)
			Marchant	Salmon
			Marino	Sanchez, Linda T.
			Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta
			Matsui	Sarbanes
			McCarthy (CA)	Scalise
			McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
			McCaul	Schiff
			McClintock	Schneider
			McCollum	Schock

Schrader	Stutzman	Walz	Bass	Fincher	Lee (CA)	Richmond	Sensenbrenner	Valadao
Schwartz	Swalwell (CA)	Wasserman	Beatty	Fitzpatrick	Levin	Rigell	Serrano	Van Hollen
Schweikert	Takano	Schultz	Becerra	Fleischmann	Lewis	Roby	Sessions	Vargas
Scott (VA)	Terry	Watt	Benishak	Fleming	Lipinski	Roe (TN)	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Scott, Austin	Thompson (CA)	Waxman	Bera (CA)	Flores	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Shea-Porter	Vela
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Weber (TX)	Bilirakis	Forbes	Loeb	Rogers (KY)	Sherman	Velázquez
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)	Bishop (GA)	Portenberry	Loefgren	Rogers (MI)	Shimkus	Visclosky
Serrano	Thornberry	Welch	Bishop (NY)	Foster	Long	Rokita	Shuster	Wagner
Sessions	Tiberi	Wenstrup	Bishop (UT)	Foxx	Lowenthal	Rooney	Simpson	Walberg
Shea-Porter	Tierney	Westmoreland	Black	Frankel (FL)	Lowe	Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema	Walden
Sherman	Tipton	Whitfield	Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Roskam	Sires	Walorski
Shimkus	Titus	Williams	Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Ross	Slaughter	Walz
Shuster	Tsongas	Wilson (FL)	Bonamici	Fudge	Lujan Grisham	Rothfus	Smith (NE)	Wasserman
Simpson	Turner	Wilson (SC)	Bonner	Gabbard	(NM)	Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Sinema	Upton	Wittman	Boustany	Gallego	Lujan, Ben Ray	Royce	Smith (TX)	Waters
Sires	Valadao	Wolf	Brady (PA)	Garamendi	(NM)	Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Watt
Slaughter	Van Hollen	Womack	Brady (TX)	Garcia	Lummis	Runyan	Southerland	Waxman
Smith (NE)	Vargas	Woodall	Brady (IA)	Gardner	Maffei	Ruppersberger	Speier	Weber (TX)
Smith (NJ)	Veasey	Yarmuth	Bridenstine	Garrett	Maloney,	Rush	Stewart	Webster (FL)
Smith (TX)	Vela	Yoder	Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Carolyn	Ryan (OH)	Stivers	Welch
Smith (WA)	Velázquez	Yoho	Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (WI)	Stockman	Wenstrup
Southerland	Visclosky	Young (AK)	Broun (GA)	Gibson	Marchant	Salmon	Stutzman	Westmoreland
Speier	Wagner	Young (FL)	Brown (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Marino	Sánchez, Linda	Swalwell (CA)	Whitfield
Stewart	Walberg	Young (IN)	Brownley (CA)	Gohmert	Massie	T.	Takano	Williams
Stivers	Walden		Buchanan	Goodlatte	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta	Terry	Wilson (FL)
Stockman	Walorski		Bucshon	Gowdy	Matsui	Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)

NAYS—2

Amash

Massie
NOT VOTING—24

Barletta	Garcia	Moran
Butterfield	Gosar	Perlmutter
Campbell	Grijalva	Quigley
Clarke	Hinojosa	Rohrabacher
Clyburn	Jeffries	Rush
Cooper	Kingston	Sewell (AL)
Culberson	Lynch	Tonko
Ellmers	Markey	Waters

□ 1852

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was absent because of travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 144 for the National Blue Alert Act, I was unavoidably detained. I would have voted "aye."

POLICY REGARDING INTERNET GOVERNANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1580) to affirm the policy of the United States regarding Internet governance, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—413

Aderholt	Andrews	Barletta
Alexander	Bachmann	Barr
Amash	Bachus	Barrow (GA)
Amodei	Barber	Barton

Bass	Fincher	Lee (CA)	Richmond	Sensenbrenner	Valadao
Beatty	Fitzpatrick	Levin	Rigell	Serrano	Van Hollen
Becerra	Fleischmann	Lewis	Roby	Sessions	Vargas
Benishak	Fleming	Lipinski	Roe (TN)	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Bera (CA)	Flores	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Shea-Porter	Vela
Bilirakis	Forbes	Loeb	Rogers (KY)	Sherman	Velázquez
Bishop (GA)	Portenberry	Loefgren	Rogers (MI)	Shimkus	Visclosky
Bishop (NY)	Foster	Long	Rokita	Shuster	Wagner
Bishop (UT)	Foxx	Lowenthal	Rooney	Simpson	Walberg
Black	Frankel (FL)	Lowe	Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema	Walden
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Roskam	Sires	Walorski
Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Ross	Slaughter	Walz
Bonamici	Fudge	Lujan Grisham	Rothfus	Smith (NE)	Wasserman
Bonner	Gabbard	(NM)	Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Boustany	Gallego	Lujan, Ben Ray	Royce	Smith (TX)	Waters
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	(NM)	Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Watt
Brady (TX)	Garcia	Lummis	Runyan	Southerland	Waxman
Braley (IA)	Gardner	Maffei	Ruppersberger	Speier	Weber (TX)
Bridenstine	Garrett	Maloney,	Rush	Stewart	Webster (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Carolyn	Ryan (OH)	Stivers	Welch
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (WI)	Stockman	Wenstrup
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Marchant	Salmon	Stutzman	Westmoreland
Brown (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Marino	Sánchez, Linda	Swalwell (CA)	Whitfield
Brownley (CA)	Gohmert	Massie	T.	Takano	Williams
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta	Terry	Wilson (FL)
Bucshon	Gowdy	Matsui	Sarbanes	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Burgess	Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise	Thompson (MS)	Wittman
Bustos	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McCaul	Schiff	Thornberry	Womack
Camp	Grayson	McClintock	Schneider	Tiberi	Woodall
Cantor	Green, Al	McCollum	Schock	Tierney	Yarmuth
Capito	Green, Gene	McDermott	Schrader	Tipton	Yoder
Capps	Griffin (AR)	McGovern	Schwartz	Titus	Yoho
Capuano	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre	Schweikert	Tonko	Young (AK)
Cárdenas	Grimm	McKeon	Scott (VA)	Tsongas	Young (FL)
Carney	Guthrie	McKinley	Scott, Austin	Turner	Young (IN)
Carson (IN)	Gutierrez	McMorris	Scott, David	Upton	
Carter	Hahn	Rodgers			
Cartwright	Hall	McNerney			
Cassidy	Hanabusa	Meadows	Bentivolio	Gosar	McHenry
Castor (FL)	Hanna	Meehan	Butterfield	Grijalva	Moran
Castro (TX)	Harper	Meeks	Campbell	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Chabot	Harris	Meng	Clyburn	Jeffries	Quigley
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Messer	Cooper	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Chu	Hastings (FL)	Mica	Culberson	Lynch	
Ciilline	Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Ellmers	Markey	
Clarke	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)			
Clay	Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)			
Cleaver	Hensarling	Miller, Gary			
Coble	Herrera Beutler	Miller, George			
Coffman	Higgins	Moore			
Cohen	Himes	Mullin			
Cole	Holding	Mulvaney			
Collins (GA)	Holt	Murphy (FL)			
Collins (NY)	Honda	Murphy (PA)			
Conaway	Horsford	Nadler			
Connolly	Hoyer	Napolitano			
Conyers	Hudson	Neal			
Cook	Huelskamp	Negrete McLeod			
Costa	Huffman	Neugebauer			
Cotton	Huizenga (MI)	Noem			
Courtney	Hultgren	Nolan			
Cramer	Hunter	Nugent			
Crawford	Hurt	Nunes			
Crenshaw	Israel	Nunnelee			
Crowley	Issa	O'Rourke			
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Olson			
Cummings	Jenkins	Owens			
Daines	Johnson (GA)	Palazzo			
Davis (CA)	Johnson (OH)	Pallone			
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell			
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Pastor (AZ)			
DeFazio	Jones	Paulsen			
DeGette	Jordan	Payne			
Delaney	Joyce	Pearce			
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pelosi			
DelBene	Keating	Perry			
Denham	Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)			
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Peters (MI)			
DeSantis	Kennedy	Peterson			
DesJarlais	Kildee	Petri			
Deutch	Kilmer	Pingree (ME)			
Diaz-Balart	Kind	Pittenger			
Dingell	King (IA)	Pitts			
Doggett	King (NY)	Pocan			
Doyle	Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)			
Duckworth	Kirkpatrick	Polis			
Duffy	Kline	Pompeo			
Duncan (SC)	Kuster	Posey			
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Price (GA)			
Edwards	LaMalfa	Price (NC)			
Ellison	Lamborn	Radel			
Engel	Lance	Rahall			
Enyart	Langevin	Rangel			
Eshoo	Lankford	Reed			
Esty	Larsen (WA)	Reichert			
Farenthold	Larson (CT)	Renacci			
Farr	Latham	Ribble			
Fattah	Latta	Rice (SC)			

NOT VOTING—19

Butterfield	Gosar	McHenry
Campbell	Grijalva	Moran
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Cooper	Jeffries	Quigley
Culberson	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Ellmers	Lynch	
	Markey	

□ 1900

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 145 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—411

Aderholt Doggett Kilmer
 Alexander Doyle Kind
 Amash Duckworth King (IA)
 Amodei Duffy King (NY)
 Andrews Duncan (SC) Kinzinger (IL)
 Bachmann Duncan (TN) Kirkpatrick
 Bachus Edwards Kline
 Barber Engel Kuster
 Barletta Enyart Labrador
 Barr Eshoo LaMalfa
 Barrow (GA) Esty Lamborn
 Barton Farenthold Lance
 Bass Farr Langevin
 Beatty Fattah Lankford
 Benishek Fincher Larsen (WA)
 Bentivolio Fitzpatrick Larson (CT)
 Bera (CA) Fleischmann Latham
 Bilirakis Fleming Latta
 Bishop (GA) Flores Lee (CA)
 Bishop (NY) Forbes Levin
 Bishop (UT) Fortenberry Lewis
 Black Foster Lipinski
 Blackburn Foxx LoBiondo
 Blumenauer Frankel (FL) Loeb sack
 Bonamic Franks (AZ) Lofgren
 Bonner Frelinghuysen Long
 Boustany Fudge Lowenthal
 Brady (PA) Gabbard Lowey
 Brady (TX) Gallego Lucas
 Braley (IA) Garamendi Luetkemeyer
 Bridenstine Garcia Lujan Grisham
 Brooks (AL) Gardner (NM)
 Brooks (IN) Garrett Lujan, Ben Ray
 Broun (GA) Gerlach (NM)
 Brown (FL) Gibbs Lummis
 Brownley (CA) Gibson Maffei
 Buchanan Gingrey (GA) Maloney,
 Bucshon Gohmert Carolyn
 Burgess Goodlatte Maloney, Sean
 Bustos Gowdy Marchant
 Calvert Granger Marino
 Camp Graves (GA) Massie
 Cantor Graves (MO) Matheson
 Capito Grayson Matsui
 Capps Green, Al McCarthy (CA)
 Capuano Green, Gene McCarthy (NY)
 Cárdenas Griffin (AR) McCaul
 Carney Griffith (VA) McClintock
 Carson (IN) Grimm McCollum
 Carter Guthrie McDermott
 Cartwright Gutierrez McGovern
 Cassidy Hahn McHenry
 Castor (FL) Hall McIntyre
 Castro (TX) Hanabusa McKeon
 Chabot Hanna McKinley
 Chaffetz Harper McMorris
 Chu Harris Rodgers
 Cicilline Hartzler McNeerney
 Clarke Hastings (FL) Meadows
 Clay Hastings (WA) Meehan
 Cleaver Heck (NV) Meeks
 Coble Heck (WA) Meng
 Coffman Hensarling Messer
 Cohen Herrera Beutler Mica
 Cole Higgins Michaud
 Collins (GA) Himes Miller (FL)
 Collins (NY) Holding Miller (MI)
 Conaway Holt Miller, Gary
 Connolly Honda Miller, George
 Conyers Horsford Moore
 Cook Hoyer Mullin
 Costa Hudson Mulvaney
 Cotton Huelskamp Murphy (FL)
 Courtney Huffman Murphy (PA)
 Cramer Huizenga (MI) Nadler
 Crawford Hultgren Napolitano
 Crenshaw Hunter Neal
 Crowley Hurt Negrete McLeod
 Cuellar Israel Neugebauer
 Cummings Issa Noem
 Daines Jackson Lee Nolan
 Davis (CA) Jeffries Nugent
 Davis, Danny Jenkins Nunes
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (GA) Nunnelee
 DeFazio Johnson (OH) O'Rourke
 DeGette Johnson, E. B. Olson
 Delaney Johnson, Sam Owens
 DeLauro Jones Palazzo
 DelBene Jordan Pallone
 Denham Joyce Pascrell
 Dent Kaptur Pastor (AZ)
 DeSantis Keating Paulsen
 DesJarlais Kelly (IL) Payne
 Deutch Kelly (PA) Pearce
 Diaz-Balart Kennedy Perry
 Dingell Kildee Peters (CA)

Peters (MI) Sánchez, Linda
 Peterson T.
 Petri Sanchez, Loretta
 Pingree (ME) Sarbanes
 Pittenger Scallie
 Pitts Schakowsky
 Pocan Schiff
 Poe (TX) Schneider
 Polis Schock
 Pompeo Schrader
 Posey Schwartz
 Price (GA) Schweikert
 Price (NC) Scott (VA)
 Radel Scott, Austin
 Rahall Sensenbrenner
 Rangel Serrano
 Reed Sessions
 Reichert Sewell (AL)
 Renacci Shea-Porter
 Ribble Sherman
 Rice (SC) Shimkus
 Richmond Shuster
 Rigell Simpson
 Roby Sinema
 Roe (TN) Sires
 Rogers (AL) Slaughter
 Rogers (KY) Smith (NE)
 Rogers (MI) Smith (NJ)
 Rokita Smith (TX)
 Rooney Smith (WA)
 Ros-Lehtinen Southerland
 Roskam Speier
 Ross Stewart
 Rothfus Stivers
 Roybal-Allard Stockman
 Royce Stutzman
 Ruiz Swalwell (CA)
 Runyan Takano
 Ruppensberger Terry
 Rush Thompson (CA)
 Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS)
 Ryan (WI) Thompson (PA)
 Salmon Thornberry

Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

Becerra Ellmers Moran
 Butterfield Gosar Pelosi
 Campbell Grijalva Perlmutter
 Clyburn Hinojosa Quigley
 Cooper Kingstone Rohrabacher
 Culberson Lynch Scott, David
 Ellison Markey Welch

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 676

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 676.

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

There was no objection.

REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. JOYCE. I rise in support of repealing the Affordable Care Act and preventing Ohioans from having to deal with higher health costs, \$1.1 trillion in tax hikes, and more government intrusion in their health care. As we near the full implementation of the health care law, it seems as though every day

we receive more evidence that this law will increase health costs for ordinary Ohioans, place an enormous burden on Ohio small businesses owners—making it harder for those businesses to hire new workers—and insert more big government in between Ohioans and their doctors.

My district in northeastern Ohio is home to several medical device manufacturing companies which will be especially hurt by the health care law's onerous medical device tax. It's crucial we repeal this law and replace it with commonsense health care legislation. Jobs and affordable health care are at stake.

HONORING "BREAKAWAY FOR CANCER" CHAMPION VIRGINIA "DEE" WILLIAMS OF LIVERMORE

(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. Today, I rise to honor the amazing Virginia "Dee" Williams of Livermore, California, a 12-year survivor of breast cancer who will be honored this Saturday as part of Amgen's "Breakaway From Cancer" initiative at the Amgen Tour of California.

Dee was chosen as a "Breakaway From Cancer" champion because of the profound difference that she has made in the lives of cancer patients within our community. Dee is a "call back" volunteer who talks to cancer patients to determine if their needs are being met while undergoing chemotherapy or radiation. She also spends time talking with recently diagnosed breast cancer patients to help relieve their concerns as they're going through this journey.

As one of the Walnut Creek American Cancer Society "Look Good, Feel Better" coordinators for Livermore and Pleasanton, Dee teaches women who are undergoing chemotherapy or radiation how to pick out, take care of, and wear wigs, as well as teaching make-up techniques.

Dee has survived cancer and is still dealing with fibromyalgia and arthritis and battling a neurological disorder, but she has not let any of that slow her down one bit. She is truly an inspiration, and Livermore is lucky to have her, and I am lucky to represent her in the United States Congress. I look forward to seeing her this weekend on the Amgen Tour.

IRS, DOJ, BENGHAZI—AMERICANS DESERVE ANSWERS

(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, at a 2009 college commencement address, President Obama joked he could use the Internal Revenue Service to target political enemies, but, of course, he never would.

Well, today, it appears that officials at the Internal Revenue Service had the last laugh. On Friday, the IRS admitted to the political profiling of conservative groups and that senior-level officials were aware of these actions as far back as 2011.

This, on top of new revelations in the ongoing Benghazi terrorist attack investigation, one could say it's been a bad week for the White House. But it doesn't stop there. Yesterday, it was reported the Justice Department used a secret subpoena to obtain 2 months of phone records for Associated Press reporters and editors without notifying the news organization.

It has been a bad week for the White House, Mr. Speaker, but an even worse week for the Constitution, which is no laughing matter. The American people deserve answers from the White House concerning these abuses. The constitutional protections of free Americans and a free press—the foundations of our democracy—are at stake.

BENGHAZI

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are trying to tar anyone in sight with Benghazi. Next they're going for the former Joint Chief of Staff and a former Ambassador who did the investigation. But their investigation mandate was not talking points. It was:

Whether the attacks were security related; whether security systems and procedures were adequate and implemented properly.

They have found that they most definitely were not, resulting in four tragic deaths. Talking points say a lot about bureaucratic in-fighting. We have yet to get to the real investigation of the causes and most especially how to prevent another Benghazi. That is our mission. Let's get to it this week.

STATE SECRETS VS. FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when I went to the Soviet Union in the 1980s, the Communist leaders told me that they believed in and had a free press and they also had free speech. However, I also learned that Soviet law prohibited these freedoms when they jeopardized state secrets—or national security, as we call it in America. The state-secret provision was so broad the Soviet press and speech were gagged and shackled. They certainly were not free.

Now we learn that our Department of Justice improperly seized without notice phone records of over 100 Associated Press journalists—all in the name of national security concerns.

To me, this is a clear violation of the spirit and letter of the First Amendment. These actions border on the Soviet method of legalizing these freedoms but never allowing them. So it's time to revisit U.S. law and require in all cases judicial review where these types of records are seized.

We cannot allow our government to arbitrarily abolish the First Amendment in the name of "state secrets."

And that's just the way it is.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring further attention to the fact that unless Congress takes definitive action, student loan interest rates will double on July 1. With that in mind, I proudly support H.R. 1595, introduced by Congressman JOE COURTNEY, and other bills that would keep student interest rates frozen at their reasonable rates for the next 2 years.

Right now, college tuition is spiraling beyond what many students and their families can afford. In many instances, students are being forced to leave school because they are accruing so much debt. At UC-San Diego or the University of San Diego or Point Loma Nazarene, all of which are in my district, students are relying on us to keep loan rates low.

My own education was made possible by student loans and work-study, and we must ensure that today's generation of students has the same opportunity to attend college that I and so many of us had. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1595.

THE BUCK STOPS HERE

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Well, we once had a political party known as the Know-Nothings. We now have a President who wants us to believe that he knows nothing. He wants us to believe that he knows nothing about who decided to blame the terrorist attacks in Benghazi on a video. He wants us to believe that he knew nothing about the IRS scandal until he read the same press reports that you and I have read. He wants us to believe that he knows nothing about the Department of Justice subpoenaing 2 months of the Associated Press' phone records.

What has happened to the days in America when Democratic President Harry Truman proudly placed a placard on his desk that said: "The buck stops here"? Perhaps, sadly, we have returned to the days where the question to the President of the United States ought to be: What did you know and when did you know it?

□ 1920

LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Today I joined JIM BRIDENSTINE in filing a bipartisan constitutional amendment that would allow Congress to decide whether and how to limit the terms of its Members. Our measure would not prescribe the number of terms a Member would serve; but by giving Congress the power to ultimately decide, I believe it will foster a productive conversation about how to make Congress more responsive to the needs of the American public.

Many in our country feel that Congress is focused on reelection to the exclusion of solving our country's problems. They are rightly concerned about the enormous powers of incumbency and the corrupting influence of money as well as the uncompetitive, gerrymandered districts where the Representative chooses his constituency and not the other way around.

We owe our constituents institutional reforms that address these concerns. Enacting comprehensive campaign finance reform, fixing the congressional redistricting process, and moving forward with sensible term limits can improve how Congress works.

I urge all my colleagues to join in this reform agenda.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to those men and women who have answered the call of duty to serve their community, to those who place their lives on the line each and every day for their neighbors. This week we celebrate National Police Week, and I want to thank the police officers in my community who exemplify what it means to "serve and protect."

Minnesota is proud to be home to some of the most dedicated and professional police departments in the country. I have the distinct honor to meet regularly with local police officers and leaders during my law enforcement roundtables, and I can tell you we are privileged to have such committed officers patrolling our streets.

I want to especially recognize the officers that are currently aiding in the search for Mandy Matula, an Eden Prairie woman who has been missing. I pray for her swift return. And thank you to the law enforcement, also, for whose perseverance recently brought closure to the families of Danielle Jelinek and Kira Steger Trevino, who were victims of domestic violence.

Mr. Speaker, as we go about our busy lives, let's take time this week to

thank the police officers in our communities and keep the memory of those who've lost their lives in our thoughts and prayers.

YOUNG PEOPLE IN MEMPHIS CHOOSING OCCUPATIONS THAT HELP OTHERS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there was a recent survey of about 9,000 outstanding high school and college students and graduates asking them where they would like to work. They had 200 companies that were all in the Fortune magazine list of top companies. I'm proud of that group of students from ages 15 to 27. Their number one choice was St. Jude Children's Hospital in Memphis, Tennessee. It speaks well of that group of young people that they want to work to help others and to find a cure for cancer—and to work at St. Jude, which is such a wonderful institution in my home city of Memphis.

Eight of the 25 sites that were selected by these young people were in the health care field. I think it's admirable and commendable that so many young people want to help others and do it through efforts in the health care industry, not necessarily in ways to enrich themselves.

I'm proud that they chose St. Jude, and it wasn't just because of the Grizzlies.

IRS TALKERS

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is humbling for me every single day to walk onto this House floor knowing that I represent the former district held by Abraham Lincoln in central Illinois. In 1863, during his Gettysburg Address, President Lincoln spoke of our democracy by saying that it is "a government of the people, by the people, for the people." Yet what we have seen over the last 48 hours is nothing close to a government for the people.

Does a government of the people target specific groups of individuals, especially groups that oppose the President's viewpoints? Does a government by the people obtain the phone records of reporters in what appears to be a violation of First Amendment rights? And does a government for the people refuse to accept responsibility and instead place blame wherever they can? The answer, of course, is no.

Public trust in government is at an all-time low, and partisan actions by this administration will continue the deterioration of that trust. We have been called to Washington by our constituents to work together in a bipartisan fashion for the best interests of our country. So I ask that we put poli-

tics aside, Mr. Speaker, lead by example, and work together to keep the trust of the American public.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT FIXES

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about commonsense actions we must take to fix the health care law. I wasn't in Congress in March of 2010 and I didn't vote for the Affordable Care Act, but I'm here today to ensure that it meets the needs of small businesses and middle class families.

That's why I've spent a lot of time listening to small business owners and staff, to seniors, and to hospital employees and physicians in Arizona about their concerns. That is why I have cosponsored legislation to repeal the medical device tax, the annual tax on health insurance, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board. These actions will protect families and small businesses from premium hikes, and protect access to health care for seniors and all Americans. This is why I'm working with the citizens of Green Valley in my district to keep health care affordable by protecting the tax deduction for medical expenses.

These are but a few examples of how we can come together to fix this law. I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find additional ways to do so.

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, sexual assault in the military has reached a crisis point. A recent report from the Department of Defense found that the number of servicemembers who have experienced unwanted sexual contact has increased by more than 30 percent over the past 2 years, from 19,000 to 26,000 people.

These numbers are staggering, but they're more than just statistics. Behind every number is the story of a member of our armed services who stepped forward to serve our country. They're people like my constituent, Judy Atwood-Bell, a Hudson, New Hampshire, resident who enlisted in the Army at age 17 to further her education and live the American Dream. At 19, Judy was raped by a fellow soldier and suffered sexual harassment in silence throughout her career. After 20 years of service, she sought help and was eventually diagnosed with PTSD related to military sexual trauma.

Our military leadership, the chain of command, and the Veterans Administration failed to protect Judy and thousands of victims like her who suffered from sexual assault. We owe it to Judy and every other survivor to come together in a bipartisan manner to confront this epidemic head on.

REPUBLICAN FRESHMAN CLASS ON THE NEED TO REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MESSER. 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 the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for another in a series of Republican freshman class Special Orders, this time to focus on the need to repeal ObamaCare in a vote in this Chamber later this week.

The President and many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle proudly refer to this health care law as "ObamaCare," but we should neither be proud of the process that led us to this point nor the resulting policy mess.

The 2,800-page bill was crafted behind closed doors and rushed through Congress in 2010 with limited debate and without amendments. The predictable result is a flawed product that expands the Federal Government's role in health care, raises taxes on employers, and mandates benefits that will increase health care costs for most. Remarkably, there already have been more than 20,000 pages of regulations issued regarding this bill's implementation.

□ 1930

I would like to start by recognizing my distinguished colleague, the gentlelady from Missouri, for her remarks on this important issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding and for organizing these Special Orders this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 45, a bill that will repeal the President's devastating health care reform law, commonly referred to as ObamaCare. When promoting the health care reform legislation to the American public, the President and members of his party told people that if you liked your health insurance then you could keep it, that the penalty Americans have to pay under the individual mandate was not a tax, and that those with preexisting conditions would have access to health care. Well, as many of us suspected then, these claims were nothing more than blatant lies.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office recently said that 7 million people will lose their job-based health insurance due to ObamaCare. The Supreme Court has affirmed what we already

knew: that ObamaCare penalties are, indeed, taxes, and on February 15 the Obama administration announced they would not cover over 40,000 patients suffering from preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, friends, this should not happen in America. We need to repeal this law, and we need to do it now. Today, though not fully implemented, ObamaCare has already had many destructive effects on the American people—real people with bills to pay, mouths to feed, and jobs to do.

Since ObamaCare was signed into law, many of the new taxes in the President's \$1 trillion tax hike have gone into effect, most of which target the middle class, increase the cost of health care, and stifle job creation.

The law continues to take its toll on small business. I hear from mom and pop operations throughout the St. Louis region that are not hiring needed workers or reducing full-time employees to part-time workers, for the sole purpose of being able to keep their doors open as a consequence of the new ObamaCare regulations.

The impact on jobs already is unmistakable. ObamaCare promised 4 million jobs, including 400,000 almost immediately. Yet we know the truth: that ObamaCare is destroying jobs and costing the American Dream for millions of Americans.

Just today, a Missouri hospital announced that it was eliminating 129 good-paying jobs. The reason? ObamaCare.

These are facts, these are real jobs, and this law is hurting real people.

It continues.

Premium costs continue to rise on hardworking families across the country. Premiums for the average family have already grown by \$3,000 since 2008, despite promises by the Obama administration that ObamaCare would decrease premiums \$2,500.

Premium costs are expected to double, triple, and even quadruple for millions of Americans when many of the provisions of the law go into effect next year. The greatest effect will be on young people in this country, who are already struggling to find jobs, pay off student loans, and grow healthy, prosperous families. These young people will be stuck between paying for insurance they cannot afford and being subject to a burdensome tax.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by addressing the shameful raiding of Medicare by this irresponsible law called ObamaCare. Despite promises to the contrary, ObamaCare has gutted Medicare to the tune of \$716 billion—nearly three-quarters of a trillion dollars—stolen from our Greatest Generation to pay for this devastating law.

Every day, more and more doctors are refusing to see Medicare patients because they simply cannot afford to do so. Is this how we pay back our seniors—with reduced benefits, reduced access to health care, and reduced respect for their quality of life? We owe them more. We owe the American people more.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear: this law is wrong for America and needs to be repealed immediately before any more of its harmful provisions are implemented.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for her remarks.

Many of the promises that were made to justify ObamaCare's enactment have been broken. The results of these broken promises are hurting hardworking American families, workers, and businesses today, and will hurt them even more in the future, which is why House Republicans will be voting to repeal this government takeover of health care later this week. Through the course of the Special Order, we will look at some of those broken promises.

I would next like to recognize my good friend, my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join a chorus of individuals who are calling for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, it's not even affordable. The CBO says it will cost \$1.8 trillion just to employ. Blue Cross/Blue Shield in North Carolina says the premiums are going to go up 284 percent. We can't afford this. Seven million people won't be able to keep their own policies. There's no risk pool now, no funding for it, no provision. Even Democrat Senator MAX BAUCUS, Finance Committee chairman, says this is a train wreck getting ready to happen.

Mr. Speaker, last January, I sponsored a seminar in my district that brought together 400 business leaders. The purpose of this seminar was to explain ObamaCare. We had the Cato Institute and the AARP there. Mr. Speaker, what they heard was a resounding, What in the world have we done? They were so concerned about what ObamaCare was going to do to their own businesses, they were afraid to hire people, and they thought they would let people go.

Do you know what they saw, Mr. Speaker? This chart right here. This chart—what a quagmire to process through to try to get real health care. It can't be done. We can do better.

That's why with Congressman HUDSON I've introduced a bill called Auto Enroll. This is a little provision put in the health care law, one of those provisions that I believe Speaker PELOSI said we are going to read it after we vote on it, we are going to learn about it then.

Well, we've learned about it. What did we learn? That the companies have to automatically put people on their health care plan. And this bill says, no, you can opt out, you don't have to comply.

Students who are already on their parents' health care, they shouldn't have to do this. You have temporary people who are working during seasonal work time in major retail or in restaurants. They shouldn't have to be on this, yet they're required to. This bill will allow some flexibility for employers.

The American people were told, We are going to provide you a champion thoroughbred horse who is going to go win the Kentucky Derby. Do you know what they got, Mr. Speaker? They got a maimed, blind, deaf, crippled horse that can't even make its way around the track. That's what we have with ObamaCare.

We are going to do better. We are going to provide for the American people at the right time, and we can do this in competitive markets. They can cross State lines, hundreds of companies competing, drawing down the cost of health care. This needs to be done now.

We can get rid of the frivolous lawsuits that are driving the cost of health care up. The American workers, responsible people, hardworking taxpayer Americans, they deserve better, and we are going to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would next like to recognize my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. MESSER.

I've been blessed to do a lot of fun things in my life, to do a lot of interesting jobs. I was an Air Force pilot for 14 years. That was maybe the funnest thing I've ever done. I was a writer. I've written 15 books. That was very satisfying. But the hardest job, without question the hardest job I've ever done was to be a small business owner.

As a small business owner, you fight every day to make ends meet. You care about your employees. Your employees become your family.

One of the funnest things to do is to hire new people, but one of the hardest things to do, and one of the most, frankly, discouraging things you have to do is when you have to lay people off. But that is exactly what has happened in the business that I owned, that is exactly what is happening now, and that is what is going to continue to happen.

Jobs are being killed by the implementation of ObamaCare. And that's not a statistic. That isn't some government projection. It isn't some estimation from CBO. That is a fact. It is a reality. ObamaCare is killing economic activity. ObamaCare is killing jobs. And it's only going to get worse.

□ 1940

There is a reason that the Democrats—and I'm not talking about the Republicans; I'm talking about Democratic leaders—are calling ObamaCare a train wreck. There is a reason why NANCY PELOSI said, We have to pass this bill before we can find out what's in it.

This is like taking the lid off a garbage can that has been sitting out in the sun too long. The longer it's out there and the more we know about this legislation, the worse it is. 400 percent—that's how much some people's

premiums are going to go up because of the implementation of ObamaCare. The President promised and, in fact, the entire purpose of the Affordable Care Act was to drive premiums down. Instead, we see exactly the opposite—30 percent, 80 percent, 400 percent increases in health care premiums.

All of us Americans have become familiar with new words over the last year or two. We've learned about sequester, and we've heard a lot about the fiscal cliff. The new government phrase of the year is going to be "rate shock." You're going to hear about that all the time beginning this fall because people will be shocked and businesses will be shocked and jobs will be lost and people will be hurt because of the implementation of ObamaCare.

Please, let's take the opportunity to repeal it now. We can do better. We can write something and design something that is better. Let's take the opportunity to do that.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would quote for you broken promise No. 1 of ObamaCare: "If you like your current health care plan, you will be able to keep it."

Not true. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that nearly 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored health care coverage under ObamaCare.

I would next like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, Representative COLLINS.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I want to thank the gentleman for holding this special session tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the American public is often concerned there is not enough agreement in the Halls of Congress. Well, I am pleased to report there is growing agreement among both parties and in both Houses of this Congress that ObamaCare is truly a train wreck, as recently described by Democrat Senator MAX BAUCUS. As this massive piece of legislation is being implemented, the negative impact it is and will have on our economy is becoming clear:

ObamaCare guts the funding for Medicare Advantage to help cover its growing price tag. So, for all those seniors out there, like my 86-year-old mom, who are happy with the coverage they receive through Medicare Advantage, I have news for you: you can't keep your existing plan, as promised, because ObamaCare effectively ends it.

What the administration could not raid from other sources to pay for ObamaCare it makes up in new taxes. Just last week, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Health and Technology, I heard from small business owners and advocates about the impact the health insurance tax will have on the bottom line of America's small businesses. The amount of that tax will be \$8 billion in 2014, increasing to \$14.3 billion in 2018, and will increase based on premium trends thereafter.

Supporters of ObamaCare will say these fees are supposed to be paid by the health insurance companies; but common sense, substantiated by independent studies, tells you the insurance companies are passing these costs directly on to consumers in the form of higher premiums. To avoid the taxes and fees, companies are cutting jobs, not hiring, and are reducing employee hours to stay under ObamaCare thresholds, all this at a time when national unemployment remains embarrassingly high.

ObamaCare is built on the premise that the young and the healthy will pay to insure the old and the sick. Well, guess what? The young and the healthy are too smart to have their pockets picked. Knowing they can't be denied coverage down the road, the young and the healthy are going to drop out of the insurance market and instead pay the \$95 penalty and their out-of-pocket medical expenses. They know this approach will be far, far cheaper in the end than paying thousands of dollars for an individual or a family plan under ObamaCare. It's like not buying collision insurance on your new car because you know you can get it after you've been in a wreck.

When attempting to defend ObamaCare, its supporters like to tout all those "free" things that ObamaCare offers the American people. That sales pitch crystallizes what is wrong with ObamaCare and the tax-and-spend policies this town is famous for. Nothing is free in this world. For every free service ObamaCare offers, someone out there in America is paying for it with his hard-earned money; or, worse yet, we'll just add a few more bucks onto our staggering debt to cover this so-called "free" service.

This country can't afford ObamaCare figuratively or literally. ObamaCare must be repealed. It needs to be replaced with commonsense, cost-effective ways to improve health care in this country.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would next like to yield to my good friend, the gentlelady from my home State of Indiana, for her insights as to this important Special Order.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Thank you to the gentleman from Indiana for organizing this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 45, the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

ObamaCare is bad for the young and for the elderly.

I recently received a letter from a high school senior in my district. She noted that her family's out-of-pocket premium costs have risen \$7,000 in recent years while their deductible has increased tenfold. She said she is worried about how she is going to pay for health care on her own in the future.

She is right to worry. According to a study published by the American Academy of Actuaries' magazine, 80 percent of Americans under the age of 30 will

face premium increases because of ObamaCare.

The costs of ObamaCare are more than monetary. Americans will also have fewer health care choices because of it. Specifically, the Independent Payment Advisory Board will threaten the options available today to Medicare recipients. This board of 15 officials will get to choose which treatments and which procedures Medicare will reimburse and which it will not. What a doctor prescribes or what a patient needs will come second, if at all. The IPAB is unelected and won't report to Members of Congress or to any elected official. The budget for this board is given directly by the executive branch. IPAB doesn't even have to justify its finances to the public.

My friends on the other side of the aisle like to say Republicans want to change Medicare as we know it; but, in fact, it is ObamaCare that is changing Medicare, putting bureaucrats in charge of decisions that should be between senior citizens and their doctors.

Repealing ObamaCare will right this wrong for the young and for our seniors. I urge the adoption of this important bill.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlelady for her remarks.

I would next like to yield to my good friend from the State of Florida, Representative YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in support of H.R. 45, the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

It's not just the House Republicans who want this or House freshmen who want to repeal this law; it's the American people. The American people don't like this. The people of my district overwhelmingly desire the repeal of this legislative debacle.

Let's face it: in March of 2009, with a Democratic Congress, this bill was passed through in the twilight hours. The Speaker said—and I think we all remember those infamous words—that we have to pass it to see what's in it, that we have to pass it to see how it's going to work.

America deserves better. Americans deserve better, and they demand better.

The Affordable Care Act is the number one job-killing bill in America. When the President speaks of job creation and of stimulating the economy, the 800-pound gorilla in the room that nobody talks about is the Affordable Care Act. It's the number one job-killing bill—bar none. Here are a couple of examples:

I had a person call in today. A young lady, one of my constituents, said that even though she doesn't have insurance, it's because she doesn't have a job; and the reason she doesn't have a job is due to this bill. It's getting in the way of job creation.

□ 1950

Another business owner I know, he's got 350 employees. I asked him how the

effects of this bill were going to affect his business. He said, Let me tell you about this bill. I could expand my business right now and I could add 100 new employees, but I'm not doing anything because of the estimated cost of this bill.

Think about that. That's one man's business in one town in America. How many businesses in America, throughout this country, are not expanding because of this bill and the uncertainty? It's got to stop.

There's a county in our district, Clay County. I was talking to one of the municipal people there that was in charge of the health care. He said that the estimated costs coming up because of the Affordable Care Act were going to cost \$15 million. Then they figured out if they didn't comply with the Affordable Care Act what that cost would be. It would be \$5 million. What choice do you think they're going to make? They're either going to lay off people or they're not going to cover people. They'll pay the fine.

In my own town in Alachua County, there's a contractor, and he's got 51 employees. He's bidding on a job against another contractor that has 49 employees. The estimated cost to him is \$2,000 per employee. So this contractor with the 51 employees is starting at the same line with this guy who has 49 employees, and he's going to owe \$102,000 more in his opening bid. I asked him what he was going to do. He said, The most commonsense thing to do is lay off some people so I don't have to pay for that. Again, I hear this story over and over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, it seems the President himself doesn't really like his plan that much either. In spite of all the glowing speeches he gives, the President himself has signed into law repeals of certain ObamaCare provisions on seven different occasions. When the President claimed that his plan would lower the cost of health care for Americans, he left out the fact that about 7 million Americans would just lose their health care altogether.

Estimated insurance costs for the younger generation: they can expect their insurance premiums to increase from what they are today 150 percent to 175 percent. When the President claimed that under his plan no family making less than \$250,000 a year would see taxes increase, he completely left out the fact that there are 21 new taxes in this bill; and these are taxes that are on not just the wealthy, but all Americans at all income levels. It's a bad bill, and this is not what America wants.

The whole point of the Affordable Care Act was to create health reform, which implies not just health care, but health prevention. After 3½ years of this bill being out there, the Supreme Court said in reviewing it that it's not health care; it's a health tax. The bottom line is it's going to create people who have less insurance.

Then we have to think about who will collect these taxes: the IRS. That's

the very same IRS we found out that's under a criminal investigation today. Americans don't want this.

Americans are a caring, generous, and a charitable people. We will always make sure that the least fortunate among us are cared for. The President's plan doesn't care for the less fortunate. In fact, it makes us all less fortunate. Our vote this week is not about politics; it's about being responsive to the people and adhering to the Constitution.

We represent the people who are being hurt the most by the ObamaCare bill, and we owe it to them to relieve them of this burden. If we truly want to create jobs, the full repeal of ObamaCare is the first step in jump-starting our economy, and I'm proud and thankful to be able to be a part of the process of repealing this legislative disaster and replacing it with a commonsense health care reform.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank my colleagues for their stamina and patience.

I would next like to recognize my good friend, the straight-talking Member from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for allowing me to speak on this issue on behalf of my constituents. I can say very clearly that I support H.R. 45, ObamaCare repeal, and I can tell you why.

Under ObamaCare, we're looking at a minimum of about \$500 billion in new taxes. We're talking about taxes on pharmaceuticals and taxes on medical devices. We're also talking about taxes on payroll, things that have nothing to do with medicine; taxes on the sale of real estate; taxes on other capital gains. There will be 21 new taxes, and \$500 billion is the conservative estimate. Some people say it's going to be \$1.1 trillion in new tax revenue.

Guess what? It's not enough. There's also going to be \$500 billion in new borrowing over the first 10 years of ObamaCare. And it's still not enough. So we're going to rob \$716 billion from Medicare at a time when seniors are finding it hard to find providers who are willing to accept Medicare as it is. This is hugely problematic for the people in my district.

Let's talk about the employers. Employers are seeking ways to reduce their staffs below 50 people. They're laying people off. No kidding. I talked to an employer just a few weeks ago in my district. He's got 57 employees. He's now trying to get down to 49. He's also trying to figure out ways to make his staff part-time. He's trying to get his staff under 29 hours so he has less than 50 full-time equivalents, as they refer to them now. This is going to be a disaster for the employment prospects of the people in my district.

Let's talk about how this is administered. It's going to be administered by the IRS. So everyone has to have the health insurance that perfectly conforms to what the President wants

them to have. It used to be that there was a time when my wife and I had insurance, where we had a high deductible and a low premium. We had a little bit of savings. We wanted to save money on our premium, and so we were willing to accept the high deductible. We were willing to accept a little bit of risk upon ourselves to save money. That's not available anymore under ObamaCare. All that will be enforced by the IRS.

So if you have that high-deductible, low-premium policy, or if you have a policy that they call a "Cadillac plan," you're going to be penalized. These penalties have been ruled by the Supreme Court to be taxes, but let's be clear that they are penalties for not conforming to what the President wants you to have in insurance.

That penalty, if you don't have the right health insurance, is going to be 2½ percent of your income, eventually. So if you make \$50,000 a year, your penalty is \$1,250, assessed by the IRS when you do your taxes. Or you could pay the premium. If you want the comprehensive health care that ObamaCare requires you to have, that premium is likely to be around \$7,000, or you can pay the penalty of \$1,250. What are most people going to pay? They're going to pay the penalty. Why? Because under ObamaCare, they can't exempt you for a preexisting condition. So you can pay the penalty, and then when you get sick you can go to the doctor and get the health insurance you need and then get healthy; and then when you're healthy, you can drop your health insurance again.

This creates an adverse selection. This is a big problem. If you want to see health insurance premiums skyrocket, let's only insure the people who are sick; and that's exactly what this bill does.

Let's talk for a second about the expansion of Medicaid under ObamaCare. I'm very proud of the State of Oklahoma for not expanding Medicaid under ObamaCare. This is a teaser rate. This is a time when the Federal Government comes in and they say, We're going to fully expand your Medicaid expansion up to 138 percent of the poverty line for the first 3 years, then we're going to pull the rug out from under you.

The State of Oklahoma is going to be faced with challenges. What are we going to cut? Maybe we'll cut education, maybe we'll cut the Department of Transportation in the State of Oklahoma, or maybe we'll raise taxes. This is just another way for the Federal Government to addict States to a program that ultimately they're going to pull the rug out from under the program and the State of Oklahoma is going to be forced to carry this load. I'm very proud of Governor Mary Fallin for not expanding Medicaid under ObamaCare.

I'd like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for allowing me to express my views. I fully support H.R. 45, the repeal of ObamaCare.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inquire as to the amount of time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has approximately 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. MESSER. Great. We're right on pace.

I would next like to recognize my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for organizing this important discussion with our freshman colleagues.

President Obama made big promises while pushing his health care law through the House and Senate. He promised the American people that it could create jobs, that it could increase access to health care, that it would promote economic growth, that it wouldn't add to the deficit, that it would not raise taxes on the middle class. He promised that if you like your health care plan, you could keep it. He said that it would lower the cost of premiums. He said that it would strengthen Medicare.

□ 2000

Three years later, President Obama's health care law has proven to be a string of empty and broken promises. We are seeing premiums rise. One business in my district that employs 13 workers expects a 26 percent increase in its premiums, totaling more than \$30,000. That's \$30,000 that cannot go to increasing wages for workers. Another company in my district with 17 employees expects a 19 percent premium increase with an annual cost of more than \$20,000. Companies are being forced to change their health plans and pay more for them. Some companies may even drop their plans and put their employees in the ObamaCare exchanges. That means they're not keeping their plans. That's a broken promise.

ObamaCare is also raising taxes on the middle class. The Supreme Court made that clear.

One little known tax in ObamaCare is a medical device tax. This is a tax on the middle class because it is going to be passed directly to the consumers. Pennsylvania has the fourth largest medical device industry in the Nation. The medical device tax threatens health care businesses and innovators, like ZOLL Medical Corporation in my district, that supports 600 good-paying jobs.

ObamaCare does not strengthen Medicare. It cuts \$716 billion from the program and creates the Independent Payment Advisory Board, also known as IPAB, which puts unelected bureaucrats in between seniors and their doctors.

President Obama's health care law is causing folks to lose their health plans; it's raising taxes; it's hurting Medicare; it's increasing the deficit; and it won't bring universal coverage. More

than 30 million people will still be uninsured in 10 years. The fact remains that 3 years later, President Obama's health care law is a trillion-dollar string of broken promises. It's damaging our families, seniors, hard-working Americans and their health care. It's killing jobs, and it's violating the First Amendment rights of people of faith.

It's a small wonder that even some of the authors of this misguided health care law are now calling it a train wreck. The American people deserve better. This law should be repealed. Then all Members of Congress should sit down and do their jobs to craft commonsense, patient-centered reforms that reduce costs, preserve Medicare, and increase access to all Americans.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would like to talk right now about ObamaCare broken promise number two. The President promised:

I will not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficits, either now or in the future.

The truth: ObamaCare will end up adding, according to a GAO report, more than \$6.2 trillion to the debt over the long run.

I would next like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from Indiana very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the unaffordable health care act. I'll admit it: I'm standing here because of it. The unaffordable health care act is what made me realize that Washington was out of control and run amuck. It made me realize that the people of this great country needed a voice. Whenever I think of the proceedings that gave us this massive health care law, the words "we must pass the bill to find out what's in the bill" ring in my ear. It makes me cringe.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are good people. They passed the bill because their leadership assured them that it was good law. I don't think they purposely wanted to harm the country. We now know what's in the bill, and it's not good. I'm confident that my friends wouldn't have voted in favor of ObamaCare had they known that the bill empowered the IRS to bully people about their health insurance or that the new law created a rationing board to decide who gets treatment and who doesn't. Had the bill been read, I don't think it would have passed.

On top of repealing this law, we must reform how business gets done in the Capitol. That's why I've introduced the Read the Bills Act. The law is easy to understand: before we pass laws which will impact millions of hardworking Americans, Congress must read the bill. This is the kind of bill that will help restore the faith in Congress of those who send us here to represent them. Let's get rid of the notion that we have to pass bills to find out what's

in them. Please join me in repealing ObamaCare and supporting the Read the Bills Act.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the good gentleman for his comments.

Next I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

This has been a great time tonight. It is a great time in the sense that we get to stand here and explain to the American people what they were not explained to a few years ago. It's a good time to explain to them what they were sold as being something good and something that was going to help in health care, and remember this bill says "health care" in its title. But the truth of the matter is it's not about health care, Mr. Speaker; it's about control. It's about who's going to control health care, who's going to control what our government is getting into and what our government should stay out of.

I fully support voting this week to repeal ObamaCare and moving forward with an agenda that promotes jobs, that creates better opportunities, because you see what is happening tonight, as my good colleagues have stood here: they've talked about the problems with business; they've talked about the problems with taxes; they've talked about the broken promises. My colleague has spoken of the broken promise of keeping your own health care, of it not adding to the debt, all of which are lies, things that are not true that were not talked about on this House floor just a few years ago.

So my problem is let's be honest. Let's talk about what it does do. It begins to make a regulatory framework that is amazing. It wasn't a matter if you read the bill. It didn't matter if you read the bill in 2009 because you wouldn't have known what's in it because at the end of almost every paragraph it would say, oh, by the way, we're going to let this agency promulgate the rules and regulations. You could have read every page and you'd have just known that more bureaucrats were going to tell you what health care was going to be like. Twenty thousand pages of regulations are already on the books, 828 pages in one day. We're paying a lot of folks to do a lot of regulation writing. We're paying a lot of folks to take away the basic rights that we're looking at.

You see, you can make an argument this is not about health care, this is about broadening regulatory authority at HHS and at IRS. Oh, wait, IRS. Any thoughts this week about letting them be the regulators of who's paying and who's not paying in our health care system? Excuse me, we're having trouble dealing with what their job is. We don't need them in health care. We've got bigger problems here.

But when broken promises come about, we have to remember—what has disturbed me the most about this

whole debate tonight is we've heard about businesses; we've heard about taxes; we've heard about some broken promises; but what we've not heard about is health care. We've not really heard about health care in a doctor and patient. As a doctor told me the other day, he said, Just let me practice medicine, which is all I want to do.

You see, it's time we talked about health care because this law, instead of helping those who need help, it kicks them off insurance and makes people pay more and does all of the things that it was promised not to do.

Doctors are getting out, and new doctors are not going in. And you know who's lost? I can see it right now. The picture I have in my mind is those waiting in the waiting room waiting to see a doctor who need health care, and this law simply leaves them waiting.

Let's don't do that. Let's repeal this law. Let's get on with the real business of this House.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. MESSER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

I yield to my good friend from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. I thank my good friend from Indiana, Congressman LUKE MESSER, for organizing this Special Order in preparation for Thursday's vote to repeal the President's health care law.

Earlier today I emailed my constituents a quick survey back home in Montana with one simple question: Do you support efforts to repeal President Obama's health care law?

We've seen already overwhelming response to our office here tonight from Montanans across our State, combined with letters, emails, the phone calls we've received, by three to one, Montanans want to repeal ObamaCare.

□ 2010

Last week I had a tele-townhall meeting so I could hear from the people of Montana about the issues that matter most to them. The last question I was asked at the very end of this hour-long tele-townhall was from a woman from Florence, Montana, a small town on the western side of our State.

She shared her heartfelt concerns about the health care law and how it was going to affect her small business. Between the costly new rules and regulations and rising health insurance premiums, she didn't know how she would be able to follow the law and keep her business afloat.

And these challenges aren't unique to this one small business owner from Montana. Families and small businesses across America are struggling under President Obama's health care overhaul.

Rather than providing real solutions to increase access to affordable care, ObamaCare is driving costs up, it's hurting small businesses, it's raising taxes on Americans by more than \$1 trillion over the next decade and, ulti-

mately, puts the government directly between patients and their doctors.

This law also hurts our seniors and their access to health care. The President's health care law took more than \$700 billion out of Medicare to pay for new ObamaCare spending, and establishes IPAB, this unaccountable, unelected board of bureaucrats empowered to further undermine seniors' access to medical care.

And following this week's troubling news from the IRS, it makes it very clear that the IRS should not be in charge of enforcing ObamaCare's core provisions. We need to repeal ObamaCare to strip them of this authority.

Furthermore, the President's health care overhaul sets in motion serious violations of America's religious freedoms. Under ObamaCare, the Department of Health and Human Services has mandated health care coverage of products and services to which some Americans are morally opposed. Under this mandate, religious institutions and employers, as well as health care providers who hold religious and moral convictions, are stripped of their religious freedoms.

This is a clear violation of Americans' First Amendment rights, and it is of critical importance that the religious and moral convictions held by many Americans are protected.

That's why I recently joined more than 90 of my colleagues here in the House in calling for the upcoming House appropriations proposals to contain full protections for Americans' religious liberties and conscience rights by including provisions found in the Health Care Conscience Rights Act, which I helped introduce in March.

But we must continue fighting to repeal this failed law in its entirety. We know that our health care system is complex; it has major problems that need to be addressed. But ObamaCare only makes the matters worse.

The President's health care law takes us in the wrong direction. At the end of the day, it will result in higher costs, higher premiums, and force millions of Americans to lose the coverage they currently have.

And let's just remember something from 3 years ago. Remember in March of 2010, when ObamaCare passed the House, there was nothing bipartisan about ObamaCare. There was bipartisan opposition. In fact, 34 Democrats joined 178 Republicans in opposing ObamaCare, but not one single Republican voted for this. There's nothing bipartisan about it, other than bipartisan opposition.

I will vote to repeal this law on Thursday. I will continue to work with my colleagues in support of better, more effective solutions that give Americans the quality, affordable care they deserve.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I'll talk to you briefly about broken promise number three. The President

promised that "coupled with comprehensive reform, our bill could save families \$2,500 in the coming years."

The truth? Just the opposite has happened. The average family premium has grown by more than \$3,000 since 2008. In Indiana, residents are expected to face some of the highest health care insurance cost increases in the Nation, amounting to more than 60 percent for many and as high as 100 percent for some.

I next would like to recognize my good colleague, a man who's shown the patience of Job this evening as he's waited with great stamina, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. Thank you to my friend from Evansville, Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for the time.

Mr. Speaker, few things in life are more personal than health care, the care we receive as individuals, the treatment our children receive, the treatment our friends and our loved ones receive.

And beginning next year, Mr. Speaker, the government will dominate this personal arena. Dismantling this failed attempt at health care reform needs to be a priority of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again I hear from the medical professionals in my district, those who have dedicated their lives to serving others, about the uncertainty ObamaCare is causing them. What regulations and rules are going to come down from HHS and step in between the care that these medical professionals provide their patients?

What treatments will they be able to provide?

How many hoops are they going to have to jump through to get the procedures and tests that their patients need?

How many hoops will they have to go through to get approved?

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare has also harmed small business in all sorts of unimaginable ways. Small businesses are what drive this Nation's economy, through innovation and good old-fashioned sweat equity. They are a testament to what built this country and made it great.

But this law, Mr. Speaker, is causing many of them to make tough decisions, tough decisions about whether they can go out and hire that additional worker or employee; tough decisions on if they can invest in growth as they try to grow their company, and what other long-term impacts ObamaCare is going to have on their business.

Many small businesses are struggling, and this law will only make things worse. We have heard here tonight about employers considering dropping coverage altogether because of the uncertainty.

Providing health care benefits has served as a sense of pride for small business owners, and has always been a means by which small business owners have been able to recruit and retain the best talent. This talent is what

helps them be successful but, unfortunately, under ObamaCare, providing health care is not going to be something that many small businesses do.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Congress repealed the misguided 1099 reporting requirement that was included in ObamaCare. It was there to gin up revenue. In this Congress I'm hopeful we can repeal the medical device tax, and I've cosponsored a bill to do just that, one that enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support, bipartisan support that is similar to the support shared for many of the misguided provisions of ObamaCare and the wish to get in there and repeal them and rein them back in.

Anyone who reads or watches the news knows that the Affordable Care Act, which, Mr. Speaker, probably should have been named the Unaffordable Care Act, as Mr. BENTIVOLIO said earlier this evening, is costing more and more money just to get it up and running. Costs have ballooned, and the law hasn't even been fully implemented yet or nearly implemented yet.

State exchanges are requesting more and more Federal dollars, which has sent the administration scrambling to pull dollars out of the so-called Prevention Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the CBO estimates that ObamaCare may now cost twice as much as originally promised, at a pricetag of \$1.88 trillion through 2022.

Mr. Speaker, we haven't even touched on what will, without a doubt, impact individuals and families the most: the cost of their premiums. This is what American families are the most concerned about. Since 2008, families have seen their premiums grow by over \$3,000, and the new report by the House Energy and Commerce Committee, based upon actual industry numbers, suggests that rates may go up anywhere from 47 percent to 400 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this law needs to be repealed immediately so patient-oriented reforms can be enacted that protect American jobs and actually deliver on the promise of affordable health care to individuals and families.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would like to speak briefly about broken ObamaCare promise number four. The President promised "Under my plan, no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see their taxes increase." The truth? Taxes have gone up for many, and not just the well-off.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has issued a report detailing 21 new or higher taxes that will cost taxpayers more than \$1 trillion. Indiana, which has a medical device industry that employs 20,000 Hoosiers, with a payroll exceeding \$1 billion, would be devastated by ObamaCare's \$20 billion tax on medical devices.

I would next like to recognize my good friend from Indiana—I appreciate her leadership on this topic—Mrs. WALORSKI.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Thank you to my good friend and my colleague from Indiana, Representative MESSER, for organizing this Special Order tonight.

It has been, Representative MESSER, over 3 years since ObamaCare was signed into law. In a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing, Senator MAX BAUCUS told Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius that he now sees this bill as "a huge train wreck." I couldn't agree more. ObamaCare is a huge train wreck.

A few weeks ago I held roundtable discussions in many of the Chambers of Commerce in my area, in each county in my district. I sat down with a wide spectrum of industries, ranging from agriculture to manufacturing.

□ 2020

The prominent topic of each discussion was ObamaCare and the uncertainty it creates for Hoosier businesses that cannot afford the overwhelming taxes and employer mandates. From longtime small businessowners to aspiring start-up companies, employers agree that ObamaCare is largely responsible for smothering economic development. If the President and Members of Congress were truly listening to the American people's opinion of this law, they would see the writing on the wall: we must repeal ObamaCare.

The State of Indiana is proud to be a global leader in the medical device industry that my colleague just spoke of. However, ObamaCare is forcing a 2.3 percent tax on medical device manufacturing. This tax affects the orthopedic industry, causing rises in costs for seniors, veterans, and patients in need.

On the 3-year anniversary of ObamaCare, I met with Complexus Medical in Mishawaka, an emerging leader in orthopedic instrument manufacturing in the Second District. I was told that this tax will stifle innovation and could force companies to consider overseas supply chains.

The medical device tax is of great concern also for our veterans. That's why I sent a letter, along with my colleagues from Indiana, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs asking how this tax will impact veterans care. After the sacrifice and fearless bravery demonstrated by our troops and our veterans, it is unacceptable for them to worry about their access to quality care.

And it gets worse. Just this week, we learned more shocking news when the IRS admitted they're targeting certain groups of people, a practice that is completely unlawful, unethical, and downright shameful. Their willful actions to defy transparency have already qualified the IRS for a comprehensive congressional investigation, with at least two hearings scheduled in the House in the coming weeks.

But let's not forget, the IRS is set to play a major role in ObamaCare from enforcing the individual mandate to distributing tax credits. If the IRS can-

not operate under the light of transparency today with their current duties, I am deeply concerned that further responsibilities with sensitive information and controversial policies are a recipe for disaster.

This bill, ladies and gentlemen, is spiraling out of control. It's time for Washington to heed the overwhelming evidence and wipe the slate clean to show the American people that we are listening. Now, more than ever, the President and the Congress must restore transparency at the Federal level. I support the full repeal of ObamaCare and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlelady for her remarks. As many other speakers have said tonight, ObamaCare is Big Government at its worst.

Federal agencies have recently reported that it will take them almost 190 million additional man hours per year for employers, families, and health care providers to comply with its onerous implementation regulations. That's nearly 95,000 new, full-time employees just to do ObamaCare paperwork.

Now I'd like to recognize our final speaker of the night, one of the hardest working Members I know in this Chamber. I appreciate your stamina and persistence for being here, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Well, I want to thank the gentleman, my friend from Indiana, for his courtesy and for his leadership on this very important issue. I join my colleague in supporting H.R. 45, the full repeal of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it is true, you've heard from the other Members here this evening, you've heard about the importance of repealing ObamaCare because it is legislation that is full of broken promises. We know that the signature promise of this legislation was that if you like your current health insurance, you can keep it. We know now that 7 million people will lose their employer-sponsored health insurance at least, which is nearly double the previous estimate of 4 million.

We heard about savings. Remember, this was titled the "Affordable Care Act," but in 2013, the Congressional Budget Office projection tags the total cost at \$1.88 trillion. Premiums—premiums are not decreasing; premiums are going up. The average family premium has grown over \$3,000 since the passage of ObamaCare. Individuals earning as little as \$25,000 will pay more for insurance because of ObamaCare. And 1.1 trillion in new taxes and jobs. This legislation was supposed to create 400,000 jobs immediately. Speaker PELOSI promised that ObamaCare would create 4 million jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, small employers in Kentucky and central Kentucky tell me that ObamaCare is the principal reason that they're not hiring.

According to a study by the National Federation of Independent Business, the employer mandate like the one included in ObamaCare could eliminate

an additional 1.6 million jobs by 2014. ObamaCare is creating an environment in which employers are incentivized to reduce hours for their employees to go to part-time work. The supporters of ObamaCare are supporting a part-time work economy. We need a full-time work economy, and that's why we need to repeal ObamaCare.

It increases the Federal deficit. According to a January GAO report, ObamaCare will add 6.2 trillion to the deficit over the next 75 years. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with the story that illustrates why this really matters.

There's a lot of statistics about jobs and the economy and increased premiums and costs, but the real signature failure of this legislation is that it hurts patients, that it deprives the American people of the benefits of medical innovation. A hospital administrator told me in central Kentucky that we used to take care of patients, but we now take care of paper. Medical innovation is central to America's future economic growth and to delivering new lifesaving medical devices to patients. But the new medical device tax included in ObamaCare, which imposes a 2.3 percent tax on medical device manufacturers, punishes medical innovation and prevents quality health care.

Families around the country know this all too well. In my own family, we saw this up close. Christmas Day 2012 could have been one of the worst days of our lives. Fortunately, it was the best day of our lives.

It happened when my mother called me that morning on Christmas morning and said, Andy, your father has had a fainting spell. I said, can I talk to him? So she got him on the phone. I said, Dad, how are you doing? He said, I need to drink a glass of water. I said, Well, stop drinking any more coffee. Calm down and give me a call if anything happens.

I got another call an hour later. This time, it was from my mother again. She said they were in the emergency room. My father had passed out a second time. So I rushed to the emergency room. I was greeted by the ER doctor. I said, What's going on, Doctor? He said, Well, we did an EKG, and here are the results. He showed me a flat line. He said, your father's heart is slowing down. I said, Doctor, what are we going to do about that? He said, Well, fortunately, we can put a pacemaker in your father.

An electrophysiologist came down to the ER, and he reassured us. He said, We can put a pacemaker in your father, and we can make him better. So he went in to get that pacemaker surgery. When he came out, he was recovering, and his life was saved because of that pacemaker technology.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, American families depend on the innovative, unbelievable technology that American entrepreneurship has created. But ObamaCare punishes that.

And if it wasn't for that kind of medical innovation and technology, my father wouldn't be here today.

So I stand opposed to ObamaCare for all the reasons we've talked about here tonight, but, most importantly, because I credit the American free enterprise system for saving lives, and ObamaCare rolls that back. I certainly appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana for discussing the importance of this issue and the future of high-quality, innovative health care in America in the future.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentleman for his moving remarks. I thank all my colleagues for their remarks today. We're going to vote this week on repealing ObamaCare. That vote is more than symbolism. ObamaCare is wrecking this economy. ObamaCare is terrible for patient outcomes, and it needs to be repealed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2030

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to talk about this subject, rebuilding the American manufacturing sector, and I will. But I just heard the most remarkable 1-hour debate in my life—not a debate, but a whole slew of accusations and incorrect facts. I guess a fact shouldn't be incorrect. But I've never heard such gobbledygook and misstatements in my entire life.

The last one—I'm absolutely delighted the gentleman's father is healthy, but to think that a 2 percent tax on medical devices is somehow going to stop medical technology when those devices are extraordinarily profitable to these companies is just lunacy. I know nobody likes to pay taxes, and certainly the manufacturers of those devices don't want to have to pay a 2 percent tax. But come on, you think that's going to stop medical technology from advancing when there's so much profit in it? I don't think so.

Okay. Thirty-seven times now, 37 times this week the Republican majority is going to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act—37 times—when Americans are already benefitting from the Affordable Care Act. Is it that my friends who spoke here for the last hour want to tell every 22-year-old or 21-year-old in the entire Nation that they can no longer stay on their parents' health insurance? Because that's exactly what the repeal would do. Those young men and women who are counting on being able to have health insurance—no, repeal ends that part of the Affordable Health Care Act.

Are they to go out and tell 40 million Americans that they're not going to

have health insurance at all? That's what the repeal of the Affordable Health Care Act will do, 40 million Americans. Are they to say that somehow this is costing more money to have an insurance policy where you can stay healthy, where you can get care before it becomes a crisis and wind up in an emergency room, that that's going to be cheaper when you repeal the Affordable Health Care Act? Sending people to the emergency room is going to be cheaper? What planet are you from? That's not the way it is. The most expensive care in the world is the emergency room, where somebody does not have the continuity of care that an insurance policy provides for them.

Or maybe they want to discriminate against women as existed before the Affordable Health Care Act. Every woman in this Nation faced insurance discrimination, but the Affordable Health Care Act ends that discrimination.

And how many families out there, how many families out across America have a member of that family—or maybe many members of that family—that have some preexisting condition—high blood pressure, onset of diabetes, maybe some incident in their past? I will tell you, I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, and I know exactly what the health insurance companies will do if the provisions that prevent insurance discriminations are eliminated with the bill that these gentlemen and ladies intend to take up later this week.

Insurance discrimination has harmed millions upon millions of Americans—many of whom came to me as insurance commissioner in California pleading for some justice in their insurance program. Justice was to be found at least in California because I knew that the insurance companies had an obligation and they had a contract. But you eliminate the Affordable Health Care Act and you'll see insurance discrimination reemerge in the United States in a way that will harm millions upon millions of Americans because they will not be able to get insurance. And if they did, they will have to pay far more simply because they are a woman.

Thirty-seven times. Thirty-seven times you've attempted to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act.

Seniors—every senior in this Nation that's on Medicare is able to get a free annual checkup. And ladies and gentlemen, you need to understand in your arguments that that free, affordable annual checkup has reduced the cost of medical care in Medicare programs. And the inflation rate in Medicare has come down since the Affordable Care Act has gone into effect.

The statistics you toss around about the extraordinary cost, you need to understand that we have been plagued by health care insurance inflation for decades. The Affordable Health Care Act has built into it the very first opportunity this Nation has had nationwide

to bend the cost curve on health care, and we're seeing it happen today. We're seeing it happen today in the Medicare program because seniors are able to get prevention. They're able to get that drug that brings down their blood pressure, or the advice on how to deal with diabetes and avoid the extraordinary cost. Oh, yeah, 37 times repealing the Affordable Health Care Act.

You talk about jobs in America. Okay, let's talk about jobs in America. Let's talk about the fact that there's not been one significant piece of legislation out of this House since the beginning of this session to create jobs. President Obama stood here on this dais and talked about creating jobs, but this House has not brought forward one significant piece of legislation.

The President called for an infrastructure program—\$50 billion—to put people back to work, to create the infrastructure—the streets, the roads, the bridges, the water systems, the sanitation systems—not just to put people back to work, but to build the foundation for future economic growth.

So where is that legislation? Has it even been heard in one committee controlled by our friends in the opposition party? No. No. Well, we will take up a transportation act soon, but will there be adequate funding for infrastructure? Probably not. Probably not.

The President called for an American Jobs Act, not even heard in committee here. Americans want to go to work. They want jobs. They want to go to work, and we have a program on the Democratic side to do that.

We want to deal with the big problems facing this Nation. We want to deal with the fact that we have millions of people that want to work in America, and we have serious problems to solve.

We ought to put aside this business of repealing the Affordable Health Care Act. Change it? Yes. Make a reasonable change and let's talk about it. Make a proposal about how to make it better, and we'll talk about it; but we're not going to talk about repealing it. We're not going to go there.

Maybe we ought to go with some things that are really important. Maybe we ought to go with something that was in the news today.

It's been determined that for the first time in at least 3 million years the carbon dioxide in the Earth's atmosphere is over 400 parts per million. What does that mean? Climate change? Oh, yes. If you were in Los Angeles this last couple of days, you would have seen record-high temperatures in early May. Reports are coming out about firestorms this summer season. We've seen Superstorm Sandy, and around this world we've seen many super-environmental effects.

□ 2040

The scientists tell us that that climate change will bring more severe weather events and there will be disruptions in our food supply like the

current drought in the Southwest. Four hundred parts per million; in the last 3 million years, the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has never been that high.

Now, the good news is that this Nation, the strongest economic nation in the world, despite the inability of this House to get things done, we can solve the climate change problem, or at least lead; and in doing so, we can put people back to work.

Here's how it can be done: clean energy. Clean energy is spurring business development across this country and its future is very, very bright. Not a month goes by without some entrepreneur, a scientist, an inventor, coming to me with another idea about how you can improve solar technologies, photovoltaic technologies. One just came up the other day, a very inspired way of doing it, perhaps two times more efficient, or one-and-a-half times more efficient than the current solar panels.

Companies are investing. U.S.-based venture capital investments in clean energy surged 30 percent from \$5.1 billion in 2010 to \$6.6 billion in 2011, and the trend continues. Jobs in the solar energy industry are in every State, and there are over 5,000 companies involved employing over 100,000 American workers. And wind energy, which is big in my district in Solano County, 75,000 people across this Nation, and many of them my own constituents.

There's great potential out there as we move from coal and oil, the energy of the previous two centuries, to the clean energies of the future. We'll see that in agriculture as we grow crops that can generate energy. We'll see it in geothermal. We'll see it in wave energy in our oceans. There's enormous potential. And the research that goes into this is also jobs.

Our colleagues on the majority side have attempted in the last year to reduce research for energy and agriculture. To what effect? Well, maybe they want to go to 500 parts per million carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. I don't think Americans want to go there. I don't think the people of the world want to go there. I don't think they want the calamity that will come.

There's many other ways this can be done. Yesterday, as part of our Make It in America agenda, I was in Sacramento, California, on the edge of my district and a remarkable event took place, an event that was actually caused by a piece of legislation that was passed here, the very first piece of legislation signed by President Obama in 2009. It was the stimulus bill, the much-maligned stimulus bill. They said it didn't work. Well, it did work, Mr. Speaker, and it is working today, and it's being made in America. Here's what the American Recovery Act is doing for Americans. Here's what the stimulus bill, in yet one more example of success, is doing for America.

This is the most advanced locomotive built in the world. It's built in Sac-

ramento. The stimulus bill provided \$466 million for Amtrak to buy 70 advanced electric locomotives. And written into that bill was a sentence that said these locomotives must be American-made.

So, Siemens, a German company with large manufacturing facilities around the world, certainly in Germany and other countries on every continent except Antarctica, looked at that and said, 466 million? Hmmm. Made in America? We can do that.

They put a bid in. They went to their manufacturing plant in Sacramento that was previously manufacturing light rail cars, set about building a new factory, and that new factory employs 200 people today. Yesterday, the first of 70 new locomotives rolled onto America's rail tracks and will soon be providing service on the Northeastern Corridor. Two hundred new direct jobs in Sacramento at the Siemens factory and hundreds around the Nation—it works.

The climate change issue here is very important. The advanced technology in this locomotive that has 9,000 horsepower has the ability to generate electricity when it slows down, when it brakes for curves or stations, putting back into the grid electricity that it consumed in its previous travel.

Make it in America. Use our Federal tax dollars to buy and to build American-made equipment and supplies and materials. That's precisely what Siemens is doing.

This is a success story. This is the kind of thing we should be talking about here on the floor of the House of Representatives. This is the kind of work we should be doing in our committees: putting Americans back to work, laying the infrastructure for the future growth of this country. But, oh, no, we are going to spend this week dealing with the 37th attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

There's so much more to do. There's so much more to do here in America. Why don't we put our shoulder to the wheel of progress and provide a transportation bill that actually builds the infrastructure for this Nation, that provides these kinds of locomotives and train sets.

In the early days of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln signed the Transcontinental Rail Act. Little known, but in that Rail Act was a provision, not just to build a rail line across America, but that all of the steel, all of the iron that was to be used in that line had to be American made. Made it in America, creating jobs, connecting the east to the west, 1862. And here we are all these decades later with the same idea: a new locomotive on American rails and American made.

I want to congratulate Siemens. I want to congratulate this German company that is here in America, is providing American jobs, and is providing the most advanced locomotive in the world, and they're building it in Sacramento, California.

So, what else can we do? What else can we do to provide jobs? There's so much. If we had listened to the President when he proposed to Congress the American JOBS Act, perhaps 2 million more Americans would be working today. Construction crews would be putting bridges and dams and levees and flood protection facilities, they would be building the infrastructure. And we would also be working on our energy systems.

□ 2050

The piece of legislation that I have introduced would require that tax subsidies for individuals and businesses that wanted to put up a wind turbine or a solar panel would only be available to them if they bought American-made equipment. Spend our tax money on American-made equipment made by Americans: a pretty simple thought. Abraham Lincoln must have had that thought, and the Congress in 1862 had that thought and passed a law that did it.

There is more that we can do.

When we passed the transportation bill, as we should this year or early next year, a new highway bill, we should put into it a proposal by Ranking Member RAHALL. That proposal said that the money in this bill will be spent on American-made concrete, steel, trucks, buses—putting Americans to work. The Democrats on that committee think that's a really good idea, and we hope our Republican colleagues agree and that we write into the transportation bill a very strong "buy America" provision so that Americans can have the jobs and so that we avoid the egregious and humiliating fact that the steel in much of the new Oakland-San Francisco Bay Bridge was not made by American steelworkers, not by American companies, but Chinese. It went out to bid. It was supposed to be 10 percent cheaper, so the Chinese company took the bid, built a new highly advanced steel mill, and sent faulty steel to San Francisco Bay, requiring even more expenditure.

So there are things we should learn from the history, and we will if we listen carefully, if we pay attention to what science is telling us about climate change, about the buildup of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere, and if we listen, then we must have the courage to act. I would pray for our children's future and their children's and their children's beyond that that this House of Representatives and the Senate have the courage to act decisively on the climate crisis, and that in the farm bill that we mark up tomorrow we take the opportunity to write into that farm bill serious conservation programs that conserve the Nation's forests and farmland and water and streams. I would hope that we would do that.

I would hope that this House would find the courage to take on the oil industry and the coal industry and move decisively to green energy systems and

stop, slow down what is a terrible process underway of filling our atmosphere with ever-increasing levels of carbon dioxide. After all, it's about the next generations. My generation will soon be gone, and so will most of the Members of this House. It's the future generations that are going to face our apparent unwillingness and inability to attack the climate change problem. As I said a moment ago, we can do it in a way that builds efficient transportation systems, like this locomotive that Siemens built in Sacramento, California, that builds green energy systems, renewable energy, low carbon dioxide-producing energy.

I've noticed that my colleague from Texas has joined us.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, thank you so very much for joining us this evening. We've gone on here about the Affordable Care Act and how we ought to turn our attention to jobs for America, and I'm sure you have some thoughts on those subjects and others. Please join us.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to thank my good friend from California for really framing the discussion tonight around, I think, the only theme that gives us the kind of positive agenda that puts Americans back to work. We know, as the economy collapsed, 12 million were out of work. We also know that we have steadily made an increase, but it's not where any of us would like to be.

I listened to the gentleman so eloquently and so effectively ask the simple question as to why are we again putting on the floor of the House a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, something that has not only been resoundingly embraced by many of our leaders and by the uninsured in our Nation who are looking forward to the opportunity to be insured, but in the last election, I think it was very clear that, in the affirmation of President Obama, 64 million-plus people voted for him, and an enormous, unequaled divide in the States supported him, and he made it clear that he wanted to ensure, on behalf of the American people, that there would be the coverage of working families.

Now, as he looks to implementation, we recognize that Members of Congress will be engaged in making it work right, but we also realize that the Affordable Care Act will provide more resources for health professionals, that it will establish more federally qualified health clinics, which will create more jobs, and that it will attack the dastardly number, my friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, of 28.4 percent uninsured, and of 6 percent uninsured in the State of Texas. Of course, our Governor sees fit to reject the expanded Medicaid.

I can't imagine why we have not embraced this agenda, which includes the idea of all of the above and of creating clean energy and manufacturing jobs, bringing solar energy back to the United States again, making solar panels. Certainly, I'm aware of the fact

that any country will grab what it can grab, but the United States has the capacity to do solar energy. It has the capacity to build wind turbines. All we have to do is invest.

It has the opportunity, in actuality, to build submarines and to get back in the shipbuilding business. I'm sure there are Members listening and saying, We've long left that business. No, I don't think so, because there is always a more technologically efficient, more effective, more swift, if you will, ship or submarine. You can always make it bigger and better, smaller and better. With the technological revolution, we also have the opportunity to raise the specter of manufacturing.

Of course, in the energy sector, where I come from, there is a whole array of opportunities as we utilize clean natural gas. That is making the manufacturing opportunities grow grander and grander, and I truly believe that we will find a common balance between natural gas producers and the manufacturers who need to use clean energy. Let me also say that the housing market is booming, and I am delighted to stand here and say that that is creating jobs, and many of these homes are being built on the basis of clean energy. H.R. 1524 is a bill that speaks to this issue.

I don't know why we are spending our time, 3 days, on the floor. I know that they will be in the Rules Committee tomorrow, and I will have a number of amendments that I hope to be introducing that hopefully speak to the issue of the utilization of expanded Medicaid for States that have 20 percent-plus of uninsured, the idea of ensuring that we include the right kind of Medicare reimbursement. These are issues that can go in regular order, but yet we are spending the Nation's time, dollars, and resources to be on the floor when we could be putting forward tax reform.

Many of us want to work on tax incentives for small businesses, the backbone of the economic engine of this country. My friends—I call them all my friends; I want small businesses to be paying attention—you are our friends. You create jobs. You stay the course.

□ 2100

Just today, I was listening to an individual in the ravaged area of Hurricane Sandy, and she was saying she has six restaurants. She was complaining that we had not done what we were supposed to do. Obviously you remember they stalled the compensation for those souls in that eye of the storm. We waited and our friends, the Republicans, wouldn't let the money out. She is a victim of that. She said I have six restaurants and some of the ones I cook in. But just give her, in addition to the compensation from FEMA which is overdue, give her a tax structure that can help her grow her business and pass legislation that gives incentives for hiring the unemployed. That's what

should be on the floor of the House as we approach all of the excitement of graduation, when young people will be coming out of college doors, looking for the opportunity that America has always promised when they say we all are created equal.

I'll be going to a number of graduations. I know I will. You'll be speaking at graduations. What will you be saying to them? That America is a land of opportunity, yet we pound day after day after day after day, month after month, year after year on a bill that has been passed, signed into law and is being implemented, where physicians and researchers are saying thank you for the Affordable Care Act. For the items we have to fix, let's fix them together.

So I came to the floor to just say that I want to join the chorus of getting to work; I want to join the chorus of creating jobs. In fact, I want to join the chorus of putting our heads together and creating a summer youths' job program for the young people, high school students that are coming out in the middle of their high school years. We always used to be able to find work. No one cannot tell me that when we did it in 2009, the first year of President Obama's administration, it was a grand and exciting—it was not an experiment, but a grand and exciting response to all those young people who were in the high schools preparing to go to college.

Let me finish by saying this and just throw a little something on the table just to say that if we want to work, let's move toward immigration reform. That is another job creator and one that answers the questions of America's businesses. Let's do that. If we want to work—of course, I know I'll see a couple of my friend running out the door, but we can find sensible gun legislation. But I'll just say that if nothing else, can we get something that says store your guns?

Over the last weeks, we've been seeing people leave guns around and do this. So could you do that? Could you just have a simple—H.R. 65 says to hold people responsible for storing their guns.

I want to thank my friend for your leadership. It has been a persistent and pronounced leadership that I've been delighted to join you on. And I want to thank our leader, NANCY PELOSI, for her pointedness about can we get to work and her rising leadership, if you will, in the backdrop of the tenor that she had as Speaker to be able to get things done. And, of course, all the leadership, including the leading spokesperson for Make It in America, our friend, STENY HOYER, and I must mention all of our leaders, Mr. CLYBURN, Chairman BECERRA, and our vice chair in Mr. CROWLEY, along with our committee ranking members.

But our message has been that we can do all of the fussing; we can fix the IRS; we can talk about issues that are occurring with leaks. That's our job.

We understand that. But it is not our job to come back over and over again and revive a bill that is the law of the land not only by the vote of the United States Congress, but by the United States Supreme Court. What more do we need to answer that question?

So I hope to accomplish this in partnership with the gentleman. We're writing legislation, as well. Let me throw one other point in there. We joined in on some legislation about doing human exploration again. That creates jobs, as well. It builds the Orion that's on the books right now that is getting ready to be built. There are so many things we can do together bipartisan. And I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. GARAMENDI. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, thank you so very much. You are a leader in all of these issues. You've often and almost always present these issues to the American people on the floor of the House, and you do it with passion and knowledge.

There was an hour spent earlier by our colleagues about the 37th time that they're going to attempt to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act. It reminded me that they also have a piece of legislation to end Medicare as we know it. If you go back to when Medicare was put in place in the sixties, 1964, 1965, the Republican Party opposed it then and have often, through those years, to this date, attempted in various ways to eviscerate or to end it as we know it. Apparently they're going to try to do the same thing with the Affordable Health Care Act. It is such a waste of time because these programs are so fundamental to our ability to survive. This is health care for Americans and spreading that opportunity out.

It's a long discussion. We've had that discussion on the floor for many days. What we really ought to be focusing on is putting Americans back to work. This piece of legislation is one of about 30 pieces of legislation that's put in by the Democratic Caucus. This is mine. It deals with your tax money. It simply says that it's going to be spent on American-made clean energy, solar panels, wind turbines and the like. It's not a bad idea to spend your tax money on American-made equipment, American jobs, American businesses.

There's another bill that I have dealing with the transportation system. It's the same thing. That bill is now finding its way into the rewrite of the highway transportation program, the transportation bill; and hopefully it will be there. It's a very strong buy-American provision for our buses, our trains, our light rail, locomotives and steel and concrete for bridges.

We've got a lot of work to do in America. We've got a lot of work and a lot of need; and this House ought to be spending its time on that.

We'll take another night and we'll go into the tax policy side of this, which there is a lot to be said about changing our taxes to encourage manufacturing.

Some of that has been done. I'll leave the one example that 2 years ago when the Democrats controlled this House, we eliminated about \$12 billion of tax breaks that American companies received for shipping American jobs overseas. We put a stop to that. There's about another \$5 billion that needs to be done, but we no longer control this House. But we ought to bring those jobs back home. We ought to flip that over and give a tax break for reshoring, bringing the jobs back to America.

That's another night's discussion. We'll take that up in another evening. But for tonight, it's about putting Americans back to work. It's about focusing the attention of this Chamber, the 435 of us, on what we really need in this country, which is a very strong and growing economy.

We've seen progress every quarter since the beginning of 2010. Every quarter we've seen private sector employment grow. We're not where we ought to be. We have more work to do. And when we finally rebuild the American manufacturing sector, when once again we make it in America, Americans are going to make it.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Mrs. ELLMERS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of family matters.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and for the balance of the week.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to sections 401 and 503 of House Concurrent Resolution 112 (112th Congress), the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013, deemed to be in force by House Resolution 614 (112th Congress), House Resolution 643 (112th Congress), and House Resolution 5 (1136th Congress), I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget aggregates and allocations set forth pursuant to this concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013, as deemed in force.

These revisions are provided for the consideration of H.R. 45, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. A corresponding table is attached. These adjustments are made for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

House Concurrent Resolution 112 included the budget impact of repealing the Patient

Protection and Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111–148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (P.L. 111–152) in its aggregates and allocations.

For enforcement purposes, however, section 101 of this concurrent resolution set the revenue aggregate at the baseline level estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. Sections 401 and 503 of the concurrent resolution on the budget provided for downward adjustments for the consideration of certain specified policies, among these is the repeal of these public laws.

BUDGET AGGREGATES
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2013	2013–2022
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,799,329	(1)
Outlays	2,891,863	(1)
Revenues	2,089,540	28,957,333
A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (H.R. 45):		
Budget Authority	0	(1)
Outlays	0	(1)
Revenues	–34,000	–896,000
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,799,329	(1)
Outlays	2,891,863	(1)
Revenues	2,055,540	28,061,333

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2014 through 2022 have yet to be considered by Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 15, 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:

1465. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Standards for Wheat [RIN: 0580-AB12] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1466. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updates to the List of Plant Inspection Stations [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0099] received April 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1467. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Wisconsin [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0075] received April 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1468. A letter from the Administrator Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Programs Guaranteed Loans [RIN: 0575-AC92] received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1469. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agri-

culture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Recordkeeping for Approved Livestock Facilities and Slaughtering and Rendering Establishments [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0039] (RIN: 0579-AC61) received May 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1470. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Liquidity and Funding [RIN: 3052-AC54] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1471. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Annual Report on the Activities of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) for 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1472. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2013 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1473. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Carol M. Pottenger, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1474. A letter from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2012 report on vulnerability assessments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1475. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the thirty-third annual report on the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 by departments and agencies which administer programs of Federal financial assistance, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6106a(b); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1476. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) — College Savings Account Research Demonstration Project [CFDA Number: 84.334D.] received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1477. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 15, 74, 78, 87, 90, and 97 of the Commissions Rules Regarding Implementation of the Final Acts of the World Radiocommunication Conference (Geneva, 2007) (WRC-07), Other Allocation Issues, and Related Rule Updates [ET Docket No. 12-338] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1478. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Reassessment of Federal Communications Commission Radiofrequency Exposure Limits and Policies; Proposed Changes in the Commission's Rules Regarding Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields [ET Docket No.: 13-84] [ET Docket No.: 13-137] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1479. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — NRC Regulatory Issue Summary 2013-04 Content Specification and Shielding

Evaluations for Type B Transportation Packages received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1480. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the nineteenth quarterly report on the Afghanistan Reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1481. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Semiannual Report to Congress for the six-month period ending March 31, 2013, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1482. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the semi-annual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1483. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting Statement Of Disbursements Of The U.S. Capitol Police For The Period October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; (H. Doc. No. 113–24); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1484. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Thirty-Fifth Annual Report to Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 18a(j); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1485. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary, together with the reasons for the amendments, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1486. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the 2012 Annual Progress Report on the National Strategy for Transportation Security; 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;

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 180. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty (Rept. 113–54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 767. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project; with an amendment (Rept. 113–55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 573. A bill to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa (Rept. 113–56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 356. A bill to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled "An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes" (Rept. 113-57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARINO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BENISHK, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 7. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1958. A bill to prohibit wholesalers from purchasing prescription drugs from pharmacies, and to enhance information and transparency regarding drug wholesalers engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HALL, Mr. COLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. VELA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER):

H.R. 1959. A bill to amend the Renewable Fuel Program in section 211(o) of the Clean

Air Act to allow domestic alternative fuel to be used to satisfy a portion of the required applicable volume of renewable fuel; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington) (both by request):

H.R. 1960. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1961. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1962. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend the Water Conservation and Utilization Act to authorize the development of non-Federal hydropower and issuance of leases of power privileges at projects constructed pursuant to the authority of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1964. A bill to amend the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, including at least one lease sale in the Reserve each year in the period 2013 through 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1965. A bill to streamline and ensure onshore energy permitting, provide for onshore leasing certainty, and give certainty to oil shale development for American energy security, economic development, and job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 1966. A bill to establish a visa waiver program for the United States Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to expand the cause of action relating to the pattern or practice of conduct by a governmental authority that deprives a person of rights protected by the Constitution to such conduct relating to adults as well as juveniles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1968. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a pilot program to award grants and loan guarantees to hospitals to carry out projects for the purpose of reducing energy costs and increasing resilience to improve security; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KING of New

York, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 1969. A bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen police officers, firefighters, and other public safety officers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 1970. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to ensure that social security benefits are paid, to prioritize payments when the United States is not able to issue new obligations due to the statutory debt limit, and to address a lapse in appropriations to fund the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1971. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide certain TRICARE beneficiaries with the opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 1972. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 1973. A bill to permit business development companies to increase investments in small-and middle-market financial services companies and investment advisors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. MULVANEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1974. A bill to clarify the collateral requirement for certain loans under section 7(d) of the Small Business Act, to address assistance to out-of-State small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. HAHN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GUTERREZ, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARR, Mr.

GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 1975. A bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1976. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide access to certified professional midwives for women enrolled in the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1977. A bill to establish an alternative accountability model; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the phasedown of the credit percentage for the dependent care tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 1979. A bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013-2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. JONES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BARBER, Ms. ESTY, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 1980. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from requesting additional medical examinations of veterans who have submitted sufficient medical evidence provided by non-Department medical professionals and to improve the efficiency of processing certain claims for disability compensation by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.J. Res. 45. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States granting Congress the authority to enact laws limiting the number of terms that Representatives and Senators may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 213. A resolution establishing the Special Committee on Sexual Assault and Abuse in the Armed Forces to conduct oversight, ensure accountability, and report on the activities of the Department of Defense to prevent, reduce, prosecute, and provide victims' services for cases of sexual assault and abuse in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Rules.

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. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers)

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 1960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is enacted by Congressional Authority expressed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1st Amendment to the US Constitution.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 1963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 1966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 1967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 1969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 1970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution sets forth the power of appropriations and states that "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ."

In addition, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states that "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ."

Also, Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 and 13 states that Congress shall have power "to raise and support Armies. . ." and "to provide and maintain a Navy."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds and pay U.S. debt in order to ensure that U.S. servicemembers will not lose pay.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 1971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation ensures that the Secretary of Defense provides retired military veteran beneficiaries who live beyond 100 miles of a Military Treatment Facility, an opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime. Specific authority is provided by 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 Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 1972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice

any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 1973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 1974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, which states that Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution and section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 1976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 1978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 1979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 1980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.J. Res. 44.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.J. Res. 45.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 27: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. VIS-CLOSKEY.

H.R. 38: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 45: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HURT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. REED, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 104: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 124: Mr. LATTA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. FOXF, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 164: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RADEL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 176: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 182: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 184: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 207: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 241: Mr. POSEY and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 271: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 301: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 322: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 324: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 351: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 358: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 400: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 419: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 447: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 451: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 471: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 494: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HURT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 495: Mr. RUSH, Mr. WATT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NEAL, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 508: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 535: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 565: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 620: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 627: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 664: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 671: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 685: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 693: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 702: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 713: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 721: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 761: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 763: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BARBER, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 769: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 811: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 846: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 847: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 850: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 851: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 855: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 877: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 888: Mr. DENT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 901: Mr. TERRY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LONG, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 903: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 904: Mr. KILMER and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 914: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 920: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 924: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 940: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 946: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 957: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 958: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 961: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 981: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 983: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1009: Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1015: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1020: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1024: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1070: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1074: Mr. VELA and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1078: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1093: Ms. WATERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1129: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1138: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1141: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1148: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1155: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1176: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1199: Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1201: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1209: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1213: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1249: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1250: Mr. COSTA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1277: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1281: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1285: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1286: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1292: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1313: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1317: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1331: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1344: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1354: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1362: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1413: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1414: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1417: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1418: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1427: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1428: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 1449: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1481: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1485: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 1491: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1492: Mr. COBLE and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1493: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1498: Mr. ENYART, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE

- of California, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 1502: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 1506: Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 1507: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
- H.R. 1518: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. CHU, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESTY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H.R. 1528: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 1537: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 1552: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
- H.R. 1565: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 1579: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 1588: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 1595: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BASS, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, and Mr. FATTAH.
- H.R. 1598: Mr. FORBES and Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 1610: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 1613: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
- H.R. 1620: Mr. HECK of Washington.
- H.R. 1621: Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 1637: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
- H.R. 1638: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
- H.R. 1645: Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 1663: Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 1674: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 1676: Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 1692: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. HIMES.
- H.R. 1693: Mr. KINGSTON.
- H.R. 1699: Ms. CHU and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 1701: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 1708: Ms. CLARKE.
- H.R. 1726: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 1729: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CICILLINER, and Mr. BARBER.
- H.R. 1733: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
- H.R. 1759: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 1763: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 1773: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1775: Mr. NADLER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 1780: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
- H.R. 1797: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
- H.R. 1814: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LONG, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 1818: Mr. KLINE.
- H.R. 1825: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. HARRIS.
- H.R. 1828: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 1829: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. DAINES.
- H.R. 1830: Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MEADOWS, OLSON, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 1831: Mr. STOCKMAN.
- H.R. 1833: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 1847: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GRIMM, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H.R. 1848: Mr. PETRI, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 1863: Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CONAWAY.
- H.R. 1864: Ms. SPEIER.
- H.R. 1867: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 1869: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. MULVANEY.
- H.R. 1882: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
- H.R. 1888: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.
- H.R. 1897: Mr. MEADOWS.
- H.R. 1900: Mr. MCKINLEY.
- H.R. 1902: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 1904: Mr. BONNER.
- H.R. 1908: Mr. SCALISE.
- H.R. 1910: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 1918: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. MULVANEY.
- H.R. 1921: Mr. POLIS and Mr. MAFFEI.
- H.R. 1928: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 1946: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 1950: Mr. HANNA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. YODER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. JOYCE.
- H.R. 1951: Mr. MEADOWS.
- H.J. Res. 34: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H. Con. Res. 21: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. HOLT.
- H. Res. 24: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. McCAUL.
- H. Res. 87: Mr. FINCHER.
- H. Res. 106: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
- H. Res. 109: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H. Res. 112: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. ENGEL.
- H. Res. 131: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. MEADOWS.
- H. Res. 135: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. BERA of California.
- H. Res. 174: Mr. CLEAVER.
- H. Res. 177: Mr. CRAMER.
- H. Res. 182: Ms. CHU.
- H. Res. 187: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H. Res. 190: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H. Res. 206: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H. Res. 209: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

DELETION 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. 676: Mr. GRAYSON.