United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2013 No. 69

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 16, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VICKY HARTZLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

FREEDOM UNDER SIEGE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, just a week after the President extolled the benign virtues of Big Government and told university students to ignore those who warn of its dangers, Americans woke up to headlines that this government has been targeting groups and individuals that it doesn't like for intimidation and harassment.

I appreciate the President's sudden interest in getting to the bottom of this. But I must remind the House that more than a year ago, I and other Members rose on this floor to warn of these tactics directed at Tea Party groups by the IRS. At the time, the administration responded by saying that this was just a natural backlog. Well, we now know that was a deliberate and premeditated lie.

It now appears that nearly 500 conservative groups were subjected to invasive review and intimidation. The IRS demanded the names of every participant at every meeting these groups held over a period of years, transcripts of every speech given at those meetings, what positions they had taken on issues, the names of their volunteers and donors and, in some cases, their family members and associates, and copies of privileged communications they had with elected officials. In some cases, the person filing the request was then subjected to a personal income tax audit.

There is no way to estimate the number of additional groups that were discouraged from organizing because of these tactics. Meanwhile, it appears that leftist groups had their applications routinely approved. The impact this had on the 2012 election is incalculable.

We are also learning that these tactics extended well beyond a few low-level rogue employees in Cincinnati. Lois Lerner, the official in charge of tax exempt organizations for the IRS, was awarded more than $42,000 in bonuses while she was directing what the President now calls outrageous behavior. Highly intrusive and unwarranted demands for information also originated from the Washington, D.C., office and at least two satellite IRS offices in California.

Dr. Anne Hendershott, a Catholic sociologist, professor, and writer, came under a personal income tax audit after she exposed a George Soros front group masquerading as a grassroots Catholic organization. She said the questions put to her during a grueling audit were largely political. And this occurred from the New Haven, Connecticut, office.

It appears that evangelical groups were also targeted, as were Jewish groups supporting Israel.

Nor was this misconduct limited to groups applying under section 501.

There is now reason to believe that IRS officials leaked confidential tax information to top officials in the Obama campaign and to liberal groups such as ProPublica and The Huffington Post, which may then have illegally published that information.

During the campaign, Austan Goolsbee and HARRY REID referenced confidential tax information involving Charles and David Koch and Mitt Romney, only to back off when they were pressed for their sources.

Nor does this conduct appear to be limited to the IRS.

Shortly after businessman Frank Vandersloot was attacked by the Obama campaign for his support of Mitt Romney, he came under audits by both the IRS and the Labor Department.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute has just released a damning survey of fee waivers granted by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Freedom of Information Act. Left-leaning groups had their fees waived 92 percent of the time. Conservative groups just the opposite—about 7 percent of the time.

And this week, it also became clear that the FBI is using general warrants, banned by the Fourth Amendment, to rifle through the phone records of AP reporters with a clear intention to intimidate whistleblowers and to obstruct the operation of a free press.

We are seeing a pattern of conduct throughout this administration that is absolutely toxic to a free society: government using its powers to intimidate

Printed on recycled paper.

private citizens who are simply trying to take part in the public policy debate.

Madam Speaker, this cries out for a full investigation by the Congress, and I utterly reject the notion that the ritual naming and firing of a few hapless scapegoats is sufficient. Every government employee who abused their power needs to be identified, exposed, disgraced, dismissed, and debarred from ever again holding a position of authority or trust within this government.

When the Constitution was read by the New York Convention, Alexander Hamilton said:

> Here, sir, the people govern; here they act by their immediate representatives.

Madam Speaker, the most cherished liberties of the American people are under attack, and we, their immediate representatives, have a solemn obligation to act in the defense of their freedom, their country, and their Constitution.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, a few days ago, the world's atmosphere passed 400 million parts per million level of carbon, higher than anything we have seen in the atmosphere for over 3 million years. This puts in stark focus the climate crisis and the indifference we are seeing from congressional leadership on this problem.

In the last 24 hours, all you needed to know about the state of play for climate science and dealing with global warming was in two articles in the newspaper. Yesterday, the business section of The New York Times by Eduardo Porter discussed how the reinsurance industry is entirely comfortable with the climate science, predicting more rapid extreme weather events and dire consequences.

They in the insurance industry, after all, don't have the luxury of debating science when they must deal with facts on the ground. This is dollar and cents for a vast industry trying to help people cope with the consequences of natural disaster. As a result of the market discipline, they have had to embrace reality, accept it, and plan for it.

It was poignant that Porter observed and probed their lack of engagement in government policies, at least in the United States, that would help minimize future damage. Remember, this is even as the scientists told us we have had the highest concentration of carbon for 3 million years.

In today's Washington Post, there is a front-page story about fish populations that aren't waiting for their habitat to make it impossible for them to live. Species all over the globe are moving. They are migrating to cooler climates. In a process that has been taking place for decades now, fish are sorting themselves out and leaving areas that no longer sustain their quality of life, their ability to reproduce, and to thrive. They have steadily been moving to areas where the effects of climate change are not so pronounced.

Isn't it interesting that fish without fancy scientific instrumentation or computer analysis or, dare I say it, political focus groups have reacted to facts in the sea and move to where they can function, where they can live, where they can escape for the time being, at least, the impact of climate change?

They are also escaping from the people who depend on these fish for their living in the previous habitat. But that is another story about the devastation that local communities are facing because of the climate change consequences.

□ 1010

Isn't it time that the political process starts responding to a problem that even fish can figure out?

What is it going to take for people in this body to wake up to their responsibilities and act with the same insight as aquatic species that don't have graduate degrees in computers but, mercifully for them, don't have political blinders and ideological fervor, wasting huge amounts of time on pointless activities like debating whether to repeal ObamaCare for the 37th time?

Hopefully, insurance companies and the people who depend on these aquatic creatures will lend an air of reality to the discussion of climate change that is almost nonexistent here on Capitol Hill, maybe reaching the point where it is no longer a debate because it's really past time for a debate.

It is time for us to take action like our friends in the ocean. If Charlie the Tuna can figure it out, why can't the Republican leadership in Congress? Let's maybe spend a little time debating with the Safe Climate Caucus this existential crisis of climate change and global warming.

NATIONAL EXCHANGE CLUB BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Today, I have the distinct honor of wishing a belated ''happy birthday'' to an organization that I am a proud member of back home in Texas 14.

I want to take a moment to say thank you to the Exchange Club of Pearland of which I have been a member for a number of years. They've done a lot of good work in the community, and I look forward to the expansion of their club and the work they will continue to do to better that community.

I would also like to welcome the newest chapter in Friendswood, Texas, where I currently reside. I look forward to working with them in promoting American exceptionalism and in helping to serve our community.

For those of you who might not know, the National Exchange Club is a service organization with over 700 clubs and 21,000 members throughout the United States and Puerto Rico. On March 27, 2013, they celebrated their 102nd birthday. From a handful of members in Detroit, Michigan, at the turn of the 20th century, Exchange has developed into an outstanding national service organization comprised of tens of thousands of men and women who serve their local communities and advance their motto of ''Unity for Service.''

Exchange-sponsored activities are designed to benefit, award, and develop our Nation's youth, promote crime prevention, serve senior citizens, and recognize military and public safety service providers. Exchange also promotes Americanism, and its national project is the Prevention of Child Abuse program. In addition to these programs, the National Exchange Club has been at the forefront of significant developments throughout American history, including the early days of aviation progress. The spirit of patriotism, along with a desire to heighten the awareness of our rich religious heritage, placed Exchange in a position of leadership with other organizations that led to the addition of the words ''under God'' to the Pledge of Allegiance in 1954.

As Reagan said, ''If we ever forget we are 'one Nation under God,' we will be a Nation gone under.''

The Exchange Club is America's service club, an organization that promotes American exceptionalism. I am a believer in our country's exceptionalism, and I will never apologize for it.

Think about this for a second, folks. Whether it's a hurricane, whether it's a tsunami, whether it's an earthquake, whatever it is, when the world has a catastrophe and dials 911, who is it that answers? It's America, isn't it? It's the red, white, and blue. It's the land of the free, the home of the brave.

For a safe world, we need a strong America. For a strong America, we need a safe America. The Exchange Club works ever so hard to keep America strong and safe.

So, to them, I wish a very happy birthday, especially to the Pearland club and the Friendswood club. I say thank you for all of your hard work.

I am RANDY WEBER, and that's the way I see it from where I sit here in America.

DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office's latest forecast says this year's Federal deficit will shrink by 41 percent compared to last year's. That point bears repeating. The deficit is shrinking—and dramatically—thanks to the bipartisan actions taken by this

Congress earlier this year. The CBO now projects a deficit of $642 billion, which is $200 billion less than projected just 3 months ago, the lowest level since 2008. Just 4 years ago, the deficit was over 10 percent of our GDP. This year, it's projected to fall below 5 percent—half of what it was just 4 years ago.

Now, I understand that this news may not fit neatly within the narrative of our friends on the other side of the aisle, who, just as they did in the summer of 2011 unfortunately, tried just last week to manufacture yet another debt crisis where none exists.

I would note that it was only a few months ago that we worked together in a bipartisan fashion to suspend the debt limit. On the heels of our New Year's Day compromise on the tax portions of the fiscal cliff, my Republican colleagues recognized the dangers of yet another debt showdown on the markets and on the possibility of downgrading U.S. creditworthiness; but rather than build on that rare moment of bipartisan comity and work with Democrats on a balanced plan to put our Nation back on the path of fiscal responsibility, House Republicans doubled down. They pushed ahead with their ''cut spending at any cost'' agenda. They pushed through a continuing resolution that baked in the harmful cuts of sequestration, which is a self-inflicted wound on our economy.

Ironically, House Republicans just last week pushed through on a party-line vote a bill that claims to protect the full faith and credit of the United States when, in reality, it would only place it more at risk by suggesting we won't be good for our debt. Furthermore, many of my Republican colleagues have relied on this debt crisis research done by two economists, Messrs. Reinhart and Rogoff, who have suggested that high levels of public debt always lead to lower rates of economic growth. That research has been the foundation of Republican austerity proposals in America, including the last three versions of the Ryan budget, which decimate public investments in our communities and the economy in the name of deficit reduction. It turns out the researchers aggregated the data incorrectly. They couldn't even read the Excel sheets properly, and that dramatically shifted the findings to show growth for high debt countries was more than 2 percent higher than they said it was, and it turns out there is no magical threshold of 90 percent that always leads to, in fact, economic contraction. In fact, it's quite the opposite.

Raising the debt limit is not a license to spend more money. It simply ensures that America will be good for its current debts and obligations. We've been good for that since Alexander Hamilton established the U.S. Treasury in George Washington's first Cabinet. The bipartisan agreement to suspend the debt ceiling expires this weekend, but with this latest forecast, the CBO now says that that limit probably won't be reached until October or November of this year. Most news reports suggest this will reduce the political pressure to achieve a bipartisan deal on further reducing the deficit in a balanced way. I'd argue the urgency still remains and that this window of time presents us with a perfect opportunity for bipartisan negotiations to resume without the specter of that sort of debt ceiling limit over our heads immediately.

I am dismayed that my Republican friends continue to shun their own party's heritage for making strategic investments in infrastructure and innovation in favor of a blind adherence to slashing government spending with no acknowledgment for the consequences. I've consistently said that Federal spending must be reduced, but I've also said that it must be done in tandem with maintaining strategic Federal investments in things that create jobs, like R&D, infrastructure, innovation. I would suggest that my Republican friends look no further than the GDP growth from the last two quarters, showing it's not the Federal debt but their meat-ax approach to cutting those Federal investments that, in fact, has created what drag there is on the U.S. economy.

The last time Republicans played games with the debt ceiling we registered the lowest monthly job growth in 3 years; the stock market tumbled; and the S&P, for the first time ever, downgraded U.S. debt. The latest jobs numbers show we've been adding 208,000 jobs a month on average since November, prompting a surge in confidence reflected by the market's climb to record levels.

I implore my friends on the other side of the aisle to use this time to work with us on a balanced approach to deficit reduction and economic growth.

□ 1020

LIGHTS OUT AT OUR MILITARY BASES

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

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, it is literally ''lights out'' at our military bases.

Next to me is a photo that ran the other weekend in my hometown newspaper, which shows darkened hallways at the largest Air Force base in the world, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. There wasn't a lack of power at the base that day, but a lack of leadership here in Washington. The lights were out because the Senate and the President have failed to take up the issue of sequestration.

Sequestration is having a devastating effect on the readiness and the morale of our servicemembers and civilian workforce. Imagine going to work and the President feels that you are so insignificant that you don't even deserve to have the lights on.

The President promised the American people during his reelection campaign that this would not happen, but it has. It's time for the President to come to the table with a solution to this issue before our military is irreparably impacted.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, by now you've all heard of the terrible shooting that took place on Sunday during the Mother's Day parade in New Orleans. Like all Americans, I was saddened to once again see a joyous public event marred by gun violence.

Yet, as the Mother's Day shooting unfolded in New Orleans, I was struck by another lesser known story about the toll of gun violence that was playing out more than 100 miles away in Chicago. It is the story of love and loss told by the mothers of those killed by gun violence who were facing Mother's Day without their children, perhaps for the first time.

A group of these mothers gathered at a memorial outside a Chicago church to mourn and remember their children. As a mother who was blessed to spend the day with my children, their pain and anguish is unimaginable.

For every mass shooting that grabs the headlines, there are dozens more that take place on America's streets every day that are leaving a lost generation in their wake. And yet, in the national debate about gun violence, these everyday killings, this slow-motion massacre is often overlooked. And so are the mothers who are left behind.

Just as the mothers who wept for their children in Newtown, these Chicago mothers are also the faces of the aftermath of gun violence. Because whether your child is shot in the classroom or on a street corner or in a park, your hopes and dreams for them were the same, and so is the agony of your loss.

It is for these mothers—Clara Allen, Tanya Butler, Angela Blakely, and others like them—that I raise my voice and will continue to raise my voice in memory of their children to implore my colleagues in Congress to pass reasonable and responsible gun legislation. We must act now to end the senseless scourge of killings in our streets due to gun violence.

I know there are those who think that new gun laws are not the solution. I say they're looking at the wrong equation. Commonsense gun restrictions are part of a multipronged approach to stemming gun violence that should also include increased access to mental health services and better community and social supports. It will take a village to save these children, our children.

Passing commonsense gun legislation is a key step in the process by helping to keep guns out of the wrong hands. We must take a stand for these children and their mothers and send the message that we hear them, we care about them, and that their lives matter.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, later on this afternoon, the House will vote for the 37th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives has already been on record saying that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. So it's just not clear to me why we are wasting the time and the treasure of the American people on another futile legislative fantasy.

In fact, it's a legislative fantasy that has cost the American people more than $50 million. If, in fact, the Affordable Care Act were to be repealed, it would do even more damage, as independent economists have estimated that a repeal would add to the Federal deficit by more than $100 billion.

It's often been said that the classic definition of ''insanity'' is doing the same thing over and over and over again but somehow expecting a different result.

Barack Obama was elected President in 2008. The Affordable Care Act was signed into law in 2010. The Supreme Court, with the Chief Justice voting in the majority, held that the Affordable Care Act was constitutional in 2012. A few months later, President Barack Obama was reelected in an electoral college landslide. Yet, later on this afternoon, we're voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time—over and over and over again. It's a classic definition of legislative insanity, as if the 37th vote is going to be any different, will yield any different results than the previous 36 where we've wasted the taxpayer dollars of the American people.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and that's a good thing. It's a good thing because over the next decade more than 30 million Americans who otherwise would not have had health care insurance will be insured. It seems to me that that's a good thing.

The Affordable Care Act makes sure that insurance companies cannot deny medical coverage for preexisting conditions. It seems to me that that's a good thing.

The Affordable Care Act provides small businesses with a 35 percent tax credit, which will enable these small businesses to continue to grow and to flourish. It seems to me that that's a good thing.

The Affordable Care Act allows young Americans who are just starting out to remain on the insurance plan of their parents until the age of 26, giving them a real chance to get themselves started in their pursuit of the American Dream. I'm new, but it seems to me that that's a good thing.

Yet later on this afternoon, for the 37th time, we're engaging in another futile legislative fantasy.

There are a couple of other things that we could be doing. We could be dealing with the sequester, $85 billion in random cuts that are costing the economy more than 500,000 jobs, but we're not.

We could be debating the American Jobs Act, trying to put the people of this great country back to work and stimulate the economy, but we're not.

We could be trying to get a budget, go to conference, create some certainty for industry and the American people, but we're not.

Madam Speaker, I'm hopeful that after this vote is taken, we can finally come to the reality that the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, it's good for the American people, and we should get back to doing things that will advance prosperity in this great country.

□ 1030

REPEAL PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to speak about an issue that is of great concern to my constituents back home in Pennsylvania, and it's the matter of the implementation of the President's Affordable Care Act, the implementation which some members of the President's party have described as a coming train wreck. Madam Speaker, that train wreck has arrived. This massive undertaking of enacting such a broad, confusing law has only highlighted the concerns that I and many of my constituents back home have had with this law and what it means for our small businesses and families in Pennsylvania.

However, a new concern—possibly greater than the idea of government-run health care—has presented itself over the last several days with the revelation that the Internal Revenue Service has been targeting law-abiding Americans simply because of their beliefs. The IRS now wants to know what we think and what books we read.

Madam Speaker, the President's health care law is largely a tax bill. It contains at least 20 new or higher taxes on American families and businesses. That makes it the biggest change to an already-confusing Tax Code in over two decades. And with the implementation of this massive tax bill comes the IRS' new role in running it.

By putting politics ahead of fairness, the IRS has violated the trust of the American people at a time when the administration is loading it up with more responsibility and more power. Under health care reform, the IRS will gather extensive information about the financial resources and health insurance status of all Americans. The expansion of the IRS' power will include hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes, the hiring of thousands of enforcement agents, and a tower of new rules and regulations. I'm deeply concerned with the ability of the agency and the resolve of the agency to lawfully manage this significant undertaking with discretion and with accountability.

While the agency reported that new rules are in place to ensure that this type of situation never happens again, like many Americans, I question why this disturbing trend was ever allowed to happen in the first place. The President's health care law does too much to infringe on the rights of the American people and swells the size and scope of an already bloated Federal Government, which has once again proven incapable of acting responsibly.

Today, I urge Members of Congress to fully repeal the health care law and, in doing so, take the first step to replacing it with commonsense solutions for all Americans—like allowing people to purchase health coverage across State lines; stopping frivolous lawsuits against our doctors; clearing individuals to receive tax credits just like large businesses; and letting Americans keep control of the health care that works best for them.

RIGHT TO VOTE AMENDMENT

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

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the most fundamental right we as Americans have as citizens of this great country, the right to vote. The right to vote is not just fundamental; it is the right that preserves all of our other liberties that we as Americans hold dear. In fact, this right is so fundamental that most Americans, understandably, assume it is already enshrined in the Constitution. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, most Americans would be wrong.

While the right to vote is inherent throughout our founding document, and there are amendments prohibiting discrimination, nothing in the Constitution explicitly guarantees our right to vote. We, as Americans, possess no affirmative right to vote.

Why is this important? Because without a constitutional provision, courts have upheld burdensome registration requirements, voter-identification laws, and reduced early voting opportunities in States across the country.

According to the Brennan Center for Justice, just this year alone, more than 80 restrictive laws have been introduced in more than 30 States. From New York to Washington, legislation

has been introduced that require voters to show a photo ID. States from Virginia to New Mexico have considered bills that would make voter registration more difficult. And from Arizona to Tennessee, States have taken steps to limit early voting.

Unfortunately, this plague of restrictive voting efforts has hit my State of Wisconsin as well. In 2011, our legislature passed a law that would limit the fundamental rights Wisconsinites have to vote. Not only would this law require a photo ID; it also took steps to disenfranchise senior citizens and college students, reduce registration opportunities, and restrict the ability of citizens to receive absentee ballots.

But Wisconsin has something that other States do not possess—a guaranteed right to vote. Article III, section 1, of the Wisconsin Constitution specifically states:

> Every United States citizen age 18 or older who is a resident of an election district in this State is a qualified elector of that district.

This one sentence makes a huge difference for Wisconsinites. In two separate cases challenging the Wisconsin voter ID law, the Wisconsin circuit courts have ruled that these restrictive, burdensome voting laws are unconstitutional because, from the decision in NAACP of Milwaukee v. Walker:

> The Wisconsin Constitution expressly guarantees the right to vote.

But this isn't enough. Not all States have this right. Our friends in Indiana, as we have seen, have little recourse if a restrictive voting law is signed into law.

Now more than ever, we need to be protecting our right to vote, not restricting it. We need to reaffirm our founding principle that our country is at its strongest when everyone participates. We need to guarantee a right to vote for everyone.

So this week, along with my friend and colleague, Congressman KEITH ELLISON from Minnesota, I introduced a right-to-vote amendment to the Constitution that will explicitly guarantee, without a doubt, the right of the American people to vote. The amendment is as simple as it is necessary: every American citizen possesses the fundamental right to vote in every public election where they reside, and Congress has the right and power to protect it.

No more will Americans have to prove their right to vote has been infringed. Instead, the burden of proof will be left to States to demonstrate that any efforts they take will not deny or abridge the fundamental right to vote.

Now, I know there are some out there who will say that an amendment to the Constitution is unrealistic; it's too hard to achieve. Those critics are shortsighted. This is about engaging my colleagues in Congress on both sides of the aisle and the American public in a movement to ensure our right to vote is not at the mercy of those acting with partisan motives. The right to vote is not a Democratic right, nor is it a Republican right. It is an American right, and it is fundamental to a government for the people, by the people.

Madam Speaker, I'm proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join on and protect our most fundamental right.

HONORING JACOBY DICKENS

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of America's most prominent African American businessmen and financiers. Mr. Jacoby Dickens was born and grew up in Panama City, Florida, one of six children in a low-income family.

The family moved to the south side of Chicago when Mr. Dickens was a teenager. He attended Wendell Phillips High School. After school he worked as a building engineer, saved his money, and began investing in real estate. He eventually purchased and managed a large number of apartment buildings before selling them in 1971.

After investing in several bowling alleys in the Chicago area, he was asked to join the board of Seaway Bank in 1979. In 1983, he became chairman of the board and remained until his death earlier this year. Under his guidance and leadership, Seaway Bank and Trust Company became the largest Black-owned bank in Chicago with assets of $547 million.

Mr. Dickens was a great civic activist and contributor to public causes. He served on the boards of Chicago State University, the School of Business at Florida A&M University, and the Chicago Urban League. He donated more than $1 million to Chicago State University's athletic center, which bears his name. He was a trustee at the Museum of Science and Industry and DePaul University, where a scholarship and loan program are named for him. In the 1980s, he was a key supporter and fundraiser for Harold Washington, who was elected the first African American mayor of Chicago.

Jacoby Dickens was a man of vision, courage, and determination. He used his wisdom, business acumen, and money wisely, not only for himself and his family, but also for the uplifting of humanity. My condolences and well wishes go out to his wife, Ms. Veranda Dickens, their family, and all of the trustees and employees of Seaway Bank and Trust Company.

□ 1040

Mr. Dickens was, indeed, a man for the times and the seasons in which he lived. His bank gave loans in depressed communities and neighborhoods where people were hard-pressed to find resources. He will be sorely missed and always remembered.

POVERTY IN AMERICA

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, as the cofounder of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus and chair of the Democratic Whip Task Force on Poverty and Opportunity, I rise today to continue talking about the ongoing crisis of poverty and the impact of sequester.

We are well aware of the impact the sequester is having on many, many communities across the country in terms of devastating some of the basic social safety networks that we have all benefited from in many, many ways. They're really very, very harmful to our most vulnerable.

Nearly 50 million Americans, including 16 million children all across our country and in every congressional district, are living in poverty. Yet the sequester continues to have devastating impacts on access to childhood education, affordable housing, hot meals for low-income seniors, Head Start, and countless other programs that help low-income and vulnerable Americans.

But, Madam Speaker, these draconian cuts are not enough for some of my colleagues, given what took place last night at the Ag Committee. Last night, the Ag Committee passed a $20 billion cut to our Nation's first line of defense against hunger in the farm bill. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as the Food Stamp program, is really a vital lifeline for millions of Americans.

As a young, single mother, I relied on food stamps and public assistance during a very difficult period in my life. Let me tell you, no one—no one—wants to be on food stamps, but it is a bridge over troubled water. And so I am, quite frankly, appalled and very sad to see my colleagues attacking the integrity of such essential programs for families that need a helping hand during difficult times.

As we work to create, hopefully, a balanced reauthorization of the farm bill, we must keep in mind the people, the families, and businesses impacted by these proposed cuts.

Nearly half of all SNAP recipients are children. One in five children in America are at risk of hunger, and we know that nearly half of all children in America will be on SNAP benefits sometime during their childhood. That's half of all children in America.

Not only does SNAP help put food on the table for struggling families, every $1 increase in SNAP benefits generates $1.70 in economic activity. Yet, if the farm bill becomes law, more than 2 million families will be cut off from this economic lifeline.

With unemployment still at 7.5 percent—and in some communities it's over 13 percent—and the rate of poverty at 15 percent—again, some communities, it's 27 to 30 percent—ongoing

cuts to SNAP and other nutrition assistance programs will increase hunger in America, and we will see even greater consequences.

Hungry children cannot learn in school and suffer developmental delays. Hungry children have worse health outcomes. Hungry children have bleaker economic outlooks through the rest of their adult lives. But the impacts don't stop there.

Cuts to critical nutrition programs don't just hurt the hungry families who rely on them, they hurt the economies of local communities, as families have less money to spend in local stores. Allowing an increase in hunger across America will threaten our Nation's ability to develop the highly skilled and highly educated workforce that we will need to compete in the 21st century.

We must not make cuts on the backs of hungry children to balance our budgets. Doing so would be morally wrong and an economic disaster.

Madam Speaker, instead of scheduling a 37th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, we should come together to work to find an approach for all Americans to help get everyone back to work.

We need a comprehensive solution to replace the sequester and to address the ongoing crisis of poverty. That is why, with the support of our Democratic Caucus, we started a Task Force on Poverty and Opportunity in February, which I am proud to chair. We are working to build support for a comprehensive national strategy to help eliminate poverty, grow the economy, and create millions of new jobs, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us.

I also hope that our colleagues will join myself, Representative JIM MCGOVERN, our Congressional Black Caucus chair, MARCIA FUDGE, Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY, and our Democratic Caucus vice chair, JOE CROWLEY, in taking the food stamp challenge. We need to raise the level of awareness of what is taking place here in Washington, D.C., and so what we're going to do is commit ourselves to limiting our food budget to the average SNAP benefit for a week. That's $1.40 per person per meal. We will show how vital it is to strengthen and fully fund SNAP. And we're asking all of those who can do this to join with us.

We've got to protect the most vulnerable, grow the economy, and SNAP is one of the best programs to do just that. So it's time not to slash it, but to support it.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Dr. Mike Landry, Sarasota Baptist Church, Sarasota, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, I approach Your throne on behalf of a Nation that desperately needs You. We are faced with much division and disunity in our land, and we request Your healing and reconciling touch. We thank You that You are not a spectator God who sits in Heaven unconcerned and uncaring.

We acknowledge that the greatness of our Nation is due to Your blessing and provision. And we know that You have blessed us in order that we might be a blessing to other nations. We understand that to whomever much is given, much will be required.

Father, grant these legislative leaders wisdom and courage to make decisions today that honor You. May Your will be done on Earth, just as it is in Heaven.

Pour out Your grace and protect the marriages and families of these, our Nation's leaders.

I offer this prayer in the name of Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. OLSON 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.

WELCOMING DR. MIKE LANDRY

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this morning to welcome a very good friend to the Halls of Congress. Pastor Mike Landry, who delivered the opening prayer this morning, is a great spiritual leader in Sarasota, Florida. For the past 16 years, he has served as senior pastor to the Sarasota Baptist Church, located in the heart of my district.

My wife, Sandy, and I have had the pleasure of knowing the pastor for nearly 5 years. He is very devoted to his family, his church, his congregation, and serving the people of southwest Florida. He has made himself an incredible and beloved member of our community.

I commend Pastor Landry for his outstanding service to our community and to our Nation. It's my honor today to welcome him here to the House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE TRUTH ABOUT BENGHAZI

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an important issue: the attack against America and its citizens by terrorists in Benghazi. Four Americans, including our Ambassador, Chris Stevens, have been killed. The American people deserve the truth about Benghazi and to know who was responsible, not convenient stories blaming the violence on some filmmaker's free speech rights. The people who died deserve justice.

As we investigate this attack, and the response of the civilian and military leaders in command, we must determine whether the paralysis that seemed to characterize the government's reaction was the result of individual bad decisions or a broader institutional problem.

Our military and our soldiers are the most capable in the world, but if their commanders refuse to send them into battle, they cannot safeguard American lives or interests.

The American people and our allies abroad need to know that the United States has the resolve to act in the face of uncertainty. Our enemies need to know that when they attack Americans, they do so at great danger because Americans do not leave our people behind.

HONORING HOLOCAUST EDUCATION AND RESOURCE CENTER

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Holocaust Education and Resource Center of Rhode Island, which is celebrating its 25th anniversary this weekend. I had the honor of serving on their board for a number of years.

This wonderful institution was first founded by Holocaust survivors living in Rhode Island during the 1980s. It formally opened its doors on May 5, 1988, and since that time it has helped to provide Rhode Islanders with educational resources on the Holocaust and commemorate the lives of the millions of victims of this horrific atrocity.

In addition, the Holocaust Education and Resource Center works with schools in Rhode Island, southeastern Massachusetts, and even the suburbs of Boston to teach young people about the importance of treating everyone with respect and dignity and to work to eradicate bigotry and intolerance.

Congratulations to the Holocaust Education and Resource Center on 25 successful years of promoting tolerance and respect to tens of thousands of Rhode Islanders, for helping us all remember those killed by the Nazis in the Holocaust, and for making Rhode Island and our world a better place. I wish this organization continued success in the years to come.

CONGRATULATING FORT BEND CHRISTIAN ACADEMY

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, Fort Bend Christian Academy rules. Yesterday, the Eagles won two State titles.

The day started with the Lady Eagles winning their fourth State championship in softball, the fourth title in 7 years. Behind Coach Ferguson Carroll and Elizabeth Fox's 12 strikeouts, the Lady Eagles crushed Fort Worth Christian 4–0.

Right after that game ended, the Fort Bend Christian men won their first State baseball title with a close 12–11 victory over Midland Christian. Coach Roman and the team never quit, scoring four runs in the top of the sixth inning to take the lead for good.

There's an old saying in naval aviation: don't mess with an eagle unless you know how to fly. The Fort Bend Christian men and women are Eagles who know how to fly. Those Eagles are Texas State champs.

PROVIDING FOOD STAMP SAFETY NET

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, our farms and ranches produce food products in amounts that greatly exceed our nutritional needs. There is no reason for anyone in this country to go hungry. And yet, that is a daily reality faced by many poor families.

The food stamp program provides a small but essential safety net to meet the nutritional needs of children, the elderly, the disabled, and those who fall on hard times when our economy sheds jobs.

The proposed cuts to the food stamp program included in the House farm bill are unacceptable and cruel. Poor nutrition leads to poor health outcomes and long-term developmental problems in children. It does not save money. It simply transfers costs to those who cannot pay those costs and needlessly increases suffering. We can afford to feed all of our citizens. A farm and food policy that cannot deliver nutritious meals to all Americans is indeed failed policy. We can and must do better.

□ 1210

AMERICANS NEED TO KNOW

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the President made a pledge to Americans: If you elect me and you like your current health care, you'll be able to keep it.

The reality today is that nearly 7 million people are set to lose their employer-sponsored health insurance when the President's health care law goes into full effect. On January 1, many Americans will be forced into an exchange program that has not even been set up.

NANCY PELOSI promised the American people Congress must pass the bill so you can find out what's in it. The Democratic-controlled House passed the bill almost 4 years ago. They didn't know what was in the bill then, and they don't know what to do now.

We're less than 7 months away from many Americans being forced into exchanges. Yet they don't know what options are available to them.

What we do know is that consumers are already looking at sharp premium increases. The very people who were promised the most, those young people under the age of 29, are expected to get increases somewhere in the range of 200 percent.

This is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. Most Americans operate under a budget. Americans need to know what the increases in their health care costs will be and what plan options are available. Americans need to know the effects that this legislation will have on their lives, and they need to know now.

The administration has had 4 years to figure this out, and the only thing they've figured out is that they don't know what to do.

BLOCK THE BORDER FEE TAX

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Homeland Security Committee adopted my amendment to block a study of new fees for passengers and pedestrians crossing our borders. A similar amendment was successfully included in the Senate legislation last week.

The consensus for blocking this tax is welcome, but not surprising. Cross-border travel is central to the economic viability of border communities, including my own in western New York.

Last year, 3 million Canadians visited our region, spending nearly $1 billion. Canadians rely on seamless travel at one of my district's five border crossings to travel from the Buffalo Niagara International Airport, area businesses, and to attend sporting and cultural events.

Mr. Speaker, with the bipartisan support, bicameral support for this issue, I suggest that language blocking the border fees should be included in the upcoming immigration reform legislation. This is a senseless tax. It's counterproductive, and we should take every action to prevent it.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MOSES HARRISON

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of Moses Harrison. His judicial successes have been well chronicled, but he got elected to the Illinois Supreme Court in 1992 and served for 8 years before becoming the chief justice.

However, there's probably no more credible source than my mom, who says that Moses was a nice, gentle man; everyone who knew him liked him.

I also appreciated his support in a letter for me to go to the military academy at West Point.

Moses was very involved in local activities and also was involved in the Episcopal Church.

Mr. Harrison was preceded in death by his son, Luke. He leaves behind his wife, Sharon; his son, Judge Clarence Harrison and his wife and four grandchildren, who will greatly miss him.

SAFE CLIMATE AND RAIL

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are in dangerous and uncharted territory. At 400 parts per million, there is now more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere than at any time in the past 3 million years.

Now here in the United States, more than a quarter of our greenhouse gas

emissions come from the transportation sector, so it's urgent that we make our cars and trucks cleaner, but also that we invest in clean modes of transportation, such as rail.

Saturday was National Train Day, which celebrates the rail networks that efficiently move freight and passengers across our country and reduce the number of cars on our roads.

In California, we're building high-speed rail with renewable energy. When complete, it will move millions of people far more quickly, cleanly, and efficiently than we do today. And in the North Bay, we're connecting Sonoma and Marin Counties with 70 miles of rail, meaning 1.4 million fewer car trips along Highway 101.

Investments in rail at the national scale can increase efficiency, reduce traffic, and fight climate change. It's time for Congress to get ''all aboard'' with this climate solution.

ADMINISTRATION FAILURES

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, this administration's repeated disregard for transparency and the rule of law should trouble every American.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has accused congressional Republicans of playing politics as we conduct oversight into the administration's failures before, during, and after the terrorist attack in Benghazi. But this is hypocritical, coming from an administration that already altered talking points to cover their own political agenda.

And more recently, Mr. Speaker, we learned that the IRS deliberately targeted conservative groups. The IRS has the serious responsibility of collecting taxes and holding accountable those who cheat the system; and now it seems that they, themselves, are choosing when to follow the law.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve more from their elected officials. I hope as details of these events emerge the American people will find out the truth, not just the administration's spin.

THE FOSTER CHILDREN OPPORTUNITY ACT

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be introducing the Foster Children Opportunity Act today. This legislation will ensure that abused and neglected immigrant children have an opportunity to succeed in our country. It is supported by over 175 child welfare organizations.

As we debate immigration reform, it is critical that we consider the needs of immigrant children involved in the child welfare system. This is a population that is especially vulnerable and frequently overlooked.

Despite being eligible for special forms of immigration relief, foster children are slipping through the cracks and leaving care without a resolution of their immigration issues. As a result, they cannot work legally in the U.S. and face the threat of deportation back to a country they don't know, one where their abuser may still live.

We owe these children better. My bill will make sure immigrant foster youth are assisted with resolving their immigration issues prior to leaving care and guarantees that they have access to programs, such as Medicaid that foster youth depend on to make a healthy transition into adulthood.

May is National Foster Care Month. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Foster Children Opportunity Act.

OBAMACARE IS FAILING

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, no single piece of legislation rests so squarely on a foundation of broken promises as the 2010 health care law known as ObamaCare. We were told that it would lower insurance rates to the tune of $2,500 per family, but we know not only is it not lowering rates; it's causing rates to spike 10 percent, 20 percent, even 30, 40 percent in some States.

We were told it was going to be cost effective, but now we know that the costs were purposely understated to mask the true cost of this nearly $2 trillion bill.

We were told if you like your plan, you can keep your plan. We now know the question is not whether millions of Americans will lose their current plans, but how many millions of Americans will lose their current plans. This is what you get when you pass a 2,000-page bill before reading it.

Oh, and do you want the IRS to be involved with your health care?

ObamaCare is failing, and the American people are paying the price for this failure. Let's turn the page on ObamaCare and enact true patient-centered reform that benefits people, not bureaucrats.

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN OUR NATION'S MILITARY

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, according to the Pentagon, about 26,000 servicemen and -women were subjected to sexual assault while serving in this Nation's military this past year. In fact, last year, Congress saw the Lackland Air Force scandal unravel as instructors were accused of engaging in sexual relationships with 32 recruits.

Earlier this month, an Air Force lieutenant colonel overseeing the sexual assault prevention programs was arrested for sexually assaulting a woman while he was under the influence of alcohol.

Two days ago, the Pentagon revealed yet another sexual assault allegation against an Army sergeant at Fort Hood who is currently under investigation for multiple charges, including prostitution solicitation charges.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about instructors, about lieutenant colonels, about sergeants, about people who have moved up in the ranks. I believe this highlights the underlying issue of leadership, or the lack of, in military leaders; and we must hold them accountable.

□ 1220

''TRUST'' THE GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. JENKINS. The President tells Americans to ''trust'' the government, but this week is loaded with reasons not to.

Take the new health care law. We were told it would lower costs and increase access. Now we find premiums could increase by 400 percent and 7 million who had insurance through their employers will lose it.

This law will turn the IRS, caught in a scandal of its own, into chief health care enforcers. And it's proven so unpopular, HHS Secretary Sebelius has resorted to soliciting contributions to promote ObamaCare from the same people this law authorizes her to regulate. If I got a call, I'd feel pressure to ante up; and in America, this shouldn't happen.

Today, I'm proud to support repealing this costly law to keep the IRS out of your health care and to work on replacing it with a patient-focused alternative that will actually help families.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the deep cuts once again being proposed by Republicans to the SNAP program in the House farm bill. In July 2012, the House Agriculture Committee reported a bipartisan farm bill that included $16 billion in food stamp cuts. Guess what? The Speaker and the Republican majority refused to schedule that bill for a vote. And so the Agriculture Committee has now marked up another farm bill, this time with $20 billion in cuts to the SNAP program.

Why are you so determined to attempt deficit reduction on the backs of the poor and less fortunate in our society? The SNAP program helps families

that have fallen on hard times and helps them feed their families until they can get back on their feet.

I am very upset by these proposed cuts. I ask my Republican colleagues to take a fresh look at what they're proposing and reconsider these cuts, cuts that will affect 2 million poor people, many of whom are children and the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation that helps the less fortunate. This is not who we are as a country. We are compassionate people, and we should feed the hungry in times of need.

THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the House will again vote to address the imprecisely named Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Critics say that we're tilting at windmills. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's review:

Within the last month or so, we've heard from the Senator who authored the law refer to it as a coming ''train wreck''—that's right, he called it a ''train wreck'';

We've heard the administration official responsible for helping set up the insurance exchanges worry that the public might be in for a ''Third World experience'' as they try and find health care;

Oh, and let us not forget some of the very same Members of Congress who voted to foist this massive overreach on Americans are now feverishly trying to find ways to exempt themselves and their staffs from its effects.

Let's look at the checklist, shall we?

Premiums shooting up, check;

Small businesses hiring fewer workers and jobs being lost, check;

Employees seeing their hours cut, check;

Faulty cost projections, check.

Everything that opponents of this law listed as a reason to vote against this example of government overreach is actually occurring and happening.

Tilting at windmills, Mr. Speaker, hardly. Working to protect the American people from a horribly disruptive and ineffective law, certainly.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1550

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1550.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of struggling families and low-income women and children across this Nation and oppose the dangerously high cuts in the farm bill to SNAP programs. The current House version of the 2013 farm bill will have devastating effects on so many working families, especially in Alabama. It threatens over 900,000 participants in my home State of Alabama alone.

These proposed cuts are unacceptable. While I understand that our Nation faces a serious debt and deficit problem, we also face fragile economic recovery, and families and children depend upon these government assistance programs, especially the children in the State of Alabama. I think that we are encroaching upon a dangerous trend of cuts on the backs of the people who can least afford to have those cuts.

Now is not the time to turn our backs on these struggling American families. We must work together and take action to protect all Americans who depend upon these vital programs.

IMPROPER DISCRIMINATION BY THE IRS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that our Nation's tax collectors have targeted organizations based solely on their political beliefs. Our Nation's strength depends on its citizens' freedom to organize and participate in the political process, and no branch of government should be used to harass and unfairly judge the American people.

The IRS' actions are not only troubling, but also further erode the American people's trust that public institutions will act impartially. It's unacceptable. This matter needs to be actively investigated, and those guilty of improper actions should be appropriately punished.

We cannot allow differences of political opinion to erode our Nation's best traditions and the rule of law. Americans cannot, and will not, accept judgment based upon their political beliefs. We must prevent this discrimination from ever happening again.

THE VETERANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2012

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

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing this entire Congress, this entire country, can agree on, it's the need to stand with our veterans. As a Nation, we're truly humbled by our servicemen and -women. They make incredible and, in some instances, unimaginable sacrifices to protect our country. And that feeling comes with an understanding that we have an obligation to provide our veterans with the benefits they've earned.

Among the most critical of these benefits are access to educational opportunities and workforce training. To make sure that the current programs are working, our veterans need a voice at the VA. For that reason, I am honored to introduce the Veterans Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act. This bipartisan legislation extends the Veterans Advisory Committee on Education through 2015 and includes veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee advises the VA on how to improve educational and job training programs.

I thank my colleague and friend, Mr. RENACCI, for cosponsoring this bill, and I look forward to working towards its passage.

BENGHAZI

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the sad tale of Benghazi is a story of complacency, incompetence, and coverup: complacency in the face of repeated warnings by the CIA and diplomats on the ground that the post was in danger; incompetence in preparing for a potential attack in a region in turmoil in a place where we had multiple military assets and on a day where we had every reason to believe trouble would occur; and an attempted coverup of a successful terrorist attack with talk about videos and spontaneous riots when the State Department, the CIA, and top officials in the administration knew the truth.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for the administration to take responsibility, come clean, and dismiss those associated with this debacle that cost the lives of four brave Americans.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF DALIP SINGH SAUND

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Asian Pacific Heritage Month to celebrate the life and achievements of Congressman Dalip Singh Saund.

Congressman Saund was the first Asian American Member of Congress, the very first Member of a non-Abrahamic faith, and the first Member born in Asia. He was also our first Sikh American to enter Congress. He also represented my hometown of Riverside, California, a community that I proudly represent today.

Having come to California from India to pursue his education, Saund graduated with a master's and Ph.D. in mathematics from the University of California, Berkeley. Following his

graduation, Saund worked as a farmer but was also a local activist. He spent years pushing to end naturalization restrictions for Indians living in the United States.

In 1950, Saund made a bold decision and entered local government. In 1955, Saund decided to run for an open seat in Congress—and won. Representing the Inland Empire from 1956 to 1963, Congressman Saund served on the Foreign Affairs and Interior Committees. Unfortunately, his promising career as a Member of this distinguished body came to an abrupt end when he suffered a severe stroke in May 1962.

Congressman Saund truly lived the American Dream: an immigrant who came to America with dreams and aspirations of making a difference for himself and for future generations. As the current Riverside Representative, I honor his impact and legacy on all Americans.

□ 1230

OBAMACARE AND IRS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the IRS admitted to targeting conservative groups with extra scrutiny, demanding donor lists, meeting minutes, personal member information, and even Facebook activity. The Justice Department was caught essentially spying on the Associated Press. And the White House continues to twist itself in knots explaining why it misled the American public in the aftermath of Benghazi.

The administration's apologists are in a panic. They claim the President is not responsible for any of this wrongdoing. The President, who made a career touting government as the solution to most every problem, now solicits our understanding. It seems the leviathan is rather unwieldy and difficult to manage.

This is my shocked face.

These scandals are byproducts of government too big for its britches and proof that the IRS should not be given more power to manage our health care.

House Republicans are committed to a smarter, accountable government that works for the people and safeguards liberty against tyranny and bureaucratic incompetence. That starts with repealing ObamaCare.

IN OPPOSITION TO 2013 FARM BILL CUTS TO SNAP

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

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my opposition to the proposed $20 billion in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, also known as the SNAP program. This program currently provides food assistance to 47 million Americans who otherwise would not have access to one of the most basic human necessities—food.

Two million low-income Americans—most of whom are working families with children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities—will lose their food assistance as a result of these cuts. Of that number, 200,000 children would also lose access to their free school meals because their eligibility for these meals is tied to their receipt of SNAP.

Let me ask my Republican colleagues: How often do your children have to learn on empty stomachs or come home and study on empty stomachs? I dare say not often, if ever. But that is what the Republicans are proposing that we do to close to a quarter of a million children. They are asking them not only to learn on empty stomachs, but also to come home and study on empty stomachs. This cannot stand.

EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, this month, the United States Bureau of Land Management indefinitely canceled all oil and natural gas leases in California. This includes 1,278 acres of prime oil and natural gas land in Kern and Fresno Counties located in my district—California 21. This land is part of the Monterey shale formation located in the Central Valley.

The Monterey shale contains two-thirds of our country's shale oil reserves, the equivalent of 15.4 billion barrels of oil. If tapped, it could generate half a million jobs and generate $4.5 billion in revenue. This would have a significant impact on my district, which has faced chronic unemployment for years. However, citing sequestration, BLM is suspending all future lease sales in California. This decision was made despite the fact that these leases provide significant revenue for the Federal Government.

This is just another example of the administration using sequestration to further their environmental policy agenda at the expense of American families. BLM's efforts to prevent energy development are depriving my constituents of quality jobs and increasing energy prices for hardworking families across the country. It is unacceptable that BLM is halting lease auctions in regions that have been used for oil and gas development for over a century.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. MENG. As I watch the farm bills move forward in the House and Senate, I am very saddened at the disregard for my most vulnerable constituents—our fellow Americans. Cutting another of our Nation's safety nets will only serve to further the suffering of disadvantaged children and senior citizens across the country.

Many of the recipients in my district who rely on SNAP to lift their families out of poverty and combat what would otherwise be certain malnutrition of their children, for many of these families this is the only form of income assistance they receive. Eighty percent of them fall below the poverty line.

Reducing benefits would have a terrible effect on millions of Americans. In addition to the Recovery Act's boost of funds ending, further cuts are not warranted.

Although the recipients of SNAP don't have an association to represent them here in Washington, I have come to the floor today to let them know that they are not being forgotten in this fight and that many Representatives will continue to battle on their behalf.

OBAMACARE: UNAFFORDABLE LACK OF CARE ACT

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clearer by the day that ObamaCare is detrimental to all Americans. The Unaffordable Lack of Care Act will cost almost $2 trillion, raise taxes by $1.1 trillion, and cut Medicare by $716 billion.

Despite the President's statement that premiums would decrease by $2,500 under ObamaCare, the average family premium has grown over $3,000 and climbing. Over 30 studies have concluded that the law will make health care premiums more unaffordable for Americans. Furthermore, young adults could see their premiums increase on an average between 145 and 189 percent next year.

Even Democrats are beginning to jump off the ObamaCare bandwagon. The architect of the bill recently referred to the law as a ''train wreck,'' and HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius stated she did not anticipate how complicated it would be to implement the bill.

In light of the recent news that the IRS was deliberately targeting Americans, can we really trust them to be in charge of our health care?

The bottom line is the President's health care law is a bad one. Our job creators are citing the unknowns surrounding it as reasons for planned layoffs and why they cannot expand their businesses.

If the Senate really wants to pass a jobs bill, then they should listen to the American people and support repeal and replace.

MILITARY JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT ACT

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, we have a growing epidemic in our military that requires our immediate action.

I rise today to highlight a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation that will stem the growing cancer of sexual assault on men and women in the military.

This is absolutely unacceptable. In every branch of the military, from day one our servicemembers are instilled with the values of honor, respect, and integrity. It's what makes us proud to wear the uniform, and it's what makes our military strong. However, this epidemic completely undermines what these values and our servicemembers represent.

This morning I joined a strong, committed group of legislators to introduce the Military Justice Improvement Act, which provides a uniform and fair process, ensuring that sexual predators are exposed and punished accordingly.

We in Congress and leaders of the Department of Defense must keep the pressure on. Together, we must foster a respectful, productive environment for our military men and women. The success of our Armed Forces—and the security they provide our Nation—depends on it.

□ 1240

REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there's an article I missed that came out March 15, 2013, from Healthcare IT News—rather interesting. It talks about a lawsuit against the IRS because the IRS, it says, stole health records of some 10 million Americans, including the medical records of all California State judges. Knowing California, I bet most of them are Democrats. They took their medical records.

So, the allegation, the lawsuit, is over that. Ten million Americans' records. It doesn't matter what party they are. It doesn't matter what their political beliefs are. They have a right to have their own records kept private until ObamaCare fully kicks in.

I don't know why the IRS would take those medical records so prematurely, because when ObamaCare kicks in, the Federal Government has everybody's records already.

It's time to repeal it.

SNAP CUTS IN FARM BILL

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to offer my own words about the Republicans' major cuts to food stamps.

Instead, I want to let my constituents speak directly to the House Republican leadership. In this stack of plates sent to me, one of my constituents asked:

''How would I live if food stamps were cut?''

Others have said:

''There are a lot of people who would go hungry without food stamps.''

''If the help I receive now for food stamps was cut, it will affect me and my kids while I'm trying to finish my college degree.''

''In these hard times, food pantries get me through the week.''

''To see your own kids starve and not be able to feed them is one of the worst pains a parent can experience.''

''If food stamps were cut off, my 4-year-old brother and I would have to go to sleep hungry. We would also have to miss meals. This will be unfair considering he's only 4—and I'm 15.''

These stories are heartbreaking and serve as evidence why cutting the food stamp program will really affect people's lives.

To my colleagues, I leave you with this last one: ''Please don't stop helping people.''

Please don't stop helping people.

COMMEMORATING THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE CIVIL WAR IN SRI LANKA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the fourth anniversary of the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka on May 18, 2009.

The last stages of the war were met with grave allegations of war crimes, including the Sri Lankan Government's treatment of Tamil civilians within no-fire zones—attacks that were a blatant violation of human rights.

As a result of the ensuing international outrage, Sri Lanka established a commission of inquiry to investigate the events of the 26-year civil war. However, this commission had no accountability and yielded little explanation for the families, the victims, or the international community.

We are left with the task of identifying what really happened during the last years of this terrible civil war and to hold accountable those who have committed war crimes. We also face the challenge of brokering peace in a country torn apart by civil war.

I urge the Government of Sri Lanka to demonstrate commitment towards reconciliation and promote human rights, particularly before hosting the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in November.

DON'T REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, 3 years after the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, a law that is already helping millions of Americans, our friends on the other side of the aisle are wasting time again on a pointless symbolic vote that will never become law and takes us backwards.

For the 37th time, our colleagues are forcing us to vote on repealing the Affordable Care Act when they know—they know—it has no chance of succeeding.

For the 37th time, they are voting to allow insurance companies to deny coverage to children with preexisting conditions.

For the 37th time, they are voting to roll back our efforts to not allow insurance companies to charge women more just because they are women.

And for the 37th time, they are voting to strip small businesses of protections against the skyrocketing insurance premiums we faced long before the ACA.

Einstein used to say: Insanity is when one attempts to do the same thing over and over again—expecting a different result.

This is wrong for the 37th time and a waste of our time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I realize that H.R. 45 and its rule have not been brought up for consideration, but I wish to object to the consideration of H.R. 45 as well as consideration of the rule governing debate on the bill because it violates rule XII, clause 7, section (c), which states, ''A bill or joint resolution may not be introduced unless the sponsor submits for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement citing as specifically as practicable the power or powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the bill or joint resolution.''

The constitutional authority statement submitted with H.R. 45, argues that Congress is granted the authority to enact this legislation because of the Tenth Amendment.

The Tenth Amendment does not grant Congress the authority to act; it limits Congressional power. It states, ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'' Citing the Tenth Amendment does not satisfy the rule.

Experts at the Congressional Research Service agree. In a recent report, they stated, ''The Tenth Amendment is not an affirmative grant of authority to Congress; rather, it is a limitation or disability on Congress's authority to legislate. Hence, because the House rule requires a statement citing the power or powers granted to Congress—not merely a statement of constitutional provisions—citations to the Tenth Amendment do not appear to satisfy the requirement of the House rule.''

Mr. Speaker, the constitutional authority statement for the bill before us today does not comply with the House rules, and I ask that the bill and the rule not be considered until this problem is fixed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's point of order is not timely. Neither House Resolution 215 nor H.R. 45 is pending at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill's constitutional authority statement cites the Tenth Amendment, and as such fails to live up to the rule of the House, and tries to perpetuate the false myth that the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has heard the case. They have made their decision. The Affordable Care Act is constitutional. And Speaker BOEHNER has said, it is the law of the land. The constitutional authority statement for this bill is completely inaccurate.

It is the 37th time we are voting to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act, but apparently we still can't get the paperwork right. How does a Member correct the statement of constitutional authority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized to engage in debate.

Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Has the House ever voted to repeal in whole or in part another piece of legislation 37 times, like we are doing here today—in this case, a piece of legislation that makes it illegal for insurance companies to discriminate against a woman if she becomes pregnant and makes sure that children under the age of 26 can stay on their parents' health care plan?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair does not place proceedings in a historical context.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is it correct that the House Republican budget maintains $1.2 trillion of tax increases included in the Affordable Care Act and $716 billion in cuts of Medicare; and, in fact, this very budget that we operate under would not have balanced without including these savings in taxes from ObamaCare?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's parliamentary inquiry is not relevant to any business pending before the House.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is the House here this week spending millions of dollars of taxpayer money to repeal the Affordable Care Act because it actually believes that that will occur while Barack Obama is in the White House or because freshman Republicans want to score political points back home?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to political commentary under the guise of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. I trust the American people will respond to these questions.

□ 1250

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 45, REPEAL OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 215

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 45) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. House Resolution 215 provides for a rule to consider the full repeal of the flawed, ill-conceived and inappropriately named Affordable Care Act, a bill whose final language was written by staff on the Senate Finance Committee and the actual legislative text of which received not a single committee hearing or markup in this body. While many hearings and markups were held on other iterations of other health care bills, the legislation that was signed by the President received not a single moment of scrutiny in this House and contained none of the bipartisan amendments that were accepted during the markups of other health care bills, including H.R. 3200, which passed the House but was never considered by the Senate. As such, only a full repeal is acceptable, and that is what this rule provides for.

The rule provides for 2 hours of debate, controlled by the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce. Further, the rule self-executes the Bachmann amendment, which provides for a clean repeal of the entire ACA, consistent with the provisions of the opening day rules package of this Congress. The rule further provides the minority one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

This approach, a full repeal, will give the House, particularly Members who were not here in the past two Congresses, an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote, an affirmation or a denial, of the Affordable Care Act.

Americans should have the freedom to make their own health care decisions. In March of 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was signed into law. It was drafted quickly and behind closed doors at the end of 2009—behind closed doors in the other body, in fact. It included secret deals, loopholes, drafting errors, and allowed entirely new Federal agencies to be created without congressional knowledge or oversight.

The bottom line: it was not the way to achieve meaningful reform. In addition, the Supreme Court ruled last June that the law is, in fact, a tax. This is after President Obama continually told the American people that it was not a tax.

The health care system in America needs reform, and it needs improvement; but the law that was passed will cost American taxpayers and patients millions of dollars. It will not improve care, and it will not make care more affordable. We need to start fresh and address the issues with commonsense improvements that will focus on the real issues at hand—creating a health care system that is focused on patients instead of payment, quality instead of quantity, affordability instead of cheapness, and innovation instead of stagnation. The first step is eliminating bad legislation that simply does not work and that today stands in the way of any real improvement. That is why, today, I strongly support the repeal of the President's health care law.

The President did repeatedly tell us that the penalty associated with the individual mandate was not a tax. It was repeated several times in the run-up to this bill's being signed. In June, the Supreme Court affirmed that the only way that this bill could remain law was that it was, indeed, a tax, and Congress has the infinite power to tax. In fact, Congress can tax morning, noon, and night. It can tax the American people back to the stone age if that's what it wishes, and that's what the Affordable Care Act does. When millions are unemployed, this is, indeed, the last thing we need.

It's not just the tax. It's the effect on premiums. Up on the Energy and Commerce Web site this week is a study showing how the Affordable Care Act is going to affect premiums in the individual market, in the small-group market, and in the large-group market; and almost uniformly those premiums are going up, and in some cases they are going up a staggering amount.

Last summer, the Supreme Court's decision leaves in place a costly and unworkable health care scheme that is hurting America's families, that is hurting America's workers, that is hurting America's job creators, and that is damaging America's patients. We will all have to live with that ruling. If we do not repeal, then we will have to live with the law as written. The time has come to step up and do the right thing. I urge support of the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the value of the Affordable Care Act, commonly referred to as ObamaCare, I must acknowledge the sad fact that this will be the 37th time in 29 months that the majority has voted to repeal or defund the law, and they know it will not happen. Recent estimates are that each vote to repeal or to defund the Affordable Care Act has cost $1.45 million in taxpayer money. So today's debate will bring the total cost of repeal votes to—wake up there—$53 million and counting.

Now, while the majority wastes our tax dollars, think what we could do with $53 million. The agriculture bill we were all talking about this morning is ready to take $20 billion out of food stamps, feeding poor people, while we waste that kind of money here doing a bill month after month after month that we know is not going anywhere. Yet we don't have any positive agenda to put forward here. For the last 2 or 3 months, all we've done are one-House bills that everybody knows are not going to get passed, and it really is a tragedy because a CBS study says it costs $25 million a week just to run the Congress—and how deplorable that kind of waste is with all the problems we have in the country.

We are told that the freshman Republicans would like, once again, to have an opportunity to vote to kill health care. I wonder if the freshman Republicans, as I know the freshman Democrats do, wouldn't like to vote to repeal the sequester or to maybe do a jobs bill, which we haven't had in 2½ years. We are not going to do anything about the budget either when we've heard all the time, Why doesn't the Senate do a budget? The Senate has done a budget. The Senate has asked over and over again for the House to appoint conferees so that we can get the budget put together and pass it into law. No action there either. Then, because of the sequester cuts, at least 70,000 children have been denied access to early education, and thousands of cancer patients have been denied their regular cancer treatments.

The majority says it is holding today's vote, as I said, so that the freshmen can repeal the Affordable Care Act. I wish to goodness that they would give them something that would really pass and something good to vote on.

Instead of voting to repeal the sequester, the majority is voting for the 37th time to repeal a law—and this is very important—that has already done so much already. It has given 100 million Americans access to free preventative health care, procedures such as mammograms and colonoscopies. That's 100 million already. They are voting for the 37th time to repeal a law that saves seniors $6.1 billion in prescription drug costs already. They are voting for the 37th time to repeal a law that has provided 3.1 million young adults with health insurance already that they otherwise could not afford.

The Affordable Care Act has been particularly beneficial for America's women. Did you know that prior to the passage of this law in eight States and in the District of Columbia, domestic violence was classified as a preexisting condition and you could be denied insurance? They were denied insurance because they had been abused and because, perhaps, they would be again.

□ 1300

Did you know that thanks to a practice called ''gender rating,'' women were charged as much as 46 percent more in premiums for the same level of insurance as a man? Maybe you didn't know that. But lots of women in the country are getting rebates for that very reason.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, both of these discriminatory practices have been outlawed. In addition, the Affordable Care Act has already returned money to the pockets of millions of women thanks to the rebates required by insurance companies under the health care law.

Finally, the Affordable Care Act outlawed lifetime and yearly limits, insidious insurance practices that capped the amount of health care an insurance company would provide. But because of health care reform, Americans no longer have to worry that they will be denied health care that they need simply because insurance companies refuse to pay for their continued care.

And did you know that 85 percent of your premium dollar will go to health care and not to other things that the insurance company wants to spend it on?

The majority has claimed that the Affordable Care Act is bad for America's small businesses. The truth is that for any small business that has less than 50 employees, it requires them to do nothing different, nothing at all from what they're doing today. But small businesses with less than 25 employees are eligible for a tax credit of 35 percent right now. And on January 1, that tax credit will increase to 50 percent. You will get a tax credit on half of the health insurance you pay when you have under 25 employees.

The majority has also claimed and will continue to claim that the Affordable Care Act was passed in the dark of night through a closed-door process that denied their side of the aisle the opportunity to participate in the legislative process. This charge is categorically untrue. The Affordable Care Act was the product of nearly 100 hearings and 83 hours of committee markups, including both Republicans and Democrats making amendments. The House heard from 181 witnesses, both Democrat and Republican. There were 239 amendments considered in House committees and 121 that were adopted.

And while some on the other side of the aisle charge that the final version of the law was rushed through the House, the final bill was available for 72 hours before any Members were asked to vote on it.

In contrast, the Patients' Rights Repeal Act, which we're doing again today as I said for the 37th time, is being considered after no committee hearings, no committee markups, and under a closed rule. That means there will be no amendments on this bill. Even if one were sympathetic toward the majority's goal, the complete abuse of the legislative process should give every Member of this Chamber pause.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote is just the latest in the majority's all-out effort to undermine the process of implementing the health care law. Their efforts have taken many forms, but central to it all is their refusal to provide the necessary funding to fully implement the law and a gleeful willingness to criticize an implementation process that is underfunded and undermined at every single turn.

Despite their best efforts, I believe that in the years to come, the majority will find that they stood on the wrong side of history, just as they stood on the wrong side of history when Social Security was passed and when Medicare came into being.

Indeed, the opponents of the Affordable Care Act have already had their day in court. Last summer, the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, putting to rest any false legal concerns that opponents had.

With the constitutionality of the law no longer in question, one might expect opponents to criticize the law's impact on our Nation's finances. But here again, the facts will stand in the way. Over the last 3 years, U.S. health care spending grew at 3.9 percent. That, Mr. Speaker, is the lowest growth rate in 50 years. And according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, repealing the Affordable Care Act would actually increase our Nation's deficit by more than $100 billion over the next 10 years. Please think of that and understand what they are trying to do away with today—the things that help you.

Mr. Speaker, providing safe, secure, and affordable health care for our citizens has been the goal of both Republican and Democrat lawmakers for generations. As far back as Theodore Roosevelt, we have acknowledged the need to provide our citizens with a health care system that puts their health before industry profits, that has as good outcomes as other parts of the world provide for their citizens. We need to treat health care as a right for all, not a privilege for the lucky few.

Under the leadership of a Democratic Congress, we managed to realize at long last this long-awaited goal by passing the Affordable Care Act through an open, deliberative, and thorough legislative process. And from reducing our Nation's health care spending to expanding health care to millions of Americans who could not afford it, the Affordable Care Act is succeeding.

It is in this light that the majority's 37th vote in 29 months to repeal health care should be judged. And it's hard to judge their politically driven vote as anything other than a disservice to the American people, a waste of taxpayer money and a way to spread misinformation.

I urge my colleagues to reject today's rule and the underlying legislation. And I reaffirm my pride in supporting the law that is already helping to save lives and already providing American people with secure and affordable health care. And after it is fully implemented next year, all Americans will benefit.

I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, now I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Budget Committee, ROGER WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of freedom and free enterprise, the hallmarks of our great American democracy. A government that places high value on these principles does not force its citizens to hand over their hard-earned money for a mandatory product, in this case health insurance. This is not how it's done in America.

Mr. Speaker, NANCY PELOSI and her Democratic colleagues rushed this bill through Congress more than 3 years ago. Democrats and Republicans can agree on one thing, that this is very flawed and is not even what Americans asked for in the first place. Even President Obama has signed into law seven bills that dismantle provisions of his health care law.

Defying common sense, the President and Democrats and Congress continue pushing forward with implementation of this disastrous law. And who wants it? Members of Obama's own party are now doubting how the law will work. Some of the key players who wrote the bill don't even want it. Senator MAX BAUCUS said the health care law is a train wreck, and Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER said that it's overly complicated and beyond comprehension.

Architects of this law don't want it, insurance companies don't want it, the majority of the public doesn't want it, organized labor doesn't want it, and as a small business owner of nearly 42 years, I can tell you that small businesses don't want it.

No business owner would run their business like the President is running this government and this massive health care overhaul. I can say from firsthand experience that small businesses—the backbone of our economy—are literally hurting.

As a job creator, I know how businesses can no longer hire. They can't take risks that would grow the economy. I've heard from people all over my district who have work available and positions ready to fill, but they can't hire anyone or else they risk going over the number of 50 employees and being subject to the ObamaCare employee mandate. Everybody wants to be at 49.

How is this good for Americans and America?

The struggling economy has already forced families to cut back and tighten their budgets. How does the President expect these hardworking taxpayers to pay an additional $3,000 each year for ObamaCare?

I've had employees come to me in tears wondering how they're going to provide coverage for their families. And even the few Americans able to keep their current insurance will see their premiums rise by an average of 73 percent.

Again, I ask, how is that good for America?

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to quote Patrick Henry. He claimed:

> The Constitution is not an instrument for the government to restrain the people. It is an instrument for the people to restrain the government—lest it come to dominate our lives and interest.

Let's put an end to the chaos and do what's right for our families, our businesses, and our tax dollars. Repeal ObamaCare today—the quicker the better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

Well, here we go again. In fact, I've lost count of how many times we've had to vote on a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The underlying legislation before us today would deny my constituents and the American people access to affordable health care. It would increase health costs and reduce benefits for millions of American families.

It's particularly ironic that during Older Americans Month, we are here voting on a bill that will eliminate benefits to seniors, including preventive services and savings on prescription drugs.

It would allow insurance companies to deny coverage to Americans with preexisting conditions, drop coverage when people get sick, reinstitute lifetime limits on coverage and charge people more based merely on gender.

□ 1310

The Affordable Care Act has already created long-lasting benefits for many of my constituents, including Theresa, a single mother of four whose youngest child is 20 and lives with a preexisting condition. Prior to the Affordable Care Act, Theresa was personally spending over $10,000 a year to pay for her care. Her daughter's medical condition prevented her from attending college. But thanks to the Affordable Care Act, she was able to be added back on to her mother's health plan. This has meant tremendous savings for Theresa, who was worried she might lose her home, along with the care her daughter desperately needed.

A vote against this rule and against the underlying legislation is a vote to protect our constituents from unfair insurance company practices, to provide relief to Americans, young and old alike, to protect job growth and creation, and for a fiscally responsible future. It is time for this Congress to move forward, not backwards.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this rule. And as a proud cosponsor of this bill to repeal ObamaCare, I think it is very important that we in this House have this vote. Yes, we've had this vote many times. I think it's important to have it again this Congress because so much more has come to light since the last time that this vote was held in the last Congress. What are some of those things? Well, of course, when NANCY PELOSI was Speaker, she famously said, ''You have to pass the bill to find out what's in it.''

Well, we're seeing more and more every day just how many devastating things are happening in our economy because of ObamaCare. In fact, how bad is it? It's so bad that one of the Senate architects of the bill, Senator MAX

BAUCUS, said: ''I see a huge train wreck coming down.''

Now, when they were in the back room writing this bill, he was the guy with the pen. He wrote the bill in the Senate, and he said it's a train wreck coming down.

Why would we want to do this to the American people? The system of health care that we have today has some problems, but why would you want to destroy the things that work? You fix the things that work.

This bill, ObamaCare, is actually scheduled to increase health care costs dramatically for American families. In fact, what will it do to our health care system? And this is what families are finding out, all across not just southeast Louisiana, the area that I represent, but all across the country. This chart shows all of the different Federal agencies that come in between a patient and their doctor in health care. It used to be the patient talking to the doctor, and they made the health care decision. That was the sacred relationship in health care. Now you've got all of these Federal agencies.

And who's at the top? The IRS. The IRS is the enforcement arm of ObamaCare. And, of course, just in the last few days we've seen the corruption at the IRS where they've literally gone and picked winners and losers, picked partisan fights, and literally tried to enforce the Obama administration's will, punishing the enemies of the Obama administration. This is not the agency that should be running health care.

We need to repeal this law and fix the real problems in health care.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and for her extraordinary leadership. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act and in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the American people would like Congress to focus their attention on increasing and growing the economy and job growth, we are instead, for the 37th time, involved in partisan politics.

It is especially troubling that our Republican colleagues have chosen to celebrate National Women's Health Week by attempting to undo the important gains that were made for women's health in the Affordable Care Act. A study issued by the Joint Economic Committee while I was chair found that across this country, under the old status quo, an estimated 64 million women lacked adequate health insurance, and 39 percent of all low-income women had no health insurance coverage at all.

A repeal now of the Affordable Care Act could mean that millions of American women could find it nearly impossible to gain insurance if they had a preexisting condition, such as pregnancy. A repeal now would take away benefits women are already receiving such as free mammograms. A repeal now would mean the end of lower-cost prescription drugs for our seniors. A repeal now would yank young people between the age of 23 and 26 off their parents' policies. A repeal now would send us back to the bad old days, to the days of preexisting conditions, gender ratings, and lifetime caps. It would mean that in this next year alone, over 1.9 million people would not have access to quality, dependable health insurance coverage.

Vote ''no'' on this repeal.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the author of the bill and a true leader in this effort, in this fight, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to listen to the clear, distinct voice of the American people. They have spoken loudly. They have spoken clearly. They heard the words of then-Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI when she famously said we must pass ObamaCare before we can know what's in it. As my colleague, STEVE SCALISE, said, now we know what's in the bill, and now we know why ObamaCare is less popular today than even before it was passed for the first time. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, the more we learn about ObamaCare, the more unpopular it becomes.

Even a Democrat, MAX BAUCUS, who helped write ObamaCare said:

> I just tell you, I see a huge train wreck coming down.

Well, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, 7 months from now when ObamaCare comes fully online, when people's health care premiums will soar through the roof, in some cases increasing 417 percent, what then, Mr. Speaker?

We see this coming, just like the *Titanic*. We see the iceberg, only it's not just in a mist, shortly in front of our eyes. We have time to turn. That's why we're here. We're here to make the turn from a train wreck.

So why not repeal that bill today? Repeal it in the House, but repeal it in the U.S. Senate, and force the President of the United States to repudiate his signature piece of legislation under his watch, which his own party calls a train wreck. It's now. Now is the time to listen to the American people.

You see, Mr. Speaker, President Obama told us, he promised us that ObamaCare would fund insurance for people with preexisting conditions. As a compassionate people, we want to help people in this very difficult situation. But ObamaCare, the truth is that it is so poorly thought out that the funding for preexisting conditions has already run out. You heard me right, Mr. Speaker: less than 1 percent of the American people with preexisting conditions got the funding and now the door has been slammed in their face.

And so I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what now? What are the remaining 99 percent of the American people with preexisting conditions supposed to do now? Now they're told we've already run out of money, and the bill hasn't even fully come into effect, the centerpiece of compassion under this bill.

And now we've learned that the IRS, the Internal Revenue Service—and I used to be a Federal tax litigation attorney, and our client was the IRS. I was involved with this agency. Now we've learned that the IRS, which is tasked with enforcing this very unpopular bill of ObamaCare, the IRS admitted they targeted Americans. They targeted conservative groups. They targeted Christians. They targeted pro-Israel people. They targeted people who are pro-business who are against accumulating debt. And, yes, they targeted Tea Party groups based upon their political and religious beliefs.

And so this gargantuan government expansion known as ObamaCare will allow bureaucrats access to our most intimate, personal health care information. It will be a huge database that government is putting together and building right now.

Under ObamaCare, the average American will pay more, they'll get less, and now they have to worry that their government may punish them because of their beliefs.

□ 1320

This is America. We don't do that in this country.

We want real solutions. We want cures for Alzheimer's. We can have it. We want cures for Parkinson's disease. It's within our grasp. We want cures for juvenile diabetes.

Spend our money there. We deserve better. The American people deserve better solutions and real reform in health care. Now is the time. Listen to the American people, and let's give them what they deserve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act and the underlying rule.

More than 3 years ago, following months of vitriolic debate and perpetual Republican talking points on socialized medicine and government-sponsored death panels, Congress passed, and the President signed into law, a historic health care reform bill that was designed to extend health care to millions of Americans and, over time, bring down the costs of health care.

Opponents of this new law didn't give up. They took their case all the way to the Supreme Court, and they lost. In the House, they held 36 votes to repeal or defund this law, and they failed.

According to an analysis from CBS News, these empty attempts at repeal

have cost taxpayers a total of $52.4 million, even as my Republican friends argue for cutting important programs like Head Start and critical nutrition programs for those most in need.

Yet here we stand, about to vote, for a 37th time, on repealing a bill that is already providing real benefits for our country.

Contrary to what my friends on the other side of the aisle may argue, we've already seen a slowdown in the overall growth of health care spending since the enactment of this law.

And just in my home State of Rhode Island, more than 170,000 women have guaranteed access to preventive services without cost-sharing; 374,000 Rhode Islanders no longer have to worry about lifetime limits on their coverage; and 9,000 young adults have gained access to health care coverage because of this law.

Let's reject this proposal, stop playing these political games, and get back to the really serious and urgent work of creating jobs, preventing gun violence, fixing our broken immigration system, passing a budget by regular order, and ending the sequester.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 17 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, President Obama and his legislative supporters promised us many things in ObamaCare. Some folks might call this misinformation, but today I call them whoppers.

Whopper No. 1: we were promised ObamaCare will reduce the deficit. Instead, according to the report from the nonpartisan GAO, ObamaCare will increase the Federal deficit by $6.2 trillion.

Secretary Sebelius, whopper No. 2: health insurance for all. She has now admitted up to 24 million Americans will lose their current health insurance.

No. 3: we were promised it will not fund abortions. Yet for the first time in decades, Americans will be forced to fund abortions through Federal insurance subsidies.

Whopper No. 4: it will create jobs. A recent nonpartisan study concluded that ObamaCare's employer mandate can put up to 3.2 million American jobs at risk.

No. 5: we were promised it will strengthen Medicare but, instead, ObamaCare contains $700 billion in cuts to Medicare and allows a bureaucratic, unelected, unaccountable panel to make these massive cuts to Medicare.

Whopper No. 6: we were promised that ObamaCare respects religious liberty. Nineteen courts disagree because the HHS mandate requires all employers to pay for insurance, including abortion drugs, irrespective of any moral objections.

Whopper No. 7: health insurance will go down, they promised. But instead, every estimate, every estimate provided by insurance providers indicates premiums will increase anywhere from 20 to 400 percent.

Whopper No. 8: it is not a tax. If it's not a tax, why does the IRS need 2,000 more agents just to implement ObamaCare? Because of the 21 tax hikes included in the bill.

And last of all and, most importantly, the biggest whopper of all: if you like your health care plan, you can keep it. My constituents, your constituents have shared real life story after story about how they will lose the coverage they like once the individual mandate goes into effect. And the CBO estimates up to 7 million Americans may lose their employer-sponsored health insurance plan.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to stop telling whoppers and start speaking the truth. It's time to repeal ObamaCare now.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. This is the Republicans' 37th callous attempt to derail health care reform.

Rather than work to create jobs and to improve our economy, Republicans are focused on taking away key patients' rights and benefits that are already improving countless American lives.

With this vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act, House Republicans are saying that they don't mind if insurance companies drop patients as soon as they get sick, or if our seniors can't afford their prescription drugs to stay healthy.

Three years after the Affordable Care Act was passed by Congress, signed into law by the President, and upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court, millions of Americans, particularly our Nation's women, are seeing meaningful protections for their health and well-being.

As a cancer survivor and as a mother of three young children, this law isn't about politics for me. It's personal.

When I was diagnosed with breast cancer at the age of 41, 5 years ago, it was like my world was coming down around me all at once.

My colleagues must understand, and we were reminded again this week, there is nothing in the world more gut-wrenching as a parent than not being able to assure your children that their mom is going to be okay, or that they won't have to worry about getting cancer someday themselves.

I was fortunate to have exceptional health care coverage, but too many women in our country have never had the ability to see a doctor, and so many face true financial hardship with a diagnosis like mine.

Over the past 5 years, I've had so many women come up to me and confess that they haven't had a mammogram in years because they can't afford the expensive co-pays or they fear the prohibitive cost of treatment. That is unacceptable in the United States of America.

Imagine how many millions in our country face terrifying health care decisions every day. This Congress has the power to protect them from uncertainty, instability, and financial ruin. That power lies in the provisions of the Affordable Care Act, tools like free preventative care and cancer screening services that help save women's lives.

We cannot waste another minute with more of these meaningless attempts to repeal a law that has already made a difference for so many of our constituents. For our children, and all families across this Nation, we must come together and work to implement this historic health care reform that is the law of the land and that is not going to be repealed.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the full repeal of the President's health care law. I believe we must repeal this law and replace it with patient-centered, market-oriented reforms that will improve patient care, broaden patient access, and reduce patient costs.

From the beginning, the President promised that his health care law would improve the quality of health care for all Americans. He said if you wanted to keep your doctor, his plan was for you. If you wanted to keep your health care plan, his law was for you. He said that if you wanted lower insurance premiums, his law was for you.

Well, the bill passed, and the people of Virginia's Fifth District are getting a full dose of it, and they don't like what they see. As I've traveled across Virginia's Fifth District, I've heard from our constituents, our Main Street businesses, our local governments, and our health care providers that this law is not living up to the President's promises.

In fact, people are not able to keep the health care plans that they've always counted on. People are being hit with spikes in insurance premiums, and people are having to take second jobs because they can't afford to live on a 29-hour workweek.

This repeal bill is important because it is an expression of the sentiment of the people I represent. They want real health care reform, not government mandates.

I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and support this bill.

□ 1330

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I rise in opposition to the Patients' Rights

Repeal Act, the 37th such time that the Republican House leadership has had us consider this.

Before I came to Congress, I was a prosecutor. And as a prosecutor, I would take my case, present evidence to the jury; the jury would reach a verdict, and the case would be closed. The same has occurred with the Affordable Care Act.

In 2009 and 2010, this body debated the Affordable Care Act. Evidence that the Affordable Care Act would increase access to quality care was presented. Evidence about eliminating preexisting conditions was presented. The law was passed by a majority of democratically elected Representatives. It was signed into law by the President of the United States, and recently it was upheld by the Supreme Court. We had an election where the President and the candidate who ran against him talked about these, and they had two very different positions, and this President who signed it into law was reelected. The verdict on the Affordable Care Act is in. The case is closed.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits are also real. In California, 5.6 million people will have access to health care.

There are very serious issues facing our country: growing and lifting our economy, having a green energy policy that makes us independent from other foreign sources of oil, and passing comprehensive immigration reform. But this House Republican leadership is acting like a frivolous litigant wasting our time voting over and over and over—37 times—to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The 37th time will not be a charm.

The definition of ''insanity'' is doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting a different result. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 45, and I urge the House Republican leadership to stop the insanity, and let's move forward on the issues that will grow our economy, make us independent from foreign sources of oil in how we find our energy, and fix a broken immigration system.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, Dr. BURGESS, for his leadership on this issue and for yielding me this time.

We just heard the speaker talk about the definition of ''insanity,'' and Americans woke up the last few weeks and realized the definition of ''insanity'' is giving massive amounts of information to thousands of new Internal Revenue Service agents who can use it as leverage over our lives.

I hope that, despite the fact that this bill is increasing costs on individuals and businesses, at least we ought to agree we don't want to hire thousands of new Internal Revenue Service agents and give them all of this information that they can use as an abusive process over our lives. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Prevent IRS Overreach Act which would at least take the Internal Revenue Service out of this provision.

I hope that we'll adopt this rule and we'll support the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. I want you to see the face of those who have been served across America. They are, yes, low-income, some are impoverished, but many are middle income. In fact, there was an article in the Texas newspaper that said, part of what drives the need for health care are Medicaid, expanded Medicaid, which is part of this great bill, the Affordable Care Act, is the fact that people are impoverished.

And so here is what my friends want to do today for the 37th time. They want to take away from 13 million Americans the health insurance that they need, that they were able to secure with rebates from the health insurance companies. They want to take away from 105 million Americans, 71 million Americans in private plans, who have received free preventative services. They want to be able to tell the women who needed mammograms and additional tests for breast cancer that you can't go in and get the preventative care that you need to save lives. Oh, yes. They want to tell 17 million children with preexisting disease you cannot go in anymore and be covered.

The conversation over here is plain foolish. They're only talking about their economics—their economics of wealth. Yes, maybe their districts have not felt the pain of racial disparities which they're going to eliminate if they get rid of this bill. Maybe they are not in one of these States, 10 States like Texas that has 28.4 percent uninsured, along with the Louisiana, Arkansas, Georgia and many others, Florida, that have uninsured people who need this. Maybe they'll tell the 6.6 million children that have taken advantage of the law today to obtain health insurance for preexisting disease that they cannot do that, or maybe they'll tell the seniors that you can go back into the doughnut hole again.

I don't know why we're doing this, but I will tell you that I see that lives are saved.

I introduced an amendment to make sure that we didn't lose the federally qualified health clinics. When you repeal this bill, you will dash the hopes of those who have been walking into their neighborhoods, going into federally qualified health clinics and getting the good care that they need.

All this is is spoiled grapes. That's what this is. Drink the wine and leave us alone, and make sure that we keep the Patients' Bill of Rights and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Dr. BURGESS, thank you for yielding.

The ObamaCare law must be ripped out by its roots, and it needs to be replaced with something that makes sense for my patients and my colleagues so that we can deliver good quality health care.

ObamaCare is a destroyer. It's going to destroy the doctor-patient relationship. It's going to destroy the quality of health care in America. It's going to destroy budgets: personal budgets, family budgets, business budgets, State budgets, and even the Federal budget. It's a big spending bill. We've got to stop this outrageous spending.

I just got off the phone with our Governor, Nathan Deal, and he told me that the cost of health care for State employees in Georgia has gone up 12 percent because of ObamaCare, and it's going higher. I just got an email from a businessman in Georgia who said that his premiums have doubled since last year because of ObamaCare.

We must rip it out by the roots and replace it with my Patient OPTION Act that's a market-based, patient-centered health care plan that will literally make health care cheaper for everybody in this country. It will provide coverage for all Americans, and it's going to save Medicare from going broke. ObamaCare is going to break the bank for everybody, and it just must be repealed and replaced with my Patient OPTION Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the previous speaker.

I feel very badly about his constituent whose health care price has gone up, but I want to say that that's because the insurance companies raise those prices. ObamaCare is not yet in effect for small businesses.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm sorry, I haven't got the time. It's all allocated. But I will talk to you later about it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. It's ObamaCare that's running the cost up, not the insurance companies.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. No, it's not. It's the insurance coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Patients' Rights Repeal Act and the rule.

Now, there's nothing wrong with working to improve the Affordable Care Act. We should work to make quality health care more affordable and more available to all Americans. But repeal is not a solution and has real and serious consequences for folks in Connecticut. Even worse, this vote is a tremendous waste of time when we

have serious work to do for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the 37th time—the 37th time—Congress is voting to repeal health care reform.

Five months after the tragic attack in Newtown in my district, House Republican leaders continue to refuse to allow a single vote—a single vote—on commonsense gun legislation to reduce gun violence. Instead of voting on enhanced background checks, a reform supported by over 90 percent of the American people, Congress has now devoted 15 percent of its time to trying to repeal health care.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for Congress to stop wasting time on pointless political gamesmanship and to get to work for the American people.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, STEVE KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And as I listen to the gentlelady talk about enhanced background checks, it just occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we repeal ObamaCare, we can save more lives by bringing real health care reform to this country and restoring the doctor-patient relationship, providing incentives for research and development, and letting our health care system continue to modernize instead of freezing its development and atrophy, as it will, under a government-controlled program.

As I listened to the gentlelady earlier offer her opening remarks on the rule for the Affordable Care Act, it occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that it really isn't the name of it. It is the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, that long lingo that nobody knew what it was, so it was market tested and reduced down to the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1340

We know it's the Unaffordable Care Act, that's why we call it ObamaCare. It was passed by legislative shenanigans, and it passed in the dark of the night. They had to split some of it out and pass it by reconciliation because even the voters in Massachusetts, to replace Teddy Kennedy's seat, elected a Republican to put a block to ObamaCare. That's an extraordinary event to happen in America. Eighty-seven new freshman Republicans came into this Congress as a result of it; the Blue Dog Democrats became essentially politically extinct because of ObamaCare; and the promises that were made were obviously not kept.

We remember the President's promises. There were three big promises that he made: if you like your doctor, you can keep him—or her. No, we all know that's not true.

If you like your insurance and your insurance premium, you get to keep it. Your premiums aren't going to go up. We know that's not true. The costs have gone up. The premiums are going up. There was a discussion about a 73 percent—apparently an average number that the earlier gentleman spoke about—premium increase with ObamaCare. I can tell you that those numbers that say up to 400 percent, they are real.

Two and a half months ago, I sat down with the health insurance underwriters. They gave an example of a 28-year-old woman who's satisfied with her share of her individual policy premium today at $200 a month. If she smokes, she would see the premium go up from $200 to $800 a month. It is a malignant tumor that's metastasizing on American liberty. It must be ripped out by the roots and completely repealed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result, that's insanity. This week, House Republicans are trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time. Thirty-six failed attempts weren't enough?

More than 105 million Americans have had arbitrary lifetime coverage caps lifted because of this law. Up to 17 million children with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage. And more than 6.5 million children up to the age of 26 now have coverage on their parents' plan, about half of whom would otherwise be uninsured.

Why would anyone want to roll all of this back? Why would anyone waste 43 days—as Republicans have done so far—to repeal a bill that does so much for the American people? It's not smart; it's not logical. More importantly, it's not right.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think there is one thing America needs to know that simplifies this debate very clearly. The only people exempt from ObamaCare is the President, the Vice President—the committee staff that wrote the bill exempted themselves from the bill, and the Federal agencies that are implementing ObamaCare are exempt from the very law that they're shoving down the throats of the American people.

The Democrat majority that passed this bill over the objections of the overwhelming majority of the Nation didn't even bother to read it. Speaker NANCY PELOSI said we have to pass the bill to see what's in it. They have no concept of what was in it.

I had the chance to ask the financial genius Charles Schwab recently what are two things we could do to really create jobs and grow the economy. He said: repeal Dodd-Frank and repeal ObamaCare—two of the most destructive pieces of legislation ever passed by the United States Congress, done by a Democrat majority that didn't even bother to read it and exempted themselves from it. The committee staff that wrote the bill exempted themselves from it. The Federal agencies that are implementing it are exempt from ObamaCare, but they stuck it on all the American people, including the Members of Congress. We're all under it, but President Obama and Vice President BIDEN are not. And that's all you need to know.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. To respond to what we just heard—and none of us are exempt; I don't know what in the world that's all about—I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. The House deserves a vigorous debate on any question. It also deserves the factual record.

The President, the Vice President, and the employees of the executive branch are subject to the law in the following way: because they receive coverage through their employer, their employer is subject to the rules of the law.

The second thing I want to make very, very clear: no Member of the House of Representatives is exempt from this law in any way, shape, or form. None. As far as the committee staffs are concerned, the committee staffs that you refer to are members of the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. Nothing in the law changes that. Just as any other person in America who is insured by their employer, they have to live by these same kinds of rules. This just isn't true.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. The committee staff is exempt. The President of the United States is exempt.

Mr. ANDREWS. No, they're not.

Reclaiming my time, this is just not correct. There is no one exempt from this coverage.

Does the gentleman agree that he is not exempt from this coverage? Are you exempt?

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would yield to the gentleman. Are you exempt from this law, sir?

Mr. CULBERSON. Members of Congress are covered, but the committee staff that wrote the bill are exempt.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey controls the time.

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee staffs who were involved in writing the bill are Federal employees subject to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act.

There have been many distortions about this law; this is just one of them.

I want to point out that one of the earlier speakers said that there's a GAO study that says this increases the deficit by some imaginary number. The scorekeeper around here for deficits is the Congressional Budget Office. They say it reduces the deficit by $100 billion.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the status of time for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for his consideration.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today we're having a vigorous debate about President Obama's health care bill. The reason why we're doing this is that there have been seven or eight different provisions already that have been repealed from this bill in the last 2 years because either it was fraud, it was onerous, or it would not work.

The reason why we are on the floor today is not to waste time, but to give the American people, through representative government, an opportunity to say we now know more about that bill that was not read.

Here's what we know: we know that it is a trillion-dollar-plus spending bill—trillion dollars that would have been in Americans' pockets to make their own decisions about their health care, but now it is flowing to the Federal Government. And what it is doing is arbitrarily causing our country—and this is based upon the laws that are already in place in this country of what will happen to the debt of our country. President Obama and Democrats have led us to trillion-dollar deficits every single year the President has been in office.

This is just the beginning. At some point our country will cease to become what it is—a great Nation—because we will join the likes of Eastern Europe. And it is directly because of tax increases and ObamaCare, which limits the size of small business and businesses that want to get under this threshold of 50 employees. So it arbitrarily will diminish the dreams of Americans who want to build their business from a small business to a larger business simply to avoid the IRS, who will be in their business about health care.

So the Rules Committee is, rightfully so, bringing this bill to the floor—another time—for the American people who are saying—not only publicly in polls, but through their Representatives—this is not a pathway we want to keep going on.

We have to stop the bankruptcy of American business. We need to go back to where we have a vibrant economy, where college graduates at least stand a chance to be able to have a job and to move our country forward.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

□ 1350

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule that will allow the House to vote on what the country really needs right now: a bill to create more American jobs. The SEAM Act would help to not only create more jobs, but more American-made products, by creating tax credits for productive American manufacturers in the energy innovation industry.

I ask the majority to stop these political games—this bill has had no committee action and no discussion; it is simply brought back over and over—and work with us for a change to put some smart policies forward.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I do not believe that the Affordable Care Act is perfect. I also do not believe that Congress serves the American people by engaging in a partisan fight on this floor for the 37th time.

Is the law perfect? No.

Can we—and should we—come together, stop fighting, and get back to the work of the people? Yes.

There is broad agreement in our country that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect. So let's start there. Instead of fighting, Congress should work together to fix this law and make it work for Americans.

Today, I believe our time is best served by working together to create that which our country so badly needs—jobs. Hardworking families are waiting for us to deliver on a promise that brought many of us to this Chamber—a jobs bill that puts Americans back to work.

My amendment, the Security in Energy and Manufacturing Act, creates high-paying clean-energy jobs. It supports American businesses that create innovative energy products and hire workers here in America. This is a jobs proposal to help American businesses grow and stay competitive in a global marketplace. I want businesses in my community to put their innovative energy products right into our economy.

Energy innovation is quickly becoming one of the world's largest industries. Countries all over the world purchase billions of dollars worth of innovative products. I want to see those products made in America, not China. I want Arizona and America to be globally competitive.

By defeating the previous question, we have the opportunity to restore U.S. manufacturing jobs. Our constituents sent us here—Democrats and Republicans alike—to work together and get Americans back to work. My proposal does just that.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to start out by saying I ran a small business for 25 years before entering Congress, and I always carried health insurance on my employees. But the required coverages under ObamaCare are far in excess of the coverage I ever carried. We never carried mental health coverage. We didn't carry substance abuse coverage. We didn't carry vision or dental.

Guess what, employers? You won't have that choice anymore. The Federal Government will dictate to you what coverages you must carry on your employees.

My colleagues across the aisle speak about jobs. This act has had a horrible stifling effect on hiring in this economy. Seventy percent of small businesses indicate this act has created doubt as to whether or not they will hire additional employees. Small businesses are cutting hours of their employees from 40 back to 30 so that they won't be considered full-time employees under this act.

Hardworking Americans are suffering today because of this act. Doctors, physicians, are already dropping out of the system. It's been estimated that up to 15 percent of hospitals will close if this act is ultimately implemented.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if my colleague has any more speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. I have an additional speaker, and then my close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Then I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I'm from northern California, which is the land of the original 49ers. That was based on the Gold Rush of about 160 years ago.

Now I see we are creating a new group of 49ers, and it is certainly not heading towards a gold rush for the country. These new 49ers are the people that have to limit the jobs of their small business to 49 or less in order to stay out of the clutches of ObamaCare.

We also are creating a group called 29ers, who have to see their hours cut to less than 30 hours because their employer is out of options; again, because of ObamaCare.

As a farmer, I know that when things aren't going right with the farm you have to learn to cut your losses. In this situation here, we need to have the good sense to not spend good money after bad. It is time that we take a good, hard look at this Obama health care takeover and decide to repeal it.

In California, we seem to have a lot of boondoggles, to include the high-speed rail project, which prices could quadruple over its original cost. We are seeing the same type of boondoggle with this Obama health care takeover.

Let's do the right thing to preserve jobs and preserve people's health care plans as they are and not have this boondoggle upon our entire country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to be very succinct. What you have heard today is probably the same kind of debate that took place in this Chamber on both Social Security and Medicare. Those two programs, Medicare operates with a 2 percent overhead. Most private insurance operates between 20 and 25 percent. It is a bargain, and it has lifted millions of seniors in this country out of poverty.

This bill will provide for us the type of health care that we deserve and that we need based on outcomes and not on a plethora of tests each doctor gives.

I am absolutely astonished on what we have heard today, but there are a couple of things I really want you to remember. One, today we have spent $53 million on this debate on just to repeal this law—$53 million. If you are frugal at all—and I am—believe me, that burns me up. I can think of many, many things we can use that for.

Almost 7 million jobs have been created in health care since this bill passed—7 million. Four million more are to come. The two things that we really want to do is provide good health care and good jobs in this economy.

For heaven's sake, let's not see this bill up again. Take a good, hard look at it. See all the benefits in it for all of your constituents. You don't want to go home and tell the women and tell the seniors and tell the people with preexisting conditions that you don't care about them.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Vote ''no.''

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

It was, indeed, a very dark day 3 years ago in March when this bill was brought to the House floor, 11 o'clock at night, 11:30 at night, and passed this House of Representatives after members of the Democratic conference, the majority Democratic conference, were lied to by the administration about an executive order to prevent the funding for abortion. That is what tipped the balance. That is what brought those last few wavering votes.

How did we get to that point? Well, throughout 2009, throughout the year, the House had, indeed, considered the health care question. My Committee on Energy and Commerce did have a markup on H.R. 3200. They took a lot of amendments. Some amendments I offered; some amendments were bipartisan. All of those amendments that were accepted by the committee at some point evaporated at the opening of day, whatever happened over in the Speaker's Office, and they were gone. The health care bill which the Energy and Commerce Committee passed out at 1,000 pages grew to 2,000 pages in the Speaker's Office, and all the Republican amendments were stripped out.

And then what happened? Well, H.R. 3200 died. It is gone. Nobody has ever seen or heard of it since. That was the House health care product.

What, in fact, happened was, down at the White House in July of 2009, there were secret meetings that took place. There were six special interest groups that met with the President's folks down at the White House—Nancy-Ann DeParle, Rahm Emanuel's brother. These are the folks that constructed the basis of what has now become known as ObamaCare.

The insurance companies don't hate this law. They like this law. Look what has happened to their insurance stock since the law has passed. They have doubled or tripled in value. That is because they had a seat at the table when this thing was crafted, and it was crafted according to their liking. But who really wrote the nuts and bolts of the bill was the staff on the Senate Finance Committee between Thanksgiving and Christmas.

□ 1400

H.R. 3590, which passed the floor of this House 3 years ago, was a bill that had never had a single hearing in the House of Representatives. It had never had a markup in a single House committee. H.R. 3590 had passed under suspension in the House of Representatives in July of 2009 as a housing bill. It went over to the Senate to await further action. The further action was an amendment offered by HARRY REID to ''strike all after the enacting clause and insert,'' and the health care language was inserted. It came back over here and languished for 3 months. Nobody read it. Then the Speaker forced it through the House of Representatives a few minutes before midnight on March 18 of 2010.

That's why we're having this debate today. Sure, there have been other efforts to repeal this. There was a full repeal in January of 2011, remember? Republicans won 84 House seats, so it was natural to have a repeal vote. After the Supreme Court had their ruling, it was important to reiterate that position. Now we're doing it again.

The other repeal votes that have happened, many of them have been bipartisan. The 1099—you guys liked that? Do you want that paperwork requirement to come back? The President signed the 1099 repeal. What about the CLASS Act? You all voted for that. I didn't. The CLASS Act was repealed on the fiscal cliff vote. The President signed it. The repeal votes that have happened in between have been relatively minor in scope, perfecting amendments, if you will.

The fact of the matter is you can't perfect this thing. It was a dog at the beginning, and it's a dog at the end. We ought to do the right thing. Let's bring up the bill. Let's pass it. Let's send it over to the Senate.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule and the underlying legislation because this bill would repeal the Affordable Care Act. The American people have been engaged in a debate over universal healthcare for six generations.

In 1949, Harry Truman became the first sitting President to propose universal healthcare for all Americans as part of the ''Fair Deal.''

On March 23, 2010, with the stroke of President Obama's pen, the American people received this part of the ''Fair Deal.'' This bill did not become law in the dead of night, but in the full process this body affords serious consideration of legislation. There were committee hearings, staff and member meetings, amendments and a final vote in both the House and the Senate before it was sent to the President's desk.

The Affordable Care Act has been affirmed to be law by every means provided by our nation's constitution:

On March 21, 2010, the House passed the Affordable Care Act following Senate Consideration of the bill.

On March 23, 2010, President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law.

On June 28, 2012, the United States Supreme Court issued an opinion in National Federation of Independent Businesses v. Sebelius, affirming the constitutionality of the law—leaving intact the majority of the incentives to expand healthcare coverage to millions of Americans.

The Affordable Care Act was a central issue in the Presidential election of 2012. The candidate who signed the Affordable Care Act into law won the election by 51.1 percent of the popular vote and 62 percent of the electoral vote.

Why are we here for the 37th time in three years to again vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act?

It is difficult to recall any series of actions within a short time period that have overcome every hurdle that our system of government has to establish and affirm that a law—is the law of this nation.

I believe Mr. Speaker it is important to remind new members of this body and those who are closely watching this debate that the Affordable Care Act is law. People living in each of the Congressional Districts represented in this body are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act.

The leadership of this Congress may want to give new members of Congress the opportunity to tell the people back home that they voted to repeal ''Obamacare.'' Unfortunately, they are also toying with the emotions of people who know that without the Affordable Care Act they have no other option for healthcare.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans are already seeing lower costs, better coverage, and patient protections that Republicans want to repeal:

13 million Americans benefited from $1.1 billion in rebates sent to them from their health insurance companies last year.

105 million Americans have access to free preventive services, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors on Medicare.

Millions of women began receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive services in August 2012.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage.

Nearly 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

6.6 million young adults up to age 26 have health insurance through their parents' plan, half of whom would be uninsured without this coverage.

6.3 million Seniors in the 'donut hole' have already saved $6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 small employers have already taken advantage of the Small Business Health Care Tax Credit to provide health insurance to 2 million workers.

Because of the Affordable Care Act 3.8 million people in Texas—including 2.2 million seniors on Medicare now receive preventative care services. Over 7 million Texans no longer have to fear lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance. Texas parents of 300,731 young adults can sleep easier at night knowing that their children can remain on their health insurance until age 26.

The protection provided by this law is a guarantee to 5 million Texas residents that their insurance companies will spend 80 percent of their premium dollars on healthcare, or customers will get a rebate from their insurance company.

In my state, there are 4,029 people who had no insurance because of pre-existing conditions, but today the Affordable Care Act has provided them with access to coverage. The Affordable Care Act means that many Texans are free of worry about having access to healthcare insurance.

However, the list of benefits from the Affordable Care Act is not completed. In 2014, the Affordable Care Act's final provisions will become available to our citizens. Insurance companies will be banned from:

discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition

charging higher rates based on gender or health status

enforcing lifetime dollar limits

enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits

In 2014, access to affordable healthcare for the self employed or those who decide to purchase their own coverage will be easier because of Affordable Insurance Exchanges. There will be a one stop marketplace where consumers can do what Federal employees have done for decades—purchase insurance at reasonable rates from an insurer of their choice. This will assure that health care consumers can get the care that they need from the medical professionals they trust.

I do not believe that the healthcare law is perfect—but what is worse—is the imperfection of the House Leadership in allowing this continued rehashing of a debate over a law that is not going away.

Congress should be working to mend the Affordable Care Act where we believe it can be improved, and not end healthcare security for millions of our constituents. Healthcare is the difference between life and death for too many of our constituents. The bill that needs to be amended or rejected is the one before us: H.R. 45.

For this reason, I offered amendments before the Rules Committee to address minority health disparities, medical payments to small physician owned hospitals, and a plan to study the impact of the healthcare law.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 1 would have removed all of the bill text following the enacting clause of the legislation, which would have ended this exercise to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This legislation is so bad it cannot be salvaged and the United States would be better off without it.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 2 would have ensured full Medicare reimbursement to all hospitals including physician owned hospitals with at least 100 beds, provided they could produce reliable records to document their claims for reimbursement.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 3 would have authorized additional funding to establish Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs). These centers are the last line of defense provided in the bill to make sure those living on the margins of society—the poorest of the poor had access to reliable healthcare. FQHC programs would be based in clinics, community based health care centers and pro-active outreach programs that target the homeless or marginally housed with information on how to get access to good healthcare.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 4 would have expanded state use of the Medicaid option of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care law when the uninsured rate of qualifying residents of a state exceeds 20 percent. States wishing to opt-out of Medicaid would have the option of submitting a plan to reduce the rate of uninsured to 20 percent or less to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. This amendment would have benefited Texas enormously since it leads the nation in uninsured residents at 28.8 percent. In fact Texas has held this number 1 ranking, of the state with the highest number of uninsured residents, for the last five consecutive years.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 5 would have established a program to conduct studies of minority health disparities. The Amendment directed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit an annual report of findings regarding minority health disparities and make recommendations on how disparities may be reduced.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 6 expressed the Sense of the Congress that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is law in the United States of America. The amendment enumerated each step that made it the law including a decision by the United States Supreme Court. The amendment then directed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report to Congress on the impact of the law on those it is intended to help. The Amendment would have not allowed this Congress to revisit repeal until it had research on the impact of the law to guide its further deliberation of repeal.

This Congress has work that needs to be done, and it has work that should be taken up to restore workers, their families and communities to sound economic health.

The healthcare law has many benefits—but I will redouble my efforts to mend the parts that need additional work and educate my constituents so that they can take advantage of the benefits of having access to healthcare.

For all of these reasons, I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on the Rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 215 OFFERED BY MRS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1424) to require the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to establish the Make It In America Incentive Grant Program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1424.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 215, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 193, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—12

Campbell
Clyburn
Cohen
Duckworth
Duffy
Johnson, Sam
Keating
Labrador
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Quigley
Wagner

□ 1430

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—226

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

Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—15

Brooks (AL)
Campbell
Clyburn
Cohen
Duckworth
Duffy
Johnson, Sam
Keating
Labrador
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pearce
Quigley
Wagner
Walberg

□ 1440

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, as many of you know, this is National Police Week. Law enforcement officers throughout our country are gathered here in our Nation's Capital to remember those who have fallen in the line of duty. As a former sheriff and police officer, I couldn't be more proud to be part of this family.

Unfortunately, last year, we lost 120 brave men and women, and this year we've already lost 41.

When tragedy strikes, as it recently did in Boston, we're reminded of these officers' selfless courage. Yet we often forget that these men and women are at risk every time they report for duty. Every time they kiss a loved one goodbye, they never know if it's going to be for the last time. Day in and day out, they put their lives on the line to keep us—our communities, our towns, and our cities—safe. For this, we owe them a debt of gratitude.

So in honor of these law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifice to keep us safe, may we please have a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and the House will observe a moment of silence.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 132, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—277

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—132

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barr
Bass
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan

Joyce
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lowenthal
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meehan
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sires
Slaughter
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Valadao
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—23

Beatty
Burgess
Campbell
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Duckworth
Duffy
Farr
Gohmert
Grijalva
Johnson, Sam
Keating
Labrador
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Messer
Nunes
Quigley
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Wagner

□ 1450

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 36

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor to House Resolution 36.

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

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 45.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 679, I call up the bill (H.R. 436) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 215, the amendment printed in House Report 113–59 is considered adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 45

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF PPACA AND HEALTH CARE-RELATED PROVISIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.

(a) PPACA.—Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), such Act is repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such Act) are restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted.

(b) HEALTH CARE-RELATED PROVISIONS IN THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.—Effective as of the enactment of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152), title I and subtitle B of title II of such Act are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such title or subtitle, respectively, are restored or revived as if such title and subtitle had not been enacted.

SEC. 2. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THIS ACT.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, as long as such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate shall not exceed 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the chair and ranking minority of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

You know, it is just absolutely amazing that we are once again here on the floor to repeal ObamaCare, but it is a necessary step that we find that we have to do.

It is so interesting being out in my district. Whether I am talking to State-elected officials or county-elected officials or talking to those who are employers in our district—those who are job creators—repeatedly we hear from them: this is a bill that turned into a law that is too expensive to afford.

One of the reasons—and I would point this out—this is a copy of the law as published. What it has turned into is 13,000 pages of regulation. Indeed, I wanted to bring that tower of red tape here to the floor today. It is seven feet tall and growing. It was too big to be allowed on the House floor.

It is amazing that much regulation that has come from this 2,700-page bill. Now we find out from The Washington Post and The New York Times that Secretary Sebelius had conversations with some companies and organizations asking them to help fund getting this started.

Why is this happening? Three years ago, we were told it would be an $800 billion bill. And guess what? When we went to the Budget Committee this year, $2.6 trillion is the estimated cost of this bill. So insurance—more expensive. It was to save households $2,500 a year, but instead they're already paying $3,000 more. And the survey that Chairman MURPHY ran for us in the Energy and Commerce Committee shows that the cost will go anywhere up to about 400 percent, depending on who you are, what group you're in. That's what you're going to see your insurance cost go up to.

We hear from physicians. Harder to get in to see a physician? Yes, it is.

Our goal should be about how do we preserve access to affordable health care for all Americans. Instead, what my friends across the aisle have done is to focus on how do you centralize health care, run up the cost, and decrease access. That is the reason that we are here on the floor today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act because what the Republicans will do is take away all the benefits the American people are already seeing under this law and they will stop the full implementation of it to provide millions of people with health insurance opportunities.

Our Republican colleagues say they want to provide access to health care. They want to do something about people with preexisting conditions. They say they care about stopping discriminatory practices. They want to lower the deficit. They want to stop rising health care costs. This bill, the Affordable Care Act, is the one piece of legislation that takes major steps on these issues.

Republicans offered nothing but opposition over and over again. This is the 37th time the House will vote to repeal the patients' rights bill. From the very beginning, the Republicans opposed it. They said it will kill jobs, and they were wrong. They said the law would drive up health care costs through the roof. They were wrong. We're seeing the slowest growth in health care spending in decades.

They've ignored the significant benefits that are helping tens of millions of people, such as 3 million young adults who have coverage through their parents' plans, 6 million seniors who have saved over $6 billion on their prescription drugs, 13 million Americans who have received over $1 billion in rebates from their insurers, over 100 million Americans who have access to free preventive care who no longer face lifetime limits on their coverage. And the Congressional Budget Office still confirms that the law cuts the deficit by $100 billion in the first decade and more than $1 trillion in the second.

The Republican Patients' Rights Repeal Act undoes all of these benefits. They add to the deficit, and they send us back to the days when insurance companies were in charge, costs were skyrocketing, and tens of millions either had no coverage—especially if they had preexisting conditions—or coverage that they could depend on.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Health Care Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, in two separate forums, I met with members of the Lancaster County and the Chester County Chambers of Commerce, representing dozens of businesses and municipalities across my district, about the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. Every single one of them had grave concerns with the law. They're confused and deeply concerned about how it will affect their ability to provide care and jobs.

We're only a few months away from implementation of the employer mandate, and there are many unanswered questions. Each employer I talked to had pressing questions, but time and again I had to tell them that I didn't have an answer because HHS, the IRS, or the Department of Labor hadn't issued rules or guidance yet.

□ 1500

This uncertainty is leaving them paralyzed, holding off on hiring and wondering whether they will be able to provide coverage for their employees.

It is not just businesses that are hurting. I heard from school districts operating on tight budgets who said they have no choice but to outsource loyal hourly employees like cafeteria workers and special ed aides, going to part-time work.

Workers are losing their jobs, losing work hours, losing benefits to this bureaucratic nightmare. Let's stop the damage, and let's repeal the train wreck before it occurs.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our time from the Energy and Commerce Committee be controlled by our subcommittee ranking member, Congressman FRANK PALLONE from the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. I greatly respect my colleagues on the other side from Tennessee and from Pennsylvania, but I have to say they are simply obstructionists.

This is what we get from the GOP on a daily basis. Nothing happens here in the House of Representatives. We know there is a problem. Historically, there has been a problem with health care and a lot of people not having insurance or having discriminatory practices or not being able to get on their parents' insurance policy. So we as Democrats came up with a solution, and that solution is working.

We have kids now—almost 6 million or 7 million kids—that are now on their parents' policies. We have a situation where we are plugging up the doughnut hole in Medicare for part D prescription drugs for seniors. We have all kinds of preventive care that is out there relative to women's health. And the list goes on and on. These things are happening. Beginning next year, most Americans will have health insurance.

What do I hear from the other side? They don't want solutions. I'll be honest with my colleagues: if you really care, why don't you make some suggestions, and maybe we can work together. Anything can be improved. I don't say that anything can't be improved.

But, no, they come on the floor, and what do they want to do? Just repeal it, which is not a solution. It basically would eliminate all the progress that we have made in terms of health care.

Yes, costs are not going up as much. And, yes, people are getting rebates if their insurance companies charge them too much. All these things are happening because of the Affordable Care Act.

All I hear from you is: no, obstructionism. No, we have to repeal this because this is such a terrible thing. Bringing in all these distractions about what the Secretary of Health and Human Services is doing.

This is not what you are elected to do. You are not elected to come here and just repeal things and say how bad everything is. You are supposed to come up with solutions. I never hear it from the other side of the aisle. I simply do not hear it, which is why I get very upset the 37th time, the 38th time we are going to vote on the same thing, which is repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond.

We trust our constituents and the American people. We don't need government control of this. Certainly we don't need the IRS policing our private health care information. There is nothing affordable about the Affordable Care Act, and that is why we are concerned.

At this point, I want to yield 1 minute to the chairman of our conference, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, from Washington.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama's health care proposal became law, he told us that it would lower costs, improve quality, cover everyone with preexisting conditions, and ensure that those under 26 would remain insured. But today, when we pull back the curtain, the American people see that this law has just made things worse.

The President promised that premiums would go down. In fact, he said families would see an average decrease in premiums by $2,500. Instead, the average family has seen premiums go up by over $3,000. And they are hitting young people hard, some facing increases up to 200 percent and many losing insurance.

The President promised those with preexisting health conditions would be covered. Unfortunately, just over 100,000 people enrolled in the program before he declared it ran out of money.

The President promised that his plan would lead to all Americans having health insurance. But CBO already estimates that 30 million people will still be uninsured even after the law is fully implemented.

We need to replace this policy with one that helps Americans.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our chairman emeritus from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a prodigious waste of the time of the House working on a bad piece of legislation. I rise today in strong opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

My Republican colleagues are up for the 37th time with this nonsense, and they are fully determined to take away all of the rights that we have given under the Affordable Care Act to the people of the United States.

People are going to go back in the doughnut hole, courtesy of the Republicans. No longer will people be protected against being excluded from insurance because of preexisting conditions. And it is going to be possible now for insurance companies to kick people off insurance plans because they get sick while they have a policy. Kids are not going to go on their parents' policies after they are 26 if we pass this nonsensical legislation.

Einstein said that expecting a different result from things done over and over again is proof of insanity. Well, this is insanity. But worse than that, it is a waste of time of the people in the Congress and the money of the United States citizens who pay our wages.

This is a bad proposal. Vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said by many, including everyone from Albert Einstein to Benjamin Franklin, that the very definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results.

We gather here in this Chamber today not to work on behalf of the American people, but instead to partake in our 37th round of insanity—repeal of a law that is already helping our struggling American families.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: just what part of helping the American people are you opposed to? Are you content in this preposterous display that is, by its very definition, insanity?

You are reinstating the lifetime cap on coverage for people—including children—telling

them there's nothing more that can be done for them, because their insurance provider said so.

You are ending the closing of the so-called ''donut hole'' and allowing millions of seniors to see increases in prescription drug costs, amounting to thousands and thousands of dollars in additional burdens on our seniors.

You are eliminating tax credits for more than 4 million American small businesses that stand to benefit from providing coverage for their workers, ensuring they can continue to work and provide for their business in good health and wellness.

You are telling the American people that it's fine for insurance companies to drop them from coverage just because they got sick.

You are returning our American children to the uncertain and vulnerable times when ''preexisting conditions'' meant their life and livelihood was less important than the bottom lines of insurance executives.

You are denying care for 6.6 million young people who qualify to stay on their parents' plan until age 26. Is that your preferred way of protecting and promoting the future leaders of our nation?

My friends, all that this 37th repeal vote offers is yet another piece of evidence in proving the newfound insanity of this body, further emulating the ''do-nothing'' Congress that was the 112th.

This is not what we should be wasting our time with—this is nothing more than political posturing so House Freshmen can make the same foolish mistakes of their most immediate predecessors.

This is not a vote for the American people, rather it is a callous disregard for the health and wellbeing of those who continue to work, each and every day, to make our nation great, provide for their families and ask for nothing more than a fair shot at the American Dream.

I will remind my colleagues that the very best way of protecting the American Dream is by protecting the American people—the very best asset our country holds.

We should be doing the nation's business in a cooperative manner, not working to further divide all of us who are so deeply in need of bipartisanship and unity.

Today's insane and useless vote will bring the total amount of taxpayer dollars wasted on hours upon hours of legislative attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act to $52.4 million dollars in just three years since it became the law of the land, and just one year since the Supreme Court upheld it and ensured the care and cost-saving measures that all American families deserve.

I ask you, my colleagues, to oppose this insane legislation, end this further waste of taxpayer dollars, and bring this body back to the honest and necessary job we owe to the people we're blessed to represent.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee at Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the health care bill, indeed, has some good things in it: no lifetime cap, kids on their parents policy, people can't be denied, and some prevention. But good intentions do not guarantee good results.

Because of the guarantee of this bill, we were told it would lower costs; and we are now in a position where it may cost families more, and they won't be able to cover it.

On top of $835 billion in taxes, our Energy and Commerce Committee did a study. Getting responses from 17 insurance companies, they reported there will be a 96 percent increase in cost for those getting a new policy, 73 percent for those keeping, and some will be as high as 413 percent. Some will see lower costs, but most Americans will see some increase in the health care costs.

That is a reason why we need to repeal this and get back to really reforming health care, keeping the good parts. But Americans cannot afford this. And when it is not affordable, it is not accessible care.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, here we are again voting for the 37th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a law the Supreme Court has deemed constitutional. This is nothing more than a feel-good moment for new Members of the GOP who didn't get to vote on repeal in the last Congress.

If the new standard for scheduling votes is to provide wish fulfillment for Members of Congress, then I have a few requests:

If we are going to vote almost 40 times to repeal health care coverage for millions of Americans, I would like to have the chance to vote against the Defense of Marriage Act 40 more times. I had the pleasure to vote against it in 1996. I am sure there is a new generation of Members who would like to vote against it, and I would like to do it again.

Furthermore, I regret being a teenager when the Civil Rights Act was voted on. I would like a chance to lend my support to that landmark law.

To be able to cast a vote to go to war against Nazi Germany would be very satisfying to me.

I have contributed to Social Security my whole life; and since my father was not a Member of Congress in 1932, I would like to vote on his behalf to support the creation of Social Security.

I was a student of history in my youth, and I feel very strongly that the Compromise of 1850 was the point of no return leading to the Civil War. I would like a chance to vote against it.

I ask that the Republican leadership add all of these to the agenda in the weeks to come.

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Clearly, we have plenty of time available for wish fulfillment, rather than substantive measures such as the economy, immigration reform, and putting people back to work.

So I would like an opportunity to vote again on many different things as well.

□ 1510

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, we are once again voting to totally repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare.

Now, the most senior members of the Energy and Commerce Committee from the Democratic side stand up here and say this is the 37th time that we have voted for total repeal. No, it's the third time. We are voting for total repeal for a third time because Republicans and Democrats and 65 percent—young and old—of the people across this country demand total repeal. They know that they don't want the government taking over one-sixth of our economy and Washington bureaucrats imposing a massive tax increase on middle class Americans and small business owners.

As the government becomes more involved in health care, doctors and patients become further removed—more involved, further removed—from their own health care decisions, and this will result in a more expensive and a more dysfunctional system. Patients should have more control of their medical decisions, and reform should be driven at the State level rather than rushing through legislation that we have to read to find out what's in it. Now, Mr. Speaker, small businesswomen and men have to read a stack of rules and regulations 7-feet high to find out that, truly, the devil is in the details.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. As both a physician and a taxpayer, fully repealing ObamaCare is my top priority, and I am proud that we will soon take yet another step toward this critically important goal.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Here we go again, and my colleague from Georgia knows it: 37 times, counting today, that the Republican majority has tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a law that was upheld by the Supreme Court, a law that will help not only millions of uninsured but everyone with health insurance because the Affordable Care Act improves coverage.

''Repeal'' means that insurance companies can once again deny coverage for preexisting conditions. It means college-aged dependent children will be kicked off their parents' insurance. Medicare beneficiaries will lose access to vital preventative screenings. Also, insurance company practices of the past, which frustrated the insured and drained their savings, will be allowed to return.

The Affordable Care Act means more than 80 percent of premium dollars are

spent on health care. That was in the Affordable Care Act. The law prevents insurance companies from providing their executives extraordinary perks while failing to provide health care to their customers.

But this will never happen again. The repeal of the Affordable Care Act will not be successful. It wasn't successful the first 36 times. It won't be today. That's because the American people need it. The law isn't perfect. The medical device excise tax and the Independent Payment Advisory Board should be addressed. This majority refuses to work with our side to fix the problems. The American people want to see Congress work together to fix problems. What they don't want is more political theater.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I support repealing the misnamed Affordable Care Act because it is a law that Americans cannot afford.

A recent report from the Energy and Commerce Committee shows that health insurance premiums for small businesses could rise by an astonishing 400 percent. For my home State of Florida, the report notes that individuals enrolled in some current plans could see increases of over 100 percent. In the small group market, we expect to see increases as well. This law is not affordable for individuals or small businesses. The health law tries to hide these new costs through subsidies and tax credits paid for through new taxes and cuts to Medicare.

We need to repeal this job-crushing, premium-rising, government-expanding law. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 45, and I support repealing this unaffordable act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to set the record straight that there is no government takeover in the ACA, which is contrary to what my Republican colleagues are saying.

The ACA is built on expanding private sector coverage by improving options in the individual market and by encouraging employers to provide coverage. The claim that the ACA is a government takeover is totally unfounded. A system built on private insurance, private doctors and private hospitals is not a government takeover.

I yield now 1 minute to my colleague from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, yet again, in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act as 3 years and 37 repeal attempts later, the majority is still playing politics with the health care of real people.

Thanks to ObamaCare, 27 million American women now have access to preventative health screenings and health care without cost-sharing. They can receive cancer screenings, annual wellness physicals and contraceptives without extra costs. Seniors in my district saved an average of $600 last year on prescriptions, and as we close the doughnut hole, the savings will be even greater and families no longer have to worry that their children will be denied insurance due to a preexisting condition.

Repeal would take away these benefits and protections, raising costs for families. It would return us to a broken system, all the while increasing the deficit. It is time to move on. Let's spend our time working on new solutions instead of repeatedly placing partisanship over progress. I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to our chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee.

You've seen the TV commercial about oil filters where somebody brings their car in, and they haven't had their oil changed, and the guy says, Well, they could have paid me before by changing the oil filter or they can pay me later when they bring the car in.

That's why we're here today. We're going to repeal this Act. We can repeal it today or we can repeal it later, but it's going to be repealed.

My friends on the minority side talk about all the good things of it and act like there is no government intervention. There is just a government mandate that you have to have insurance. There is a government mandate that employers have to provide it. There is a government mandate on what has to be included in that coverage. There is a government price control on the price of the premiums. Of course, there is a mandate that everybody in the country has to have insurance, and the IRS can enforce that as a penalty if, in fact, you choose not to participate in that mandated program. Other than that, there is no government involvement in this law.

So, my good friends, I would say: vote with us to repeal it now so we don't have to come back later next year or the year after when health care is in a shambles, and we will repeal it then.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Today is actually an embarrassment. Today, for the 37th time, we vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act—a messaging vote that is surely dead on arrival when it reaches the Senate.

I would say to my good friend from Texas, you can repeal it in this House 37 more times, and it's going to be just as dead when it gets over to the Senate.

This is a waste of our time. A CBS analysis last year said that Congress spent 80 hours—2 full weeks of work—on repeal votes that cost the taxpayers $48 million. Bryce Covert and Adam Peck of Think Progress estimated that, since then, we've spent an additional $6 million, bringing the total to $55 million on 37 symbolic votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act and waste our time here on the floor of the Congress. Just think what we could have done with $55 million. We could make sure college students have access to Federal work study grants. We could keep low-income kids in preschool.

Quit wasting the taxpayers' money and this Congress' time. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to one of our freshmen, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

□ 1520

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 45, and I thank our leadership for bringing this legislation to the floor because contrary to popular opinion, patients' rights were the ones in jeopardy a few years ago, and that's what we're restoring.

Architects of ObamaCare have said it is ''so complicated and if it isn't done right the first time, it will just simply get worse.''

By ''done right,'' they really mean that the administration simply has to write enough of the right regulations.

Nearly 20,000 pages of ObamaCare-related regulations are already on the books, including 828 pages that were issued in a single day earlier this year. This tidal wave of regulations should be no surprise to anyone who bothered to read the health care bill before they voted on it.

With the truth of our economic condition and the real contents of the health care bill beginning to sink in, I don't believe there's a better time to consider repealing ObamaCare than right now.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Rather than more rhetoric, I challenge my Republican colleagues to explain to the American people why we should take away the benefits and protections that ObamaCare already provides and will provide; explain to the

125,000 young adults in Illinois that they have to get off their parents' policies, even if they're sick; explain to the 134,000 seniors in Illinois who have saved over $235 million on their prescription drugs why we need them to pay more for their drugs; and explain to the 1.4 million Illinoisans who will finally have the opportunity to obtain quality, dependable health insurance coverage—sorry, politics trumps expanding their access to health services.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand for the health of the American public. Vote ''no'' to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to another of our freshmen, Mr. HOLDING of North Carolina.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is bad policy for patients, for doctors, for seniors, for young folks, for small businesses, for medical technology and pharmaceutical companies, and for families.

Mr. Speaker, folks in my district tell me time and time again that they are most concerned about the increase in the cost of health care, and ObamaCare does nothing to address those concerns. In fact, recent reports have suggested exactly the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I think Senator BAUCUS was dead on when he said that he sees a huge ''train wreck'' coming down the line in regards to ObamaCare.

ObamaCare was shuffled through Congress with back-room deals and false promises. American families deserve better. They deserve to make their own choices about health care, not the government. That is why I'm proud to rise today and join my colleagues in repealing this misguided and misnamed law.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to our Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER from Maryland.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, apparently the Republicans are opposed to ObamaCare.

I know that comes as a shock to America, so we need to tell them one more time or 37 times or maybe a 38th or 39th or 40th or 100th time.

I don't know how many times we have to replay the election. There was an election in which this was one of the principal issues, and the proponent of health care for all Americans was elected by most Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this vote, as we all know, is a waste of our time; it is, however, a political exercise. This will be the 37th vote to repeal health care reform since the Republicans took control of the House. It's exactly the same as the bill that we considered in July. That partisan bill was dead on arrival in the Senate, just as this one will be; and everybody knows it.

In fact, The New York Times reported that since 2011:

> Republicans have spent no less than 15 percent of their time on the House floor on repeal in some way.

Since 2011, they've spent 15 percent of their time on this House floor trying to repeal health care for all Americans.

When President Obama was reelected after campaigning on the Affordable Care Act as a major first-term achievement with the unanimous opposition of Republican colleagues and after the Supreme Court said, yes, this is a constitutional exercise of the Congress' authority, Speaker BOEHNER said, ''ObamaCare is the law of the land.''

I had hoped that would be the end of wasted time and $52.4 million in taxpayer money on legislation to nowhere that would strip away benefits for millions and millions of Americans. Sadly, however, this vote is more of the same.

It would increase out-of-pocket costs on preventive services for 105 million Americans, including 34 million seniors on Medicare and 71 million Americans covered under private plans.

It would allow insurance companies to reimpose arbitrary lifetime limits on coverage for more than 100 million people.

It would allow insurance companies once again to discriminate against and deny care to as many as 17 million children with preexisting conditions. CantorCare tried to reverse that and had to be pulled from this floor because even a Republican-sponsored attempt at dealing with preexisting conditions was rejected by our Republican colleagues.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the clock will not be turned back. ObamaCare is the law of the land. Those are not my words, but Speaker BOEHNER's.

You say this vote is necessary so that freshman Members have a chance to get on record on a major issue. If they haven't gotten on record now, they're not going to get on record.

If that is the standard for getting a vote on the floor, then let us have a vote on replacing the sequester which you have denied freshmen the chance to vote on all year. That is what we ought to be spending our time on, getting our country on a sound fiscal path, creating jobs and growing our economy. Instead, we tread water; we waste time as we continue to debate for the 37th time the repeal of health care for all Americans.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this may be the 37th time that the House has taken up the repeal of ObamaCare, but this is my first time; and I and the constituents that sent me here want my vote recorded to repeal this poorly crafted, job-killing law.

Last week, colleges in my district graduated more than 2,000 students eager to enter our workforce. These week-old college graduates in my district will be met with real-life challenges immediately thanks to the President's health care law. Over 50 percent of recent college graduates are unemployed. Five years after the recession, national unemployment remains unacceptably high.

Seventy percent of small businesses cite the Affordable Care Act as a reason not to hire. Businesses large and small are considering cutting their workforce and reducing hours to avoid the requirements of the Affordable Care Act in January.

Working families in America are hurting, and the Affordable Care Act is adding to their pain. The CBO estimates that 30 percent of employers will stop offering employer-sponsored health insurance next year.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 5¾ minutes, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is working for families and small businesses all across America.

Did you know that the Affordable Care Act provides tax credits to small businesses that offer health insurance to their employees and that over 360,000 small businesses have taken advantage of those tax credits so far and millions more remain eligible?

Speaking of young people, in the State of Florida alone, over 224,000 young people have been able to have health insurance because they've now been able to stay on their parents' policies.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, 1.3 million Floridians have received $124 million in rebates from insurance companies, an average of $168 per family, because of important consumer protection provisions in the law that say insurance companies can't charge families too much.

Medicare is stronger, the doughnut hole is closing, and the Affordable Care Act is a godsend to so many families who have preexisting conditions, whether it is cancer or diabetes or some other chronic condition.

To my Republican colleagues, let's come together to work on the economy and creating jobs rather than another deja vu of repealing health care and wasting time.

I urge everyone to vote ''no'' on the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to a couple of things.

We are working on jobs. One of the items that concerns us is that, according to the CBO, implementation of the ObamaCare bill with its 13,000 pages, 7-foot tall tower of red tape would cost this economy 800,000 jobs. We also know that it's grown to being a $2.6 trillion program.

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join a chorus of people who recognize the ineffectiveness of the Affordable Care Act which, frankly, Mr. Speaker, is not even affordable. The CBO also said that there's $1.8 trillion now added to the cost of ObamaCare.

We've seen the impact on physicians. Physicians, particularly those with specialties, don't want to continue in their practice. People in medical school, they don't want to continue. People in undergraduate, they don't want to go to med school. There's a dearth, Mr. Speaker, of availability in the future of physicians.

We've seen premiums skyrocket. In North Carolina alone, premiums have increased 284 percent.

We've seen the impact of 7 million people now who cannot take their own personal health insurance that they were promised.

We've seen a risk pool that no longer has funding available.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better, and we're going to work hard to ensure that we have a competitive health care program that will deliver true health provisions for the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. That's right, America, the repeal of patients' rights, brought to you by the Republican majority of the House. It is the 37th vote to repeal ObamaCare.

While far from perfect, the Affordable Care Act was a serious attempt to solve a serious problem. By contrast, the legislation we are considering today is not serious, and the only problem it portends to solve is offering new Members of this body an opportunity to vote on a bill that isn't going anywhere.

I assure you, there's no lack of real problems for this body to address. As of March, the unemployment rate for most of my congressional district was at 7 percent. Does anyone in this Chamber think we should sit on our laurels with 7.3 percent unemployment? Instead of holding 37 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, is it too much to ask that we just hold one vote on the American Jobs Act, legislation that included both Democratic and Republican ideas that would put more money in the pockets of small businesses and put countless Americans back to work? These political votes are a foolish waste of time, and the American people deserve better.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this blatantly political legislation and return to a focus on legislation that creates jobs, grows the economy, lays the foundation for sustainable prosperity, and doesn't strip away health care benefits for millions of Americans.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN), who is the author of H.R. 45.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee who has been a champion for the repeal of ObamaCare for years and years.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent revelations that have just come out within this last week regarding the outrageous activities of the Internal Revenue Service pointed against the people of the United States, every American should be concerned about the negative consequences of this bill, ObamaCare.

The Supreme Court has ruled that ObamaCare is in fact a tax. Knowing that it's a tax, the logical conclusion is that the entity in the United States that will be tasked with enforcing tax policy is the IRS.

I'm a former Federal tax litigation attorney. I worked for the Treasury Department. We had only one client; it was the IRS. The IRS is the only entity that enforces tax policy in the United States, and ObamaCare is enforced by the IRS—probably the most feared Federal agency in the United States Government. It concerns me. It should concern every single American listening to our voices today that the IRS has admitted this week that they directly targeted Americans, including Christians, including those who support the State of Israel, including those who are for jobs and less debt, including conservatives, Tea Partiers. They were targeted; why? Because of what they believe—their religious beliefs, their political beliefs—and the IRS targeted them for punishment, or for reward, depending upon how their ideas lined up with the administration's ideas.

You see, this dysfunctional implementation of ObamaCare and the ongoing assault on nonnegotiable constitutional liberties is enough to convince every single one of us who are the people's representatives to seek full repeal of this law. It's our job, Mr. Speaker, to defend liberty. We're all sworn to protect and defend the Constitution, and that's why, today, we have to end this horrible piece of legislation and stand up for people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I believe the other side has more time, and so at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I'm driven today to rise because I agree wholeheartedly with Senator MAX BAUCUS, that ObamaCare is a train wreck to our economy. As a proud cosponsor of H.R. 45, I unequivocally support a full repeal of this onerous law.

Since the Supreme Court has delineated it as a tax, it's clear that obligations or commitments to not raise taxes on the middle class have gone by the wayside. In fact, this will be one of the largest tax increases on the middle class known to man. In fact, there's a hidden tax in this bill on medical devices, lifesaving medical devices.

My mother, 90 years old, has a pacemaker, and that keeps her alive. The next time she gets one, she's going to have to pay a tax on that, and so is every other senior citizen who has a pacemaker. I think this is just flat out wrong.

Also, the Maricopa Community College district just recently reclassified 700 professors from full-time status to part-time status so they don't have to pay this onerous tax.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible bill. It needs to be repealed.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona keeps talking about the terrible things in the health care reform bill. But let me just say, in his State, if the ACA was repealed, that would mean in Arizona, drug costs for over 65,000 seniors would have been $102 million higher; 69,000 young adults would not have had coverage through their parents' plans; 917,000 women and 434,000 seniors and people with disabilities would not have had access to free preventive care; 414,000 people would not have received $28 million in rebates from their insurance companies; and next year, 948,000 people will not have access to quality, dependable health insurance coverage.

And so these are the facts, the real problem that happens in the State of Arizona, if this bill were to pass and the health care reform were to be repealed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Sanford).

Mr. SANFORD. I rise with a chorus of others in this whole notion of repealing ObamaCare primarily because of its financial impact. At the end of the day, if you look at the Government Accountability Office numbers, what they show is that there's $6.2 trillion of cumulative impact here over the next 10 years. If you look at the Congressional Budget Office numbers, what they show is increasing numbers in $800 billion increments. And, in fact, if you look at American tax reform studies, what they show are 20 new or raised levels of tax that go with this bill.

□ 1540

I think, more importantly, it turns on its head this whole notion of the Hippocratic Oath, which has been a 200-year tradition in this country of doctors working directly for a patient.

And finally, and I'd say most importantly, it turns upside down this American tradition of not having the government force on the consumers the notion of the purchase of a product. It's for that and many other reasons that I join again with a chorus of others in urging repeal of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 1½ minutes to the

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time is a waste of resources and another example of the refusal to focus on the important issues of jobs and the economy right now. It's also an example of bad budgeting.

One of the things I don't think our Republican colleagues have focused on is that their claim to have a balanced budget rests on the savings and the tax revenue in the ObamaCare bill. So if you repeal all of ObamaCare, which this bill says it wants to do, the Republican budget will immediately be out of balance in 10 years. Here's how it works:

If you look at the Republican budget, in 10 years, they claim that there's a $7 billion surplus. But the reality is it also contains in it Medicare savings—we heard that issue demagogued during the last Presidential campaign—and it also includes ObamaCare revenue. And if you take out that over $400 billion in Medicare savings and the revenue in ObamaCare, poof, the Republican budget is way out of balance.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's not just me saying that. Here's what The Heritage Foundation said. They also point out that the Republican budget depends on ObamaCare.

So, long story short, you can't have it both ways. You can't repeal ObamaCare and go home and tell people you did that and, at the same time, say you have a balanced budget.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlelady.

I rise in support today of ObamaCare repeal.

I can't begin to highlight all the problems of ObamaCare in 1 minute, so I will instead focus on this simple fact: ObamaCare is the biggest assault on the 40-hour workweek in this country in a generation.

Under ObamaCare, government mandates and penalties kick in for every employee that works more than 30 hours a week. Employers can't afford ObamaCare's mandates and penalties, so they're scaling back the hours of their employees to less than 30 hours as a result. And that's bad for workers. It means many working moms will be forced to look for a second job to find the hours they need to pay their bills and feed their family.

In my hometown of Shelbyville, for example, it has already meant that some part-time teacher's aides must work less so the local school system doesn't go bankrupt. That's bad for teachers and students. And the problems are just beginning.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to repeal ObamaCare and restore the 40-hour workweek. Forty may be the new 30 when it comes to aging, but 30 is the new 40 when it comes to the ObamaCare workweek.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield myself the balance of the time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard the gentleman from Indiana say, We can't do this; we can't do that. I mean, this is the problem with the other side of the aisle, with the Republican side of the aisle: they always believe that we can't do anything here in the House of Representatives.

The fact of the matter is that Democrats saw the problem. The problem was discriminatory health insurance practices. The problem was young people not being able to get on their parents' insurance policies. The problem was women not being able to access health care and so many Americans, 40, 50 million Americans, that did not have health insurance.

And what did we do as Democrats?

We found a solution to the problem, which was the Affordable Care Act, and it was working. The discriminatory practices are going away. More and more people are going to have health insurance. Most Americans will have health insurance by the beginning of 2014. And the doughnut hole for prescriptions drugs for seniors is being closed. All these things are answers that the Democrats have brought through the Affordable Care Act for the problems that existed with our health care system.

And all I hear from the other side of the aisle is, We can't do this; we can't do that.

Well, we've done something. Don't just come here and tell us we have to repeal it. As I said before, if you have a solution, you want to work with us to improve things, that's fine; but don't come here for the 37th and 38th time and say, We're just going to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

You never come up with a positive solution to the problem. In this Congress, all we hear from the Republican side of the aisle is, We want to repeal everything; we want to waste time.

Don't continue to do this. This bill is a complete waste of time. It passes here, it goes to the Senate, and nothing happens.

Let's keep this bill, the Affordable Care Act, in place. It's doing wonderful things for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This law has become 13,000 pages of regulation. It has gone from costing $800 billion to $2.6 trillion.

It's so interesting to hear people talk about solutions and wanting government to do things. Mr. Speaker, the American people can solve so many of these problems. They know the answers do not come out of Washington, D.C. They come from our communities. They come from our State legislatures. They come, solutions come from employers that are fighting every single day to keep people employed.

One of the biggest impediments to job growth, indeed, including the 800,000 jobs this bill will cost us, this law, ObamaCare, costing us 800,000 jobs over the next 10 years, is keeping people working full-time.

We know what the problems are. We're saying, Look, admit it was a mistake. The American people don't want it. It's too expensive to afford. Let's get it off the books.

And we do come forward with solutions. We come forward with keeping patient-centered, health care centermost for our constituents. That's what they want. They want options. They do not want regulation and mandates by the Federal Government, who can't seem to solve the problems that are in front of them right now, whether it's the IRS or anyone else.

Let's repeal this bill and pass H.R. 45.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 45, the legislation that will repeal the President's job-destroying health care law, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is mired in a jobs crisis, and the President's health care law is making it worse. Since ObamaCare was first enacted in 2010, Federal bureaucrats have written nearly 20,000 pages of new regulations—20,000 pages.

Colleagues on the other side of the aisle have talked about how many times we've tried to get rid of this menace and what's changed. Well, as we know, very famously, we had to pass the bill to find out what was in it, but even then we didn't know what was in it. We're now at 20,000 pages of regulations and still counting.

Meanwhile, America's job creators are struggling to manage the full effects of the law in their workplaces.

□ 1550

Ed Tubel has owned and operated Sonny's Real Pit Barbecue for more than 30 years. At a recent hearing in North Carolina, Mr. Tubel outlined the difficult choices he now faces, including higher prices for customers and fewer hours for workers. Brett Parker, vice chairman of Bowlmor Lanes of New York, testified in 2011 that his business may also have to shift workers to part-time hours in order to ''protect existing jobs.''

As chief human resources officer with Rowan-Cabarrus Community College, Tina Haynes stated the college must consider cutting the number of courses offered to students. She also described

the health care law as a ''massive administrative burden that comes with unanticipated costs.'' And Gail Johnson, president and CEO of an early childhood learning center, warned in 2011 that ObamaCare would ''force entrepreneurs to invest less into growing their business'' and slow the growth of small businesses.

These men and women live each day with the consequences of the health care law. No doubt, others across the country have similar stories to tell. There are a number of good reasons why Congress should repeal the government takeover of health care. It is driving up the cost of care, and millions will lose the health care coverage they have and like. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you like your coverage, you may not be able to keep it. According to CBO, at least 7 million people fall into that trap.

But for many Americans, one reason stands above the rest: jobs. Our Nation's workers and employers cannot afford the Democrats' job-destroying health care law. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 45.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee will control the balance of the majority's time.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. Mr. Speaker, we meet today for the 37th attempt to take away the basic health care rights from millions of Americans. Yet, despite all of these votes, the Affordable Care Act remains the law of the land. And it will remain the law of the land even after today's vote. That's a fact.

So why are we here for the 37th time? Are Republicans afraid that Americans are now able to get basic preventive health care screening with no copay? Are they afraid that Americans will now no longer be gouged or denied coverage because of preexisting conditions? Are Republicans fearful that the insurance companies can't cut off lifesaving care just because somebody got sick? Because they can't do that now with the Affordable Care Act.

Why on Earth would anyone fear American families being put back in charge of their health care? But we're here, yet again, to satisfy the majority's needs to have another meaningless vote. This obsession with repeal by the majority is bordering on the absurd. It's time to move on, for goodness' sake. Open season is set to begin in 5 months. Americans without affordable insurance will be able to shop for plans in an open and transparent marketplace with the help of tax credits for those who qualify. Employers of small businesses will be able to shop for appropriate health care for their employees and for their businesses with the help of tax credits.

It's our duty as public servants to help our constituents navigate this new law, not spend our time obstructing it. That's how California has approached the reform. We've worked in a collaborative way with all of the stakeholders. And that's how the government should work, because they know that it will help families struggling to afford health insurance.

Take, for instance, a family of four making $60,000 in California who buys their own insurance. Today, they pay some $12,500 on average for insurance. That's more than $1,000 a month. But starting in January, this family will save almost $5,000 a year because of the Affordable Care Act. Think about what this family can do with that extra $400 a month. It means paying your bills, it means saving money for your kids' education, it means repairing your car. This is what the Affordable Care Act can do. This is what ObamaCare does. This is what the Republicans are trying to hide from the American people.

Our country has been debating health care for more than a century. They keep saying there's other alternative solutions. It's funny that none of them came forward. None of them came forward during this debate with those alternative solutions, and health premiums were skyrocketing in double-digits year after year after year. For decades, we debated how to make sure all Americans have access to health care that won't bankrupt them if they get sick. For decades, we debated control of the national health spending by ensuring that everyone is covered. For decades, we debated how to control uncompensated care that cost families dearly. And it took the leadership of Speaker PELOSI and President Obama to bring positive change for families and businesses struggling under the weight of health care costs.

The fact of the matter is this plan currently today is working for millions of Americans, for millions of seniors, for millions of young Americans and for millions of young people born with preexisting conditions. That's what this legislation is about, lowering the cost of prescription drugs for senior citizens and making sure that people can get preventive care without copays. The Republicans want to yank that all away, and they don't have a plan to provide that health care security.

Interestingly enough, the other day in The Wall Street Journal was a full discussion about how this health care package is entrepreneurial because people who feel that they're job-locked will now be able to go out and start businesses because they know they'll have health care insurance for themselves or for their spouses or for the kids, and they'll be able to become the entrepreneurs they want to be. There's a discussion among large employers because people will leave and take their ideas and start their own businesses. That's what this health care enables Americans to do for the first time, not be locked into a job because of the fear of the insecurity of not having health care for your family and what that means.

This is an entrepreneurial act. This is liberating people. This is freeing people from the financial fear of the loss of health care. Never again, with the passage of this legislation, will an American lose health care because they lost their job, because somebody died in their family or because a child was born with a preexisting condition. Never again. The Republicans don't have an alternative. They only have obstruction and repeal as part of their program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 45, the repeal of a flawed health care reform bill.

I came to this body 4½ years ago understanding that the greatest problem with the American health care system was cost and access. I knew this because I practiced medicine in east Tennessee for 31 years. I also have been involved with health care reform in Tennessee beginning in 1993 with our attempt to reform our Medicaid program called TennCare. I knew here what not to do. ObamaCare is what not to do. We saw costs skyrocket, and we saw our then-Democratic Governor cut benefits and cut the rolls, therefore rationing care.

We need health care reform today in this country, but we need patient-centered health care reform where patients, their families, and their physicians make health care decisions, not government bureaucrats with 20,000 pages worth of rules or insurance companies.

Health care should not be a partisan issue. I, as a physician, have never seen a Republican or a Democrat heart attack. I have never operated on a Republican or Democrat cancer in my life.

We were made promises during the health care debate: your insurance premiums would go down, jobs would be created, and access would be expanded. What's really happened? Insurance premiums have skyrocketed by as much as 100 percent. We're looking at tax increases for individuals, taxes on productive companies, and taxes on lifesaving medical devices. Small business owners are being forced to cut hours, delay investment, and stop hiring just to stay afloat. This comes at a time when families need more income to make ends meet, not less hours to work and higher insurance premiums.

Are patients getting lower costs? It's an emphatic ''no.'' And maybe the biggest insult of all, the IRS will determine if your insurance coverage is adequate.

Mr. Speaker, I stand ready to repeal this flawed bill and work with my Democratic colleagues on health care

reform that will truly work for the American people, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS.)

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

It is right and good that people should passionately pursue their points of view in democratic debate. But it's also our obligation to work from the same set of facts. I have sat here and listened to my friends for the better part of an hour, and I do think it's important that we reflect a correct record on a lot of things, first of all, about the deficit. We have a neutral referee here on questions about spending and taxes called the Congressional Budget Office, and several Members on the other side have approvingly quoted what the CBO says on different things.

Here is what the CBO says about this law:

> Repealing this law will add at least $100 billion to the deficit.

Now, our friends disagree with that, but the referee that they hired, that we live by, says repeal of the law adds $100 billion to the deficit.

We hear that health insurance premiums have gone up by an average of $3,000 per year. I don't know the source of that claim. Someone should share that with us. But I do know this: the cost-control strategies in the new law which involve the establishment of a competitive insurance market so the insurance companies don't have huge market control hasn't taken effect yet and doesn't take effect until January 1 of 2014. This is characterized as government control of health care.

□ 1600

Here's what the law actually says: it says a person without health insurance can get a subsidy to choose among private insurance plans, like Blue Cross and Blue Shield, like Kaiser Permanente, and make their choice.

There is nothing in this law—and I would challenge any of my friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, to show us one word that says that the doctor-patient relationship is in any way impeded or impaired by this law. They can't find those words because they're not there.

The bill is referred to as a job-killing health care law, right out of the polling and focus groups of the Republican Party. Here's the facts: in the months before the law was signed, the country was bleeding jobs; 750,000 jobs lost in the month of January of 2009 when the President was inaugurated. Since the law was signed, the private sector has added 3.5 million jobs. Now, you can argue, well, it would have been four and a half or five. Have that argument if you want. But since the law was signed, the number of jobs in the private sector has gone up by a lot, not down. That's what the private sector has done.

One of the gentlewomen referred to CBO saying 800,000 jobs are being lost. Apparently CBO is okay in that fact. Here's what that report really says: it says that a lot of people who are older—in their late fifties and early sixties—who are working because they feel they have to work for health insurance are likely to take early retirement. That's where the 800,000 job difference comes from. That's what the report says if you read it.

We've heard ObamaCare is a tax. That is true. ObamaCare is a tax on two kinds of people—people with investment income in excess of about a quarter-million dollars and people who can afford health insurance, choose not to buy it, and choose to have our neighbors and our constituents who do buy health insurance pay their bills when they go to the emergency room. That is true.

We've heard we have to protect the Constitution. Well, we are protecting the Constitution. With all due respect, your side litigated this and lost. The Supreme Court of the United States heard the claim this is unconstitutional and said you were wrong.

Finally, we hear about the assault on the 40-hour workweek. Massachusetts, under a Governor named Romney, did something very similar to this law—imposed an employer mandate. Here's what happened in Massachusetts: while the rest of the country was shedding 3.6 percent of its full-time jobs, Massachusetts lost 2.8 percent of its full-time jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

Massachusetts added nine-tenths of 1 percent of part-time jobs to the workforce. The country was 0.8. So if this bill is going to force all of these employers to drop their hours from full time to part time, why didn't it happen in Massachusetts?

This has been a fact-free debate up until this time. The country deserves better. The House deserves better. We should oppose this absent-minded repeal.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I just left in my office the Tennessee insurance commissioner who said the first of January, the individual market, 40 to 75 percent higher premiums; the smaller-group market, 50 to 55 percent higher. Plans would be less rich, with higher copays, higher deductibles, young healthy males get a huge increase. Instead of having eight statewide plans, we're now down to two and maybe one.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Earlier this week, I sent an online survey out to my constituents with one simple question: Do you support efforts to repeal ObamaCare? Thousands of Montanans responded, and by a 3–1 margin they made it clear that ObamaCare needs to be repealed.

And as we speak, the American people are lighting up Twitter. Check it out yourself. They're tweeting about the harms of ObamaCare in three words. Actually, the hashtag is: ObamaCare in Three Words.

But while Americans are saying things like ''job-crushing mandates'' and ''premiums are skyrocketing,'' 1 hour ago the White House tweeted back and said this: ''Because. It's. Law.'' Well, I have three words for the White House: arrogance of power.

Madam Speaker, if the President is unwilling to listen to the voice of the people, then the House will, because this is the people's House. ObamaCare is a bad law, plain and simple.

I was elected to serve the people of Montana and represent their voice in this Congress, and that's what I'm doing today. Montanans have spoken loud and clear: they want this law repealed. That's why I will vote to repeal it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Today, if people want to talk about repealing health care reform, it's important that they talk about exactly what repeal means.

Repeal means that young people under 26 will have to get off their parents' policies.

Repeal means that seniors will have to suffer through the doughnut hole that we're in the process of closing.

Repeal means an end to tax cuts to small businesses who are providing health coverage for their employees.

Repeal means that next year all Americans who expect to be able to afford health insurance will not be able to afford it, and all Americans with preexisting conditions who expected to be able to buy health insurance at the standard rate will not be able to buy it.

Repeal means that those who think they will need health security if they switch jobs, they will lose that security when they switch jobs.

Repeal means an end to the laws against insurance abuses, like unreasonable rate increases and cancellation of policies when you most need them. There will be an end to that if we repeal.

If people want to talk about repealing the Affordable Care Act, they should talk about what's going to happen to young people, to those with preexisting conditions, to seniors in the doughnut hole, and the future affordability of health care.

Madam Speaker, we should not repeal the Affordable Care Act, we should oppose the legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my

good friend from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to ObamaCare for the reasons we've heard already here today. However, I would like to explain how this ''train wreck'' is affecting Indiana and costing good-paying Hoosier jobs.

Indiana is home to over 300 medical device companies, creating over 54,800 jobs that pay an average salary of $59,706 per year, and the medical device industry provides $50 billion to Indiana's economy.

Companies have already decided not to expand and many across the country have announced layoffs. The device tax is so dangerous that our friends in the U.S. Senate voted recently 79–20 to repeal the medical device tax, and last Congress the House voted in a bipartisan manner to repeal the tax.

Yet we've heard from the White House that the President doesn't support repeal because they need the money to support ObamaCare. This tax is a job killer and stifles innovation. It must be repealed.

ObamaCare is full of these types of examples. This near government takeover of our Nation's health care system is riddled with more taxes, burdensome regulations, and unintended consequences that are costing jobs and compromising the quality of health care available to Americans. Not to mention many full-time employees are being cut back to part time so that employers can comply with all the requirements of the law. My constituents are telling me that this is happening as we speak back in Indiana.

Before coming to the House, I practiced medicine for 15 years. That experience tells me that this law fails to help patients get access to quality, affordable health care, prevents businesses from expanding, and is not helping us create much needed jobs.

It also puts government bureaucrats between the patient and their doctor—government bureaucrats in an agency that is intrusive, untrustworthy and targeting American citizens based on politics. Yes, Madam Speaker, ObamaCare vastly expands the IRS and is dependent on the agency for its implementation. That's why I'm proud to stand here today with my colleagues to support our Nation's patients by voting to repeal this disastrous law so we can replace it with commonsense, patient-centered reforms.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

The U.S. Supreme Court's ruling upholding the health care bill was a historic win for this Nation's small businesses and their employees. In fact, 62 percent of all small businesses didn't have access to health insurance for themselves, their employees, and their families. That ruling proved that the Affordable Care Act was a good law.

□ 1610

The benefits small businesses are already seeing reiterate this fact, and yet we find ourselves voting again on repealing this landmark law. Once more we must vote on a bill that will not help a single small business invest, hire, or secure a loan. If you want to help small businesses, put people back to work.

In addition to the small business health care tax credit, which has already helped 360,000 small businesses providing health insurance to up to 2 million workers in this country, the medical loss ratio has ensured that businesses of all sizes were getting the most out of their premium dollars, saving them nearly $321 million—money that they could put back into their companies.

The future of health reform holds more promise. Banning denials for preexisting conditions reduces ''job lock'' and encourages more than 1.6 million prospective entrepreneurs to launch new companies.

At a small business hearing last month, Ms. Louisa McQueeney credited the ACA with providing her company ''better coverage and greater peace of mind.'' The ACA will soon prohibit insurers from hiking rates on small firms without justification and end discrimination based on gender. So, I agree with Ms. McQueeney when she says, ''Frankly, it can't come soon enough.''

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Contrary to beliefs, the ACA gives small businesses better access to quality coverage. Passage of today's bill would strip new protections that provide bargaining power to small companies. That is why I will continue to oppose any efforts repealing a law that is beneficial to millions of small firms, and I urge our colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Madam Speaker, every time Cato the Elder spoke in the Roman Senate, he said, whatever the topic, ''Carthage must be destroyed.'' As long as Carthage survived, the freedom and prosperity of the Roman people would never be secured.

As then with Carthage, so now with ObamaCare: as long as it remains on the books, the health, prosperity, and freedom of the American people will never be secure.

ObamaCare raids $700 billion from Medicare, meaning seniors across Arkansas will have their health care rationed as doctors refuse to see new Medicare patients.

ObamaCare creates an unelected and unaccountable panel of bureaucrats to ration and deny needed medical care for Arizona seniors.

ObamaCare will cause insurance premiums to skyrocket by as much as 60 to 100 percent for Arkansas families.

ObamaCare raises 21 taxes by more than $1 trillion and will cost at least $1.7 trillion in the first decade alone.

ObamaCare violates our freedom of conscience by using taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

ObamaCare is corrupt to its rotten core. The government has exempted hundreds of the President's cronies from the law. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is right now shaking down private companies for millions of dollars to promote ObamaCare.

And, of course, the IRS, expanded by 2,000 agents, will be the main enforcement agency for ObamaCare, the very IRS who we now know targets the President's political opponents for harassment and intimidation.

Madam Speaker, ObamaCare must be repealed. I urge the Congress to repeal this abominable law, and I urge the American people to vote out of office every politician who voted for it 3 years ago.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. This is now number 37, the 37th time that we have debated this issue. We have now built up quite an archive of hysterical predictions by the Republicans during all these debates and 3 years of experience to see how those predictions have actually panned out.

Prediction number one, ObamaCare was going to kill Medicare Advantage plans. Has that happened? No. In 2013, this year, 14.5 million Americans have enrolled in Medicare Advantage plans, up from last year, which was 12.8 million. And while the enrollment is up, the cost has stayed flat, even. The monthly premium, average monthly premium for Medicare Advantage this year versus last year, went up $1 a month.

Health savings accounts, the GOP said that ObamaCare would kill health savings accounts. This year, in 2013, health savings accounts have never been higher. 13.5 million Americans are in a health savings account, up from 11.4 million in January 2011. The President of the Health Savings Administrators was quoted recently as saying, ''You're going to see an explosion of health savings accounts assets.''

We have heard that it is going to kill jobs. We have already heard from Mr. ANDREWS 6.7 million new private sector jobs have been created since March of 2010, many of them, by the way, in health care—over 800,000.

But, lastly, all the predictions about busting the budget and creating higher new costs. We heard yesterday from the Congressional Budget Office that Medicare cost growth has been at the most moderate level since Medicare

was created in 1965. The index of per capita Medicare expenditure last month rose less than 1 percent, again, shattering records over the history of the Medicare program. And it is doing it the smart way, by greater oversight of fraud, by better coordination of care, by more preventive care such as giving seniors the prescription drugs that the Republican prescription drug program denied them back in 2003.

This program, like any program, can always be improved, and I have worked with Dr. ROE in terms of the IPAB repeal. Let's do that.

Let's stop wasting our time on a mindless repeal of measures that are working.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, KEITH ROTHFUS.

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 45.

President Obama made a lot of promises when pushing his health care law through Congress. He promised that it would make health care more affordable and accessible. He promised that if you liked your health care plan, you would be able to keep it. Western Pennsylvanians will tell you that President Obama has failed to keep these promises.

We recently saw one of these failures when the Community College of Allegheny County reduced the hours of many part-time employees because it could not afford the increased cost of health insurance. This is just one of the many sad side effects of a law that puts the government in the driver's seat of our health care system while taking patients and doctors along for the ride.

Western Pennsylvanians do not want a law that will turn a doctor's waiting room into the waiting room for the Department of Motor Vehicles. They want commonsense and patient-centered reform that makes health care more affordable and accessible for workers, seniors, and families.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

This is the 37th time Congress is wasting time attempting to repeal this law. My friends across the aisle could focus on putting this helpful and urgently needed law into effect.

Forty-one million more Americans will have the opportunity to get health care under this law. One in four of them are hardworking Latino Americans who want to protect their families and provide for them. They will finally be able to live without fear that they are not one illness away from going into bankruptcy. Now you want to take that promise away from them.

Earlier this year, my friends across the aisle committed themselves to engaging Hispanic Americans. How can they say they genuinely want to address our needs when they vote to destroy a law that is vastly going to represent 41 million Americans having access to health care and, of those, 10 million Latinos having access to health care?

A point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker. I would like to take the opportunity to thank my wife for being married to me for 21 years. Today is our anniversary, and here I am on the floor working. Hopefully, we will have some good work done today.

□ 1620

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, very briefly, Republicans and Democrats did vote to repeal the 1099 and the IPAB and to repeal the device tax and the CLASS Act. Then we hear we didn't have any solutions. There were 80 amendments to this bill. None of them were ruled germane to the bill. I had 10 amendments on which I wanted to work with the other side. The Republican substitute was voted on, which is an across-State-lines association of health plans actually funding high-risk pools for preexisting conditions, HSAs and consumer-driven, putting the patient in charge of health care decisions.

I now yield 1 minute to my good friend from South Carolina, JOE WILSON.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Dr. ROE, for yielding.

Today, House Republicans will vote for the 37th time to repeal or defund ObamaCare.

Prior to its deal-making passage in 2010, the National Federation of Independent Business, America's largest organization of small businesses, warned that the implementation of the government health care takeover would destroy 1.6 million jobs due to mandates and tax increases, crippling small businesses.

To make matters worse, at a time when our Nation is experiencing record unemployment, President Obama has called on the IRS, an agency currently in the midst of scandal, to hire thousands of new agents to enforce ObamaCare. Based on the recent reports, it is clear that the IRS should not be expanded to include the authorization of controlling health care for the American people.

Today's vote will give us an opportunity to repeal a crucial job-destroying bill that, in turn, will provide small businesses the certainty they need to begin hiring again and to put American families back to work. As a proud cosponsor, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is available on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee has 7¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the Republican Majority Leader, the gentleman from Virginia, ERIC CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the full repeal of ObamaCare.

Moms and dads across America are worried. They are worried about their health, the health of their kids, the health of their aging parents. They are struggling to understand how the new health care laws will affect their prescription prices, their emergency room visits, whether they can keep their doctors or, worse, whether they can keep their jobs.

These families want the best for themselves and their children, and so do we. House Republicans want patient-centered health care reform that lowers costs, increases access, makes the health care system easier to enter and easier to navigate. ObamaCare is not the answer.

While both parties agree that we must make health care more accessible, we in the majority fundamentally disagree that more government is the answer. Sweeping mandates on individuals and businesses will not improve our health care. We do not wish to see unelected, Federal bureaucrats come between patients and their doctors—limiting choices, lowering quality and raising costs.

Madam Speaker, this act, which is the ObamaCare law and which is set to be implemented 8 months from now, is a threat to American patients and their families. When this law was first debated in 2009 and signed in 2010, the White House promised the American people that ObamaCare would lower costs for families and businesses. That promise has been broken. Nothing could be further from the truth.

If you like the health care coverage you currently have, you really don't know if you will be able to keep it under ObamaCare. Many employers are delaying hiring decisions because of provisions outlined in the law, and people with preexisting conditions are now being denied the coverage the President promised. There are more complaints about the law than praise—and for good reason.

It is now projected that ObamaCare will send health care premiums skyrocketing in the individual and small group insurance markets. When fully enacted, this law is expected to pose new financial burdens on America's youngest adults and many working families. Moreover, due to the projected cuts to Medicare Advantage, many of our seniors will face a type of health care that they didn't bargain for. This act should not be considered a reform but a bureaucratic overreach that makes a mess out of our health

care system and gives incredible power to the Internal Revenue Service.

President Obama has already signed seven bills originating in the House that repeal or defund parts of this health care law, but if we are serious in wanting to deliver real results for the people who sent us here, we should repeal ObamaCare and replace it with the health care that the American people desire.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to my friend from North Carolina, RICHARD HUDSON.

Mr. HUDSON. Now, I don't have much in common with the leadership in the Senate, but today I stand in agreement with Senator MAX BAUCUS, who characterized the implementation of ObamaCare as a ''train wreck.''

Disasters occur when the government oversteps its bounds. We've seen it with ObamaCare, as it is the most egregious example. We've also seen this week what happens when Federal agencies target people for their political beliefs, and we've seen the same kind of overreach with violations of the First Amendment rights of reporters and journalists and in the failure to answer questions about the origins of the terrorist attack in Benghazi.

Legislatively, ObamaCare is the most egregious example of government overreach we have ever seen, and a disaster, ladies and gentlemen, is ensuing. Hardworking Americans are losing their jobs, families are paying more in taxes, and seniors are losing much-needed Medicare coverage—and this bill hasn't even been fully implemented yet.

Health care has always been and should always be a relationship between a patient and a doctor of one's choice, not a government mandate to be managed by faceless bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. The Federal Government has no authority to be the manager of the physical well-being of every American. I support its full repeal.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. May I inquire about the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 5¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, RANDY WEBER.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I rise to implore Congress to listen to the American public and to pass H.R. 45.

If you think the Unaffordable Care Act is a good deal, then as an American you have to ask yourself:

Do you believe the IRS acts in your best interests? My conservative guess is: not on the best days.

Ask yourself: Were all of the events swirling around Benghazi shrouded in mystery or bathed in sunlight and transparency? Not on your life.

Ask yourself: Were the phone records of the AP reporters and the privacy that should have been afforded to them protected? Not on the best days.

Ask yourself: Is the government here to help? No.

The government that is in the process of bankrupting Social Security, of bankrupting the post office and that is on the verge of killing Medicare and Medicaid now wants to come tell us, Trust us. We're from the government. We're here to help.

Madam Speaker, I don't think the American public can afford that kind of trust or help. The answers are not here in Washington, D.C. They're back with Americans. Listen to the American public.

I am RANDY WEBER. Let's pass H.R. 45. That's the way I see it from where I sit.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield myself 2 minutes.

The previous speaker just said that we should listen to the American people. When the American people listen to the Congress of the United States, they assume that all of the Republicans in the country are against this health care bill and that all of the Democrats are for this health care bill.

Yet, if you look at the Kaiser Family Foundation's most recent poll on this, you'll find out that 96 percent of the Democrats and 83 percent of the Republicans support the tax credits for small business, which are now the law of the land, and 360,000 small businesses are getting those tax credits.

□ 1630

Ninety percent of the Democrats and 74 percent of the Republicans support closing the doughnut hole, and the doughnut hole is in the process of being closed. Democrats and Republicans agree in the country that this is a good deal.

Eighty-seven percent of the Democrats and 72 percent of the Republicans are excited about the creation of health care exchanges where they can go and shop for health care just as the Members of this Congress do in open season when they can pick and choose from different plans. In California, there will be 33 plans offered by private health insurance companies that they can pick and choose from. They think that's a good idea. They think it's a great idea.

Eighty-four percent of the Democrats and 68 percent of the Republicans think it's a great idea that children will not be thrown off their parents' policy, as is the law today.

That's why you've only voted to repeal. On the first day you took the majority in this Congress, you voted to repeal and you instructed the committees to come up with an alternative. You've had 37 votes on repeal, and you've had no action by the committees on the alternative.

So you have a plan that is meeting the needs of American families, millions of Americans of all walks of life, small businesses, big businesses, employees at both, children, seniors, people with preexisting conditions, and your answer is to repeal, like that's progress.

No, that's not progress. That's the failure to have an alternative and creative thinking about how to deal with the health care problems of the American people. ObamaCare does that, the Affordable Care Act does that, and that's what this Congress did.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield 1 minute to SCOTT PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, in 2010, this body was told by Speaker PELOSI that it needed to pass the bill so the American people could know what's in it. Well, Madam Speaker, if the American people would have known of the toxic consequences that ObamaCare would have, I'm certain they would not have allowed this legislation to be passed. I rise today to expose some of the ramifications that ObamaCare will have on Americans when it is fully implemented in 2014.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, premium rates in the individual market will increase by approximately 30 percent, and on a national level there will be a 73 percent rise in premium costs for those keeping insurance. For those interested in getting a new plan, you're going to see an average increase of 100 percent in cost compared to today.

Due to the employer mandate, as many as 20 million to 65 million Americans will likely lose their employer-sponsored health care.

Well, Madam Speaker, it's 3 years later, and we still don't know everything in this legislation, but we do know who's picking up the tab: hardworking families and job-creating small business owners.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield 1 minute to the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership and that of Mr. LEVIN and Mr. WAXMAN as the chairs of the three committees when this legislation, so transformative in the lives of the American people, was passed by the House of Representatives and now for coming to the floor today—I don't know what the word is—to even counter some of the ridiculousness that is being said on the other side of the aisle in relationship to the Affordable Care Act. The fact is that what's happening today is the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. That's what they want to do is repeal patients' rights.

Why are they doing this? Do you think it's a good idea to do this on Women's Health Week, to repeal legislation that gives a wide range of free

preventive services to women, protection being dropped for women when they are pregnant or when they are sick and they no longer will be charged higher premiums than men? Of course the Republicans want to repeal that today on Women's Health Week. But knowing soon that a woman will no longer be a preexisting medical condition is just one piece of it.

The fact is this is not a serious effort to repeal the act. That's not going to happen. What this is is another example of jobs evasion in several ways.

First of all, it is our job to come here and act for the good of the American people. Right now, the American people see that good as the creation of jobs. What is it, 134 days into this Congress and the Republican majority has yet to vote one bill out to create jobs? That's job evasion.

Here we are today with yet another one of their subterfuges. Let's not talk about jobs; let's use up time. What does it add up to? Up until now, it has been $54 million and 43-some days spent on this, the 37th effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

What we should be doing is what the Republicans have asked for, regular order, to go to the budget table, to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate so that we can put forth a budget that creates jobs, that reduces the deficit, that strengthens the middle class. Instead, we're wasting the taxpayers' dollars and time on legislation that is going to undermine protections for the American people when it comes to their health and well-being.

This bill today just gives us another opportunity for our side to talk about the transformative nature of the Affordable Care Act.

If there were no reason to pass such a bill, if everyone loved his or her own health care and health insurance premiums, if that were the case, we would still have had to pass the legislation because the status quo in health care in our country was unsustainable from a financial standpoint. It was unsustainable for families, for individuals, for small businesses, and for corporate America.

The cost of health care was a competitiveness issue. As we try to retain our position as number one in the world—a competitive issue—the cost of health care was rising. It certainly was unsustainable for cities, States, and the Federal Government. Our budget could not sustain the rapid increase of health care to our budget.

That is why, when the Speaker asked, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office responded by informing House Republicans in a letter sent yesterday reiterating that repealing the Affordable Care Act would increase the deficit by $109 billion over the next 10 years. They said that this is a figure that they had given the Speaker last July. There may be some little changes in it between now and then, but that was approximately where the figures were.

So if you want to reduce the deficit, you don't repeal the Affordable Care Act because you will increase the deficit by $109 billion over the next 10 years. The purpose of the bill was not only to improve the quality of health care, increase accessibility to many more people and to lower the cost, but that in lowering the cost, it would reduce the deficit.

So it's a bill, and pretty soon many more Americans will be taking advantage of it. So far, over 100 million Americans have taken advantage of the preventive services and over 100 million Americans are no longer subjected to lifetime limits on their insurance coverage. That's a remarkable thing. Seniors who are in the doughnut hole have seen their prescription drug costs reduced by around $6 billion. Right now young people can stay on their parents' insurance policy until they're 26 years old.

The list goes on and on about the preventive exams that are free to seniors. The list goes on and on about what benefits the action that the Republicans are taking today would repeal that are good for the health and well-being of the American people. This bill is not just about health care; it's about the good health of the American people.

□ 1640

It's about prevention. It's about wellness. It's about electronic medical records that will change everything in terms of access to care and the quality of your care because your records are wherever you are. It's entrepreneurial.

Our Founders, in their dedication, in their sacrifice, in their courage called for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as goals of our new Republic, of our democracy; and this bill honors the vows of our Founders in just that way—a healthier life, the liberty to pursue your happiness. If you're an artist or if you're a photographer or a writer, if you want to be self-employed, if you want to start a business, if you want to change jobs, whatever it is, you are no longer job-locked because you can only go as fast in reaching your passion and your aspirations as your health insurance program will take you.

If you have a child with a preexisting medical condition, or if you're concerned with being sick yourself, you no longer are confined in your pursuit of happiness by the cost of a health care premium or the ability to even get one. It is entrepreneurial.

We even see articles now, and, Mr. Chairman, you have pointed them out in the public media about young people, or not even young people, but people who want to leave companies and start their own businesses. They're waiting for this bill to be fully implemented so they have that freedom to go forth.

So while I think it is a waste of the public's time to take this bill up on the floor of the House, to hear my colleagues talk on the floor, you think either they don't know what they're talking about, or they do. But in either case, they're not presenting the facts about what this legislation does.

It is going to be right up there with Social Security and Medicare as pillars of economic and health security for the American people. It is going to make us more competitive internationally because our businesses will not have an anvil of the rising cost of health care. It reduces the deficit, improves the health and well-being of the American people. It's about the entrepreneurial spirit of America. It honors the vows of our Founders of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This legislation should be rejected; and pretty soon more people, as they take advantage of the legislation, will see just how important it is to them individually and how important it is to the health and well-being of our country.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to Mr. DOUG LAMALFA from California.

Mr. LAMALFA Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to join my colleague, Mrs. BACHMANN, on this legislation.

We do have a history in the past of repealing bills, such as Prohibition. It has been done, so this one would have near the same status in size by the time it's all done.

I'm from California. We know a lot about boondoggles in California, going back to high-speed rail and other issues like that. They call this the Affordable Care Act, and it's still being done with a straight face. Really? Price tag: it was advertised as $900 billion. Now it's approaching $2 trillion.

Jobs—48 percent of business owners are saying that they're holding off on new hires because of the ObamaCare health care takeover.

Taxes—again, affordable? There's over a trillion dollars in new taxes with more in sight. How are we calling this affordable?

We've had seven different measures to repeal portions of the Obama health care takeover, with more on the way.

And this part is really great: thousands of new IRS enforcers will be hired to help implement ObamaCare. Isn't that great. I ask you to support H.R. 45.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield the balance of my time, 1½ minutes, to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) to close.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, on the east coast it's almost the end of the workday. And we know that somewhere a mom who stood on her feet all day in a retail store, or broken her back all day in a nursing home, will come home, and she will see that her son or her daughter isn't feeling very well, is too sick to eat dinner, can't seem to sleep through the night.

Most of us in this country have the privilege of taking that child to the pediatrician or to the emergency room

right away. Right away. But for over 40 million people in this country, they don't have that privilege. She'll hesitate because she'll think, maybe my daughter will get better by the morning, because a trip to the emergency room for that family might also mean a trip to the bankruptcy court.

We are here today to honor her work, not disrespect it. Almost every day here the Wall Street bankers, the oil barons, the big shots get their way. Her day is coming on January 1, 2014, because for the first time in this country's history, we'll do more than talk about the fact that we honor her. We will honor her work and honor her family with affordable health insurance. That day is coming.

This charade won't stop it. No amount of misrepresentation will cease it. That day is coming. Her work will be honored. The Affordable Care Act will be implemented.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I came here 4½ years ago in a bipartisan way to work on health care reform which this country desperately needed. We've now had 3 years to look at the Affordable Care Act, and I wish the bill had done as everyone had described here today. I wish that it had done that. I wish that costs had gone down. I wish that businesses were hiring everybody because of this bill. I wish that taxes were not going up. But none of these are true. They are. And I wish that we had debated this bill in an open manner here by regular order, the Senate version of the bill on this very floor of the House, which we did not.

So I asked our insurance commissioner today in Tennessee, if we did not pass this bill—and you just heard me say earlier in the debate about premiums going up 50-plus percent—I said if we did absolutely nothing, what would happen to rates in Tennessee? They would go up about 8 to 10 percent. We would be much better off in my State and around this country; and, again, I came here in a bipartisan way not to work on a partisan bill, which is what this is.

Madam Speaker, we need to repeal this bill and to replace it with patient-centered reforms that put patients and doctors back in charge of health care decisions.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 45, legislation to repeal ObamaCare. In March of 2010, then-Speaker PELOSI famously said, with respect to the President's health care law:

> We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what's in it.

□ 1650

Well, Washington Democrats passed that bill, and virtually every week since has been an expensive, eye-opening experience.

Over the past 3 years, it's become clear that ObamaCare is irreparably flawed, fails to deliver on its promises and causes serious harm to our economy. The legislation before the House is the first step toward fixing all of these problems. We must first repeal this onerous law and then move forward and work with stakeholders to develop step-by-step, commonsense reforms that actually lower the cost of health care and respect the patient-doctor relationship.

The President's health care law is, at its core, a flawed policy. It puts the Federal Government precisely where it doesn't belong, between Americans and their doctors. Instead of families deciding what coverage is best for them, or families and employers deciding how much they can afford, this law has the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the IRS making those decisions.

ObamaCare also falls short of almost every one of the President's and congressional Democrats' promises for the law. It doesn't control costs, doesn't let Americans keep the insurance they have and like, doesn't protect jobs, doesn't ensure seniors have access to their doctors and hospitals, and doesn't prevent 21 new tax increases, including more than a dozen that will hit middle class families. Simply put, it's a resounding failure.

If that wasn't enough, the health care law is causing serious harm to our economy at a time when it's struggling to climb out of the hole dug by the administration's failed economic policies.

We've received countless reports of businesses reluctant to hire, or shifting employees from full-time to part-time employment because of the steep costs associated with complying with the law. This is simply unacceptable. Well over 11 million Americans remain unemployed.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to repeal this burdensome law and continue working toward real reform that lowers costs and improves the quality of health care in this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Here we go again. This vote is more than just a sideshow. It's an embarrassing spectacle that has consumed House Republicans for more than 2 years, to the detriment of our economy and millions of Americans looking for work.

Republicans, on this, have their legislative heads in the sand and their feet in cement.

The Republicans are blind to the benefits that so many are already experiencing through ACA. It's already helping millions of Americans, with many millions more set to gain insurance coverage through the marketplaces next year.

With their feet in cement, 37 times House Republicans will have voted to repeal all or part of ObamaCare.

More than 50 million—50 million—taxpayer dollars have been spent by House Republicans through the dozens of hours Republicans have devoted to floor votes to try to repeal ObamaCare, which even Speaker BOEHNER acknowledged last year is the law of the land.

Since the beginning of 2011, Republicans have spent no less than 15 percent of their time on the House floor trying to repeal ObamaCare, when they know it would not happen.

Yet, not once this year, not once, have Republicans turned their focus toward job creation. What we have here, repeal, is a Republican obsession.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as a physician with 30 years' experience, clinical experience, I rise to vigorously oppose ObamaCare once again. We need to repeal this abomination. Why?

Just take a look at this chart. Where's the doctor, and where's the patient?

Well, look at the corner. Physician's way here in the corner. Patient's way over there.

And what's at the center of this?

The Department of Health and Human Services with the Secretary. And at the top, the IRS. And we all know what's going on with the IRS today. How can we trust an entity like that to enforce this abomination of a health law?

Doctors and patients deal with very personal information, very personal. That's why you have to preserve the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. And having all this between the doctor and the patient is basically a recipe for massive failure. That's why we must repeal it. That's why I stand with my colleagues to repeal it.

Let's do the right thing. Let's go step by step and get sensible, real reforms that will make Americans proud of their health care system.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I think all of us came to this august body with the mandate that we should try to improve the quality of life for our constituents and, therefore, the United States, the people that made our country so great. Education, health care, jobs, these are the things we want to do.

But it's reached a point that this is no longer just putting Democrats in a political advantage. What it is doing is embarrassing the entire Congress, and I dare say, people in the country recognize that there's something wrong going on in Congress.

Now, those of you that have taken Civics 101 know that there is no intention to repeal this act.

People are waiting to get jobs. They're waiting, really, to get health care. And we're on the move for that.

I've been here over 4 decades, and darn it the devil, we've been trying to get universal care. We're almost there.

Now, if you're talking about repeal, it takes a majority of both Houses to pass this bill. The President's going to veto it. And you have to have two-thirds of both Houses in order to repeal. That is not going to happen, and you know it.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the Chair's leadership on this.

This law has been in place now for a little over 3 years. So, as a physician, let's look at the symptoms of this law. Cost of premiums: increasing. Access to your doctor or your plan: already more difficult. Quality of health care going down because of Washington interference. Innovation: terribly affected, harming quality in this country. Choices for patients: decreased.

So let me get this straight. Increasing costs, less access, lower quality, less innovation, limiting your choices.

Madam Speaker, that's a life-threatening and terminal diagnosis.

It's time to repeal the ACA and adopt patient-centered health care, where patients and families and doctors make medical decisions, not Washington and the IRS.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who's the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Well, Madam Speaker, it's Thursday. Everybody's going home. Got to have your press release ready.

So here we come. The thirty-seventh time they're going to try and repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Now, you've heard a lot of nonsense already in two speakers, absolute untruths told right here about killing jobs and about rising premiums.

Washington State put out their premiums yesterday, and their premiums for young people are down by 15 percent. All that hyperbole about going up 450 percent, or whatever we hear, is nonsense. It is simply fearmongering and, you know, the deficit comes down, insurance is more affordable and accessible and, at the most, 33 percent have been convinced by this stuff over here.

In my home State, people are ready and willing to do it. Our Governor went out and set it up, and we're going to go and do it.

Now, the only thing the Republicans are angry about is that ObamaCare's going to become the law. It's being implemented. It's going to be in place in October. It drives them nuts that they can't figure a way to stop it.

□ 1700

They've come out here once a month to try and repeal it over and over and over again, and they keep failing. That's pretty close to the definition of mental illness: doing the same thing over and over again and thinking you're going to get a different result. You are not going to get a different result. The fact is that this is about votes. We have a new crop of freshmen who are getting their campaigns ready, and they've got to have that check in the box that says, I voted against ObamaCare. Vote ''no.''

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I stand here today outraged by the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has been targeting conservative groups since as early as 2010. This is not a Republican or Democrat issue. This is a First Amendment issue, one that should be a wake-up call about the dangers of the new, expansive powers afforded to the IRS under ObamaCare. No government agency, particularly one with such corruption and apparent disregard for the Constitution as the IRS, has any business accessing or monitoring Americans' personal health information.

As I speak here today, government bureaucrats are building the Federal data services hub, the largest personal information database ever created by the U.S. Government. And because of ObamaCare, five major government agencies are compiling information for the data hub, including the IRS, HHS, Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, and Social Security Administration.

What this hub means is that government bureaucrats are gaining unprecedented access and power over the American people's financial, health, and personal information through the implementation of ObamaCare.

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

Mr. CAMP. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACK. The IRS scandal begs the question: How can President Obama and the congressional Democrats continue to support ObamaCare, a law that gives more power to the IRS? Ultimately, the IRS scandal is yet another example of why ObamaCare must be repealed—for the sake of our health care, our economy, and our constitutional freedoms.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a distinguished member of our committee, Mr. NEAL.

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

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the repeal of the Patients' Rights Act. Seventy-one million Americans have already taken advantage of this opportunity for preventive health care services, 100 million Americans no longer will have a lifetime limit on their health insurance program, and young adults can stay on their parents' health insurance until they're 26. Ninety-eight percent of the people of Massachusetts are insured. The number regularly polls in the high 70s for customer satisfaction.

Let me just state this with some degree of certainty: the best hospitals in the world are in Massachusetts. Arguably, the best doctors in the world are in Massachusetts. Certainly the best teaching hospitals in the world are in Massachusetts. They've made it work. People are happy with the plan. If you're going to get sick, I say this to my Republican friends, as well, I'm going to get you a spot in Massachusetts.

Here's the point that we ought to be discussing today: the implementation of this successful plan. And I want to say this today tongue-in-cheek, but also with some satisfaction, we should thank Governor Romney for working with a Democratic legislature to make sure that the model for the Affordable Care Act was in place.

Let me say that again: thank Governor Romney for helping to make sure this plan was successful.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, when ObamaCare was being debated, its champions and cheerleaders indicated it would create 4 million jobs, including 400,000 jobs almost immediately. I find it deeply disturbing, then, that when I travel back to my district in Indiana, I hear from constituents that jobs are already being lost and hours are being cut in anticipation of this law's implementation.

I've heard from numerous constituents who work low-wage, hourly jobs like school support employees: cafeteria workers, janitors, bus drivers and so on. They're being told that, due to ObamaCare's employer mandate, they will no longer be allowed to work more than 29 hours a week. ObamaCare's proponents have created an incredibly perverse incentive here. Who in their right mind endorses a law where the best business decision is to lay people off, and during a very down economy to boot?

If we're serious about addressing rising health care costs and putting

Americans back to work, we should repeal this law, and repeal it now, and replace it with sustainable, bipartisan health care solutions.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to another member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from the State of Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I have an idea: What if The Heritage Foundation had an idea to reform our entire health care system? Even better, as Mr. NEAL says, what if that idea was piloted successfully by a Republican Governor in a Democratic State who would go on to become their nominee for President? What if that idea were brought to fruition nationally through the Affordable Care Act so it could provide American citizens, especially the uninsured and those with preexisting conditions, to become the focus of our energy and concern in Washington? An emphasis on wellness by seeking to enhance the best in the private sector, the best in the academic sector and the public health initiatives that have guided this great country of ours?

What if we do what the American people expect us to do, instead of quibbling over partisan issues—rolling up our sleeves and coming together for a solution to the American people?

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. What if we come together, and instead of quibbling over the Affordable Care Act, we rolled up our sleeves and put the Nation to work? Every day we waste in ideological turmoil is another day lost in the opportunity to help the American people and the key, as Mr. RYAN states, to driving down our national debt. Come together with us, Republicans, solve this issue for America.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say it is time to pull ObamaCare out root by root. We all know that it increases premiums and squeezes the family budget. We know that it does not let you keep the plan that you have today. We all know that ObamaCare is crushing jobs and forcing many parents who have full-time jobs today into tomorrow's part-time jobs.

And now we have some new information as we prepare to vote. The chief enforcers of this law, the IRS, have been outed as partisan political operatives. They've harassed, bullied, and suppressed the political opponents of the Obama administration. And now they want to be in charge of our health care? Give me a break. I don't think so.

Members, this is your chance. This is your chance to weigh in on the IRS scandal. A vote to repeal is a vote to stop the IRS, but voting to keep ObamaCare is a vote to empower the IRS as the health care police of the United States. The choice is easy. Vote to take power away from the IRS, not to give them more.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act. Like a broken record repeating the same old, scratchy, sad verse, these Republicans cannot stop repeating their record of indifference to the health care crisis. They've given up on ''repeal and replace'' because all they ever cared about was the repeal part. As the Party of No, this year they have not advanced a single health care proposal as an alternative.

I only wish that the Affordable Care Act were as good as they think it is bad. But to the millions who have received refunds from insurance company monopolies for overcharging, to the millions who are no longer denied coverage by the fine print in an insurance policy they didn't write, to the seniors who are getting some help on their prescription drugs and preventive care, to the millions more who will be able to finally apply in October for coverage they do not have now, and for the small businesses who will receive assistance in supplying their employees with the coverage they have been unable to afford in the past, you know, this ObamaCare works pretty well.

□ 1710

Together, we could make it better. We could make it more accessible for more individuals—like the many people in Texas who will be denied by Governor Perry's decision to refuse 100 percent of the cost of Medicaid protection. Together, we could provide more cost-effective care and do something more about spiraling health care costs. But really, the only true Republican alternative to ObamaCare is ''nothing care.''

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge support of H.R. 45, legislation that will repeal the President's massive and unaffordable health care law. As a doctor, I am extremely concerned with many different aspects of the bill, which is broad and overreaching.

When this law was passed, I was in northern Michigan treating patients and wondering how this bill would change the relationship between a doctor and his patients. I can tell you that after my 30 years of experience and after continuing to speak with doctors, nurses, hospital administrators, and patients across northern Michigan, there are innumerable problems with this law, and it needs to be repealed.

Thanks to ObamaCare, we will face severe problems with access to quality health care. We are looking at massive cuts to reimbursements to hospitals and other care providers, cuts that will end up limiting access to care.

ObamaCare does not fulfill the most basic promises that were used to pass this law. Health care costs have not gone down. My constituents are not able to ''keep their plans.''

These are just some of the reasons why I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill so we can work together to provide patient-centered reform that will reduce costs and expand access.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition and in support—in support—of the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

Madam Speaker, you know we've gone through this many times. You've attempted in committee and subcommittee to try to undercut the patients' rights to health care, and it wasn't successful.

By the way, the IRS is not the individual agency that is the operative of health care. Where in God's name did you get that from? There hasn't been much truth spoken today on the floor over there.

Whether in town halls or small group meetings, I ask this question when we talk about health care. I ask individuals to raise their hands if they're against, number one—you ought to raise your hands, too—closing the Medicare doughnut hole for seniors; are you for that or are you against it? Allowing children to stay on a family's health plan until they're 26 years of age; are you for that or are you against it? Ensuring Americans are not denied insurance for preexisting conditions; are you for that or are you against that? Or helping American families avoid medical bankruptcy.

Every meeting not one hand goes up. How many over there? Raise your hand. Free country. I'll wait 2 seconds. Maybe you didn't hear me.

In New Jersey, a report by the New Jersey Public Interest Research Group explained that by repealing health reform, employers would see health costs grow by more than $3,000 a year and, most shocking, New Jersey would have 10,000 fewer jobs.

Let's get it straight. In conclusion, let me ask my colleagues, in voting, those who will vote for repeal, is the opposition willing to increase the deficit? Because you already used the money from the Health Care Act to pay your budget, or else it doesn't even balance in 50 years. Are they willing to give the power back to the insurance companies? You've got to ask that question.

We've come down to the skinny right now. This is down to the bare bones. Are you willing to allow premiums to escalate? Better ask yourself those questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the Members to address

their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

Mr. RADEL. Heavy-handed government has been chipping away at our freedom and your freedom and your opportunity for generations, whether it's Big Government Democrat programs or, to be bipartisan, Big Government Republican programs. And that brings us to this debate today on the Affordable Care Act, which is not affordable and it is not about health care. It is about control.

Your freedom, your choices between you and your doctor no longer between you and your doctor. Someone from here in D.C., in some way, shape, or form will be involved in your most personal decisions. Freedom and opportunity, the freedom to choose insurers, insurance, and your doctor in a truly free market now gone.

This repeal is about your opportunity, which ObamaCare is already taking away from you. I want you to have a job. I want you to work more than 39 hours a week.

This repeal is about your freedom. I want you to keep more money in your pocket. I want you to have low premiums. I want you to have a choice—your choice, not Washington, D.C.'s.

This Affordable Health Care Act is not affordable and it is not about health care. It's about control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not a perceived viewing audience.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

We've heard a lot about the fact that this is the 37th vote to take away health care from hardworking Americans, but let me put that in context.

Under the Republican majority, we have spent over 56 hours on the floor debating repeal of the law of the land—and that doesn't even come close to capturing how much committee time, amendment debate, and general grandstanding has been spent on this bill.

Now, it is tempting, but I'm going to avoid illustrating this point with comparisons like telling you how many times you could have watched ''Gone With the Wind'' in that same amount of time—although, as a matter of fact, you could have watched it 15 times. What I want to talk about is what else we could have done with that 56 hours of Congress' time and energy:

We could have acted on a real jobs plan to get our economy moving;

We could have come together on a plan to avert the devastating sequester cuts that are hitting our Head Start programs, our cancer patients, and our military, just to name a few;

We could have moved forward on immigration reform, gun violence prevention, or infrastructure development, but we haven't.

Now, my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have been using a chart—an incomprehensible chart, something that no American can understand—to try to demonstrate how the Affordable Care Act works. Well, it just so happens I have a chart right here. This is the Republican plan to deal with the absence of the Affordable Care Act. It's right here. This is the chart. This is the chart right here. I will try to explain it to you. In fact, it's self-explanatory. They have no plan. They have no plan to substitute the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. In fact, they haven't a plan for health care at all.

So, my colleagues, my colleagues, I just wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would spend as much time building America up as they've tried to tear it down because, frankly, my colleagues, I do give a darn.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 45 to repeal ObamaCare.

Madam Speaker, as a physician, I know our health care system is broken, but this form of Washington meddling only makes it worse. The President's law puts too much control in the hands of the Federal Government, creating a complex system that emphasizes government intrusion over actual patient care.

There is no reason for the IRS to play a role in our health care system, favoring one and punishing another. Medical decisions already cause deep anxiety in the lives of too many Americans. Why compound that with the weight of an audit?

Our goal should be simple: respect you as a patient and connect you to the doctor that you deserve. Patient-centered solutions place you, the patient, at the center of our health care system, simplifying your life, not pushing you to the corner of Big Government sprawl.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve full repeal.

□ 1720

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another member of our committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

As some of my colleagues on the other side prepare to vote in favor of this legislation, I want to make sure that the American people know that they are taking 13 million Americans' rebates that they got from insurance companies last summer, totaling at least $1.1 million.

They will be voting to repudiate the fact that beginning last summer, millions of women began receiving free coverage for preventive services.

They will be voting to take away the fact that 17 million children with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

And they will be voting to take away the coverage of 6.6 million young adults, who, up to age 26, are able to be on their parents' insurance coverage, half of whom without it would have no coverage at all.

They will actually be voting, Madam Speaker, to take America's health care backwards. We can't afford to go there.

I urge that we vote ''no.''

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Health Subcommittee for the purposes of controlling the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a new leader in health care, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I stand today to show my support for H.R. 45, the repeal of the largest legislative piece of malpractice ever passed through the Halls of Congress.

This one bill, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, has done more to disrupt our economy and bring uncertainty to the marketplace than anything I have witnessed.

My colleagues on the other side talk about jobs and no job creation on this side. We are working to create jobs here by repealing this bill. This is the number one job-killing bill in America, and it has rocked the engine that drives our economy—the business owner and the entrepreneur that create the jobs. Without jobs being created, the hardworking Americans will lose their jobs and they are going to lose their health care.

Instead of health care reform, Congress created a health care tax. It is a tax that will be paid by all Americans young, old, rich, or poor.

Today, in response to the people who have had enough, the White House declared this: ''It's the law.'' My response on behalf of the people I represent is this: Not for long.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, Mr. BLUMENAUER, from the State of Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this is, as has been pointed out, the 37th attempt to repeal the health care reform. It has been my privilege to run 37 marathons in my career, but at least when you run a marathon you get someplace.

Millions of people are benefiting from the health care reform. Over a third of a million small businesses are getting tax credits to be able to help insure their employees. We are seeing aggressive efforts at better care, lower cost, eliminating lifetime limits, keeping young people on their parents' insurance policies.

Madam Speaker, we are finding across America there are literally hundreds of thousands of people working on the implementation of this legislation. Is it perfect? I haven't seen a perfect bill, especially one that is dealing with 17 percent of our economy. It is a dramatic improvement over what we have got. But instead of working with us to refine and improve over the course of the last 4 years, we go through these pointless exercises without offering an alternative.

My friend, my colleague from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), had their plan: a blank piece of poster board. No specifics; no effort to come forward with something that would do a better job of meeting the needs of seniors' prescription drug problems, young people, patient protection, lifetime limits, payment reform.

I will tell you, in Oregon I have met with thousands of professionals in the health care arena who are working cooperatively on making sure that Oregon is a model of how to do it right.

The health care reform train has left the station. We are not going to be repealing it today. We ought to be working to refine it in the future.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield 1½ minutes to a new member of the Ways and Means Committee, a job creator, a businessman himself, who has had to deal with rising health care costs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is interesting to hear as we go through this tonight about just how important and how great a piece of legislation this is. I've got to tell you, there is an old saying out there: ''Of all the words of mouth and pen, the saddest are what could have been.'' This could have been a miraculous piece of legislation.

Wouldn't it have been wonderful if both sides of the aisle had been able to work on it? Wouldn't it have been wonderful to have some debate and some amendment on it? Wouldn't it have been wonderful not to have to wait until midnight and shove it down the American people's throat? And wouldn't it have been wonderful for guys like me who have small businesses to be actually able to look at this and think to the future that, you know, I can actually plan?

ObamaCare is making this Nation sick. It is having a terrible effect on our economy. They keep people from hiring.

But do you know what it does, and it is the worst thing of all? It drives a wedge between business owners and business operators and their employees and their associates. That is the biggest problem. We are trying to make those people—the owners, the managers of the businesses—the bad guys.

Listen, the bad guy in this case is the United States Government. We have done something that is absolutely reprehensible. You cannot do that to people who make a living working with each other and then put them on opposite sides of a case. Better health care? Absolutely. Affordable, accessible? Absolutely. This piece of legislation did not do that.

I am intrigued by the amount of passion that we see now from the other side when there was so little concern at the time it was crafted to even bring the providers to the table and ask their opinion. You talk about having a piece of legislation ready. It is law. We know it is law. But do you know what? We are not going to quit trying until we go to the will of the American people.

I will tell you all, please go out to your constituents, go out to the people who actually create the jobs and find out how difficult we have made it for them with this piece of legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama, a former district attorney, State legislator, and county commissioner, who understands how communities struggle with health care, Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to proudly vote to repeal ObamaCare, the most dysfunctional law to ever pass United States Congress.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional? For the vast majority of Americans, ObamaCare guarantees worse health care at higher costs.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional? ObamaCare imposes 21 new taxes on America; thereby, according to the Congressional Budget Office, costing 800,000 Americans to lose their jobs.

In my home State of Alabama, just one of those tax increases imposes roughly $200 million a year in higher tax burdens on Blue Cross/Blue Shield, costs that will translate into higher premiums for Alabama citizens.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional? Those 21 tax increases come nowhere close to paying for the increases in ObamaCare costs, thereby either denying health care to American citizens or forcing even higher taxes on already stressed family incomes.

□ 1730

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional?

It gives Americans worse health care.

Doctors and patients will largely be shut out of costly lifesaving health care decisions. Instead, Independent Payment Advisory Board bureaucrats will decide whether ObamaCare will pay for the treatments that save your life or risk ending it.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional?

It suppresses the research and development necessary for the discovery of the next generation of lifesaving diagnostic tools and medical cures.

Why is ObamaCare dysfunctional?

It drastically drives up health insurance premiums for Americans who work for a living.

Madam Speaker, while my friends across the aisle bemoan today's vote to protect Americans from a dysfunctional ObamaCare, I rejoice that Republicans in the House of Representatives say that when American lives are at stake, we will never give up, and we will never, never surrender.

Mr. LEVIN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a long distinguished Member of this House and one who is very knowledgeable of health care and the costs to families and businesses, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In my role as chairman of the Health and Human Services Subcommittee of Appropriations, we oversee the budget for ObamaCare. I can tell you that the money is not there even for implementation. The request was for $1.2 billion. Now it has accelerated up to $1.7 billion, and there is no funding for it available. So here we are on the eve of the largest takeover of a private sector function in United States history, and the money is not there to implement it.

So what does the Secretary of HHS do? She goes to the private sector and says, We need to get money from you to implement ObamaCare.

Now, that is like the Mafia's shaking down businesses for protection money. I'm not saying at all that the Secretary would be trying to do that purposely, but it is similar to it. How can you ask people for money, whom you regulate, in order to implement a program that they're going to fall under? That is just repugnant to any American, and we can't let that happen.

The money is not there. We need to vote ''no'' and send this thing back to committee and look at it another day and in another way.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Patients' Rights Repeal Act.

I simply want to say thanks. My good friend Mr. CROWLEY indicated that there is no plan on the other side, but look at the list that I can give, and let me just emphasize Texas:

For the gentleman from the business community, 360,000 small businesses

are using the health care tax credit for their workers that is provided by the health insurance under the Affordable Care Act;

There are 17 million children with preexisting conditions in the country who no longer can be denied coverage by insurers;

Then, of course, what we are finding out is those who treat those with cancer are suffering because there are cuts in Medicare and those cuts in Medicare are coming because of my friends on the other side. The Affordable Care Act will provide an umbrella for those who are in need;

Then we find out that Texas, itself, has 3.4 million women and over 1.8 million seniors and people with disabilities who are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act.

More importantly, we have articles that suggest that the poverty in Texas is going up and that Texas has the highest uninsured people in the Nation. How can people from Texas vote against this? How can they vote against this?

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 45, the 37th attempt by House Republicans to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This bill is as bad as the previous 36 and has no chance of becoming law. And that is a good thing because the Affordable Care Act has and continues to be a life saver for millions of Americans.

The leadership of this Congress may want to give new members of Congress the opportunity to tell the people back home that they voted to repeal ''Obamacare.'' Unfortunately, they are also causing anxiety in people who know that without the Affordable Care Act they have no other option for healthcare.

I believe it is important to remind new members of this body and those who are closely watching this debate that the Affordable Care Act is law. People living in each of the Congressional Districts represented in this body are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act.

Many of those most in need of the healthcare coverage provided by the Affordable Care Act live in the Districts of many of the new members of Congress. Texas, my own state, leads the list of states with the highest percentages of uninsured residents.

Those states with the highest percentage of uninsured are:

Texas with 28.8 percent; Louisiana with 24 percent; Nevada with 23.3 percent; California with 23.2 percent; Florida with 22.8 percent; Georgia with 22.5 percent; Arkansas with 21.9 percent; Mississippi with 21.7 percent, and Oklahoma with 21.4 percent.

The highest concentration of the uninsured is the poor. The Affordable Care Act provides at no or nearly no cost to states an option to enroll those living in or near poverty into their Medicaid program.

This option would help states in three ways—reduce the cost to states for those insured through Medicaid, reduce the numbers of poor persons without healthcare insurance and address the problem associated with the high cost of persons who arrive at local emergency rooms in need of very expensive critical care. Health care costs that result from emergency room ad hoc primary healthcare are unpaid medical expenses passed on to everyone.

The idea of everyone paying something towards their healthcare was a Republican idea that was put into practice in the State of Massachusetts by then Governor Mitt Romney six years ago. Today, Massachusetts has the lowest percentage of uninsured residents' and a model for where every state could be in six years or less.

Just taking advantage of the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid option would help reduce the numbers of uninsured persons living in the United States.

Medicaid would provide the much needed support to our nation's most vulnerable by providing early diagnosis and treatment for chronic conditions. In many cases conditions could be caught prior to the onset of disease and allow medical professionals the opportunity to work with patients to avoid the major drivers of health care cost: diabetes, high blood pressure and obesity, which can lead to heart and arterial disease as well as kidney disease.

Many watching today's debate may wonder why this is an issue—money from the federal government that would reduce their state tax burden associated with Medicaid. The issue is governors who reject extending Medicaid coverage to their state's poor. The Governors in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Maine, Wisconsin, Iowa, Idaho, and South Dakota need to hear from residents who want healthcare cost to be lower and more people covered.

As a resident of Texas and a Member of Congress representing a Congressional District in the state, I sent a letter to Governor Rick Perry in response to his letter of March 14, 2013, in which he re-affirmed his opposition to expanding the Medicaid program in Texas.

For all of the pro-business talk by the Governor over the last few months—his position on this issue will lead to higher local and state sales taxes; unduly burden local governments, and needlessly place the health and safety of millions of Texas children and adults at risk.

The infusion of federal funds associated with the state accessing the Affordable Care Act Medicaid option would increase economic out of Texas by $67.9 billion.

A May 13, 2013, editorial in the Houston Chronicle titled ''Medicaid costs driven by poverty,'' outlined why the Congress should be focused on ending the sequester and creating jobs if we are serious about reducing taxpayer dollars going to Medicaid.

Poverty is the reason for higher Medicaid costs—if we work to reduce poverty then Medicaid costs would decline.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans are already seeing lower costs, better coverage, and patient protections that Republicans want to repeal:

13 million Americans benefited from $1.1 billion in rebates sent to them from their health insurance companies last year.

105 million Americans have access to free preventive services, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors on Medicare.

Millions of women began receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive services in August 2012.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage.

Nearly 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

6.6 million young adults up to age 26 have health insurance through their parents' plan, half of whom would be uninsured without this coverage.

6.3 million Seniors in the 'donut hole' have already saved $6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 small employers have already taken advantage of the Small Business Health Care Tax Credit to provide health insurance to 2 million workers.

Because of the Affordable Care Act 3.8 million people in Texas—including 2.2 million seniors on Medicare now receive preventative care services. Over 7 million Texans no longer have to fear lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance. Texas parents of 300,731 young adults can sleep easier at night knowing that their children can remain on their health insurance until age 26.

The protection provided by this law is a guarantee to 5 million Texas residents that their insurance companies will spend 80 percent of their premium dollars on healthcare, or customers will get a rebate from their insurance company.

In my State, there are 4,029 people who had no insurance because of pre-existing conditions, but today the Affordable Care Act has provided them with access to coverage. The Affordable Care Act means that many Texans are free of worry about having access to healthcare insurance.

However, the list of benefits from the Affordable Care Act is not completed. In 2014, the Affordable Care Act's final provisions will become available to our citizens. Insurance companies will be banned from:

Discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition;

Charging higher rates based on gender or health status;

Enforcing lifetime dollar limits; and

Enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

In 2014, access to affordable healthcare for the self-employed or those who decide to purchase their own coverage will be easier because of Affordable Insurance Exchanges. There will be a one stop marketplace where consumers can do what Federal employees have done for decades—purchase insurance at reasonable rates from an insurer of their choice. This will assure that health care consumers can get the care that they need from the medical professionals they trust.

Another reason why I oppose this bill—I offered six amendments, but none of them were accepted by the Rules Committee. I will explain what my amendments would have done to improve this bill.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 1 would have removed all of the bill text following the enacting clause of the legislation, which would have ended this exercise to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This legislation is so bad it cannot be salvaged and the United States would be better off without it.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 2 would have ensured full Medicare reimbursement to all hospitals including physician-owned hospitals with at least 100 beds, provided they could produce reliable records to document their claims for reimbursement.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 3 would have authorized additional funding to establish

Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs). These centers are the last line of defense provided in the bill to make sure those living on the margins of society—the poorest of the poor had access to reliable healthcare. FQHC programs would be based in clinics, community-based health care centers and pro-active outreach programs that target the homeless or marginally housed with information on how to get access to good healthcare.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 4 would have expanded state use of the Medicaid option of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care law when the uninsured rate of qualifying residents of a state exceeds 20 percent. States wishing to opt-out of Medicaid would have the option of submitting a plan to reduce the rate of uninsured to 20 percent or less to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. This amendment would have benefited Texas enormously since it leads the nation in uninsured residents at 28.8 percent. In fact Texas has held this number 1 ranking, of the State with the highest number of uninsured residents, for the last five consecutive years.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 5 would have established a program to conduct studies of minority health disparities. The amendment directed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit an annual report of findings regarding minority health disparities and make recommendations on how disparities may be reduced.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 6 expressed the Sense of the Congress that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is law in the United States of America. The amendment enumerated each step that made it the law including a decision by the United States Supreme Court. The amendment then directed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report to Congress on the impact of the law on those it is intended to help. The amendment would have not allowed this Congress to revisit repeal until it had research on the impact of the law to guide its further deliberation of repeal.

This Congress has work that needs to be done, and it has work that should be taken up to restore workers, their families and communities to sound economic health.

I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on the passage of this bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the author of the legislation that we are debating today, the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

This is a bill that is changing the course of American history, and it is why we need to repeal this bill today. I believe, Madam Speaker, that we will see this bill ultimately repealed.

Why? Because it is women who will be hurt under this bill; it is senior citizens who will be hurt under this bill; and it is little vulnerable children who will be hurt under this bill—as well as families, as well as employers. All of America is at the cusp of being negatively impacted.

Here is just one example: this bill was sold out of compassion. We wanted people with preexisting conditions to find care, but the reality is less than 1 percent of those with preexisting conditions were able to receive the assistance when the door was slammed shut.

Why? We ran out of money.

That's what ObamaCare has delivered—a lot of promises that can't be fulfilled. Before we go forward with this train wreck, let's make sure it ends so we can bring about cures, so we can bring about better developments in health care. That's what we want—health care for American citizens.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am from Michigan, and 75 years ago, a predecessor brought forth ideas that at long last we would lift the shame of millions of Americans who go to bed without health care. Since that time, the numbers have grown. Today, there are over 50 million.

There was a reference to children. How many children today go to bed without a stitch of health care? Millions. How many women today go to bed without any health care coverage? We provided for seniors, and we have, so far, left most everybody out who needs some health care.

Then someone has the nerve to come forth and say there isn't enough money to implement—when Republicans won't provide that money. Someone comes forth here and says there isn't the money to cover those with preexisting conditions, and Republicans won't provide the money to provide further help for those people.

You talk about repeal and replace. The disgrace here is you're fixed on repeal, and you never have come forth to satisfy the needs and the conscience of the people of this country. That's a disgrace. This bill is a disgrace. The Republican conduct on this has been disgraceful.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What is disgraceful are these thousands of pages of a bill that was rushed through this Congress with little chance to read it, laden with special interest provisions to buy off votes, while promises were made to the American people that their costs would go down, that they could keep their plans if they would like, and that the economy would boom. None of it happened, and Republicans were denied even one vote on the House floor to provide a real alternative. That's the disgrace.

Today, health care costs are going up. Independent experts say it could double in some States. Workers are finding out they can't keep their plans at work and that they'll be forced into the exchange. Who can afford more expensive health care? Almost two out of three small businesses aren't hiring because of this legislation.

I toured a power plant in Conroe where the cost of ObamaCare is so high that it's the equivalent of building two new plants and of hiring 100 new workers. That won't happen. Local businesses are cutting jobs and cutting hours. One restaurant owner in Houston told his managers he will not hire another full-time worker—period. ObamaCare simply makes it too expensive.

When these concerns are voiced, what Democrats in Congress and the President say is, It's the law. Get over it. Just get over it.

The bottom line is that we are fighting to repeal ObamaCare because it will hurt too many patients, too many people, too many families. Bad laws should be stopped early before people get hurt.

Year in and year out we've wrestled with this Medicare formula to reimburse doctors. We got it wrong, and doctors and seniors are being hurt.

□ 1740

The alternative minimum tax has been a mess for years. The death tax, as well. Can you imagine how much pain we would have avoided if these bad laws had been stopped early before they hurt so many Americans?

Make no doubt about it, we needed health reform. But the President and Washington Democrats got it wrong. So let's repeal it now and replace it with real reforms that help patients, that help families, that help small businesses. Let's get government out of the office room, let's give patients real choices, and let's lower health care because ObamaCare, this Affordable Care Act, has failed on all of its promises.

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

Mr. LEWIS, Madam Speaker, it is unbelievable. With so much to be done—so much good that we could do—this Congress stops work to vote a 37th time to destroy health care reform. Thirty seven times! The voters have spoken. The Supreme Court has ruled. The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and we will not go backwards.

The American people are counting on us to do what is right; what is just. We made a promise of health care to the American people. We must keep that promise. Vote no. Keep the promise of health care.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 45, the "Patients' Rights Repeal Act."

Today's vote will mark the 37th time that this House will vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It was only ten months ago when I spoke in opposition to the same bill being considered today. I would like to remind my colleagues of what repealing health care reform would mean for the Central New Jerseyans whom I represent.

Take, for example, Matt from West Windsor. Matt wrote me, "I graduated from college this past May and am currently working at a job with new health insurance. I have a preexisting condition, and, shockingly, I truly would be without insurance and in big trouble if this legislation is reversed."

Carolyn from East Brunswick contacted me to say she had been laid off and her COBRA benefits were about to expire. Because of the

Affordable Care Act, she could enroll at age 25 as a dependent on her father's Federal employee benefits plan.

Mary from Princeton wrote to me that her son ''has cystic fibrosis and he would be subject to both the lifetime cap on benefits and the denial because of preexisting conditions were it not for the provisions of the health reform.''

Matt, Carolyn, and Mary's examples are not just anecdotal: they are representative of the numerous affordable and comprehensive health coverage benefits that New Jerseyans have gained under health care reform—as well as what they stand to lose if the Affordable Care Act were repealed.

For example, in addition to Matt, who was able to gain coverage as result of health care reform despite his pre-existing conditions, 1,343 previously uninsured residents of New Jersey who were locked out of the coverage system because of a pre-existing condition are now insured through a new Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan, which receives finding from the Affordable Care Act.

Carolyn is one of more than 73,000 young adults in New Jersey who gained insurance coverage as a result of the health care law.

Mary and her son, along with 3 million other people in New Jersey, including 1.2 million women and 877,000 children, are free from worrying about lifetime limits on coverage thanks to health care reform.

Republicans here in the House may be able to point to a business owner who has concerns over a provision of the law, or an adult who resists purchasing health insurance, but the truth is, the law has something to offer for every American. The Affordable Care Act requires that insurance companies spend the majority of your premium on health care—not on CEO bonuses or administrative costs. The law requires that Medicare coverage includes preventive services—such as flu shots and mammograms—without any cost sharing for our seniors. Furthermore, the law prohibits insurance companies from dropping someone when they get sick, or charging women more than men for the same health coverage. If you repeal the law, you take away these important provisions that make our health care more accessible, affordable, comprehensive, and reliable.

One does not bring a proposal to a vote 37 times out of a rational, considered desire to improve the lives of the American people. You do it out of an irrational, ideological vendetta. But the problem with irrational vendettas is that they are so focused on ideology that they ignore human consequences.

Stop ignoring Matt. Don't punish Carolyn. Don't overlook Mary and her son. Let's stop this foolish vendetta and do the real work we were sent here to do.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, we have millions of people out of work and a Republican majority that refuses to bring a real jobs bill to the floor. We have record drought across the United States and in my home state of Texas, and a Republican majority that has refused to bring a 5 year farm bill to the floor. In fact the only thing this Republican majority knows how to do is waste the Americans people's time. Ever since Republicans took the majority, they have created the most unproductive congresses in our history. We recently spent two days to vote on a helium bill that could have been voice voted in 5 minutes. We are working in Washington this year for only 126 days. 126 days out of 365.

Instead of spending some of those precious work days on bills that can help Americans get back to work, we are here to vote for the 37th time to repeal Obamacare. This vote is a waste of time. This bill will never become law and they know that. They knew it the first 36 times we voted to repeal it, and they know it today, but Republican leadership needs to do it so the freshman tea party members can send out a press release and a fundraising email this weekend saying they voted to repeal it. Meanwhile in my district, farmers are struggling to grow crops, families are struggling to eat, and this Congress refuses to lift a finger to help them. They should be ashamed. Vote no on this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 45, which would repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act has significantly improved access to health care for Americans, and I strongly support it.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, millions of Texans are already seeing lower health care costs and receiving better insurance coverage. Over 7.5 million Texans now have no lifetime limit on most health insurance benefits, which will protect them from having their insurance cut off if they require significant medical care.

The Affordable Care Act has lowered prescription drug costs for over 200,000 seniors in Texas by closing the gap in drug coverage known as the ''donut hole.'' It has also allowed 357,000 young adults in Texas, who might otherwise be uninsured, to gain coverage through their parents' plan. Over 1.5 million consumers in Texas have received rebates from insurance companies because under the Affordable Care Act, insurers must spend at least 80 percent of premiums on medical care and quality improvement rather than CEO pay, profits, and administrative costs.

The Affordable Care Act also promotes equal treatment for women. Starting in 2014, insurers will not be allowed to charge women higher premiums than men simply because of their gender. Because of the Affordable Care Act, insured women are already able to receive critical preventive services such as mammograms, birth control, and well-woman visits without paying any out-of-pocket fees.

Today marks the 37th time that Republicans have voted to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, Republicans seem to be treating the legislative calendar of the U.S. House of Representatives as a playing field for their political games. Instead, we should be working hard for the American people by passing legislation to create jobs, spur economic growth, and reform our broken immigration system.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land and it is working. Up to 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied health insurance, and nearly 13 million Americans have received $1.1 billion in rebates from their insurance companies. Texans cannot afford to lose the crucial health benefits that the Affordable Care Act provides. That is why I plan to vote against H.R. 45 and all future efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I am proud to stand with my colleagues and the President to support a health system that provides security, accountability, and peace of mind to Americans.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, since the law's passage over three years ago, the Energy and Commerce Committee has conducted rigorous oversight to educate the country on how the law impacts patients, providers, the economy, taxpayers, and states. At every turn, we have encountered an ugly reality filled with broken promises, rampant uncertainty, rising premiums, and harsh consequences on jobs and our economy.

The alarm bells over how Obamacare will unfold are getting louder by the day: costs are going up, insurers are warning about premium increases, and small businesses are struggling with the choice about whether they can provide employees with coverage. One of the law's chief architects and ally of the president even scolded the administration over the looming ''train wreck.''

But as we fast approach the law's full implementation, the Obama administration is in full propaganda mode, and the facts don't seem to matter. Last week the president publicly declared, ''And whenever insurance premiums go up, you're being told it's because of Obamacare. Even though there is no evidence that that's the case.''

Mr. President, we have plenty of evidence, and sadly millions of Americans nationwide, from recent college graduates to older adults, will not be able to afford the law's rate shock. We have the plans of some of the nation's leading insurers for 2014, and the looming rate shock will be devastating. One of the nation's leading insurance companies that insures millions of folks predicts premiums will nearly double for individuals getting a new plan, those keeping their insurance will see an average increase of 73 percent, and some individuals could see increases of as much as 413 percent. The last three years have been littered with the Obama administration's broken promises. Today we keep our promise to the American people as we continue working to repeal this disastrous experiment, and work towards real solutions.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, ever since President Obama was first elected and chose to push through a federal takeover of America's health care system, House conservatives have led the charge to repeal the law commonly known as Obamacare and replace it with true reforms that will increase access and lower costs for consumers. With a string of broken promises from its authors and prominent backers, this law has already forced people off of the insurance they previously had, has increased premiums by thousands of dollars, and has reduced work hours for millions.

The fundamental question facing uninsured Americans was never, ''how do we give the federal government more power over our lives?'' Yet government control over health care was what the Democrat majority provided. House Republicans offered alternatives that gave our constituents the peace of mind to know that a safety net would be in place for the least fortunate amongst us, and provided commonsense reforms to allow those uninsured or underinsured to get the insurance they needed at an affordable price. Unfortunately, what we got was a law that, as former Speaker PELOSI famously stated, ''we have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it.'' Well, we've read the bill, and the tens of thousands of pages of regulations to enforce it, and I can tell you the backlash and opposition to the law continues to mount.

One small example of the absurdity of this law is provided by a constituent of mine who lives in Virginia. This small business owner has chosen to insure his employees for the last forty years, helping his employees afford the insurance they need to keep their families healthy. Because of Obamacare, this company is required to spend more than $30,000 to re-enroll their current employees. Let me repeat that. Even though these employees already have health insurance, the company is required to pay a fee for each and every one of them, to enroll the employee back into the exact same plan. That $30,000, which could have been used to hire new workers or grow the local economy, will now be sent to bureaucrats in Washington. Instead of health insurance for Main Street, this appears to be health insurance for K Street.

Today the House has a chance to stop growing the size of government, and to give power and freedom back to the American people. Instead of propping up health care exchanges, bureaucratic IPAB rationing panels, and mandates which cost Americans thousands of dollars each year, let's start over and focus on the real needs of access to care and reduced costs of insurance. We can all admit that our health insurance system can use strengthening, but this is not the way to do it. If you are serious about reforming the health insurance system in this country, then join me in voting to repeal Obamacare and send a message to the American people that we have heard their anger and outrage over this law and we will do what it takes to see it repealed.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 215, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 45 to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

SEC. 3. PRESERVING CERTAIN PATIENT BENEFIT PROTECTIONS FOR WOMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES, AS GUARANTEED UNDER CURRENT LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 shall not apply with respect to the ACA women and families' patient benefit protection provisions described in subsection (b) until such date that all group health plans and health insurance issuers provide equivalent protections for women and their families as provided under all such provisions.

(b) ACA WOMEN AND FAMILIES' PATIENT BENEFIT PROTECTION PROVISIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a), ACA women and families' patient benefit protection provisions described in this subsection are the following, as such provisions would be in effect before application of section 1:

(1) PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES COVERAGE WITHOUT COST SHARING.—Section 2713 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–13), relating to the coverage of preventive health services without cost sharing, including well-woman preventive care visits, breast cancer screening, mammography, screening for gestational diabetes, and screening for interpersonal and domestic violence.

(2) COVERAGE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH PREEXISTING CONDITIONS.—Section 1101 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18001), relating to immediate access to insurance for uninsured individuals with a preexisting condition.

(3) ENSURING THAT CONSUMERS RECEIVE VALUE FOR THEIR PREMIUM PAYMENTS.—Section 2718 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–18), relating to the use of health insurance premiums primarily for health benefits rather than the administrative costs of insurance companies, including executive salaries and compensation.

(4) NO LIFETIME OR ANNUAL LIMITS.—Section 2711 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–11), relating to no lifetime or annual limits.

(5) PROHIBITION OF PREEXISTING CONDITION EXCLUSIONS FOR CHILDREN.—Section 2704 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–3), relating to the prohibition of preexisting condition exclusions or other discrimination based on health status, insofar as such section applies to enrollees who are under 19 years of age.

(6) COVERAGE OF ADULT CHILDREN UNTIL AGE 26.—Section 2714 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–14), relating to the extension of dependent coverage for adult children until age 26.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer the final and only amendment to this bill. And I want to be clear: passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it's adopted, my amendment will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will be immediately voted upon.

My amendment would simply ensure that women and families do not lose the benefits they have already gained from ObamaCare in the event that the law is repealed.

These benefits are critical to keeping families healthy and identifying problems when they are easier and less costly to treat—benefits like the ability to get preventive health services without any copays.

Thanks to ObamaCare, no longer must women put off critical screenings like mammograms or colonoscopies because of the cost. And women are now able to be screened for domestic violence, gestational diabetes and receive other preventive care without worrying about whether they can pay for it. Millions of us have taken advantage of these potentially lifesaving screenings.

Similarly, young adults—the most uninsured age group in our country—now have the option of staying on their parents' insurance plan until they're 26. This is a real benefit, one that has already enabled 6.6 million young adults to keep their health insurance coverage as they begin to make their way in life.

On top of these benefits, we now have protections from some of the most abusive insurance company practices. For example, no longer can insurance companies cut off your care just because you're too expensive to treat. For too long, individuals who paid their premiums and followed the rules would still be cut off after hitting arbitrary lifetime or annual caps on coverage.

These are our friends, they're our neighbors who did nothing wrong. They just got sick or had a tragic accident. Now they are protected, knowing their insurance coverage will be there when they need it.

In addition, mothers no longer have to worry that their children with a preexisting condition, like autism or asthma, will be denied health care. And starting this January, no American will be told that they cannot get coverage due to a preexisting condition.

All of these benefits have been secured while holding insurance companies accountable to use your premium dollars on actual health care, not on bonuses or advertising.

And all of these protections have been and would continue to be there for American families if my amendment passes.

You truly do not realize the importance of these protections until you or someone you love needs them. And that is exactly the case of Victoria Strong. She's a young mother living in my hometown of Santa Barbara, California.

Victoria's daughter, Gwendolyn, was diagnosed with a rare and extremely expensive disease when she was 6 months old. Despite the fact that she and her husband, Bill, had a good health insurance policy, one they paid thousands of dollars for each month, Victoria lived in constant fear that Gwendolyn would reach her lifetime policy limit before she even reached second grade, and because of her preexisting condition, Gwendolyn would then be uninsurable for the rest of her life.

I cannot imagine how difficult it was for young Victoria to not even know whether her child's basic health care needs would be covered or not in the future, and that's exactly what so many mothers faced before ObamaCare. But the elimination of lifetime caps on care has given Victoria peace of mind, and it's done the same for millions of mothers across this Nation.

That's exactly what ObamaCare is all about: fixing our broken health care system, fixing it for families like the Strong family, for women across this country, for their families. This law gets it right. And now we have one last vote to at least preserve the rights they already have.

I believe that all Americans would be better off if we in Congress worked to ensure swift implementation of the law

instead of wasting time and taxpayer dollars debating repeal for yet the 37th time. But I think we can all agree that taking away existing insurance protections from everyday Americans is the wrong thing to do just because we are setting out to repeal.

I remember the numerous hearings and markups about this law, and there was great agreement on both sides of the aisle that these consumer protections were critical to improving our broken health care system. So no matter what you think of this bill, my amendment would guarantee that no American family loses the care they have paid for now just when they need it the most.

□ 1750

The law provides legal protection and peace of mind to the Strong family in Santa Barbara and to all families like them across our Nation. Our families need this law; and if the majority is willing to vote for the 37th time to repeal it, they at least need to vote on this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on my motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can try as much as they would like today to distract the people from the real issue at hand. But the fact remains today that ObamaCare was bad policy when it was enacted, and it's getting worse the closer we get to its implementation.

When I hear from Hoosiers in the State of Indiana, from business owners trying to run companies to seniors seeking quality care options, I hear overwhelming uncertainty and concern, and ObamaCare is the driving force.

To protect Americans from this impending train wreck, I support full repeal of this law, which has been nothing more than a string of broken promises. Let's just quickly look at a few.

Broken promise number one: the President claimed that he would not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficit. However, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that this bill adds almost $2 trillion. After consecutive trillion-dollar deficits, our national debt is soaring towards $17 trillion. It's time to stop spending money we simply don't have.

Broken promise number two: the President claimed that no family making less than $250,000 a year will see their taxes increase. However, the Joint Committee on Taxation reports that ObamaCare includes 21 new or higher taxes that will cost taxpayers roughly $1.1 trillion.

I recently had the chance to tour an orthopedic manufacturing company in my district in Mishawaka, Indiana. During this visit, I heard real-life stories from real-life employees about the taxes in ObamaCare. I was warned that the new medical device tax will prevent the company from creating good-paying jobs in Indiana for Hoosiers who are out of work. The reality is this tax will increase the cost of medical devices used by our senior citizens and our wounded warriors.

Broken promise number three: the President repeatedly claimed that his proposal could save families $2,500 a year in health care premiums when, in fact, researchers from the Kaiser Family Foundation found that average family premiums have instead increased by over $3,000 since 2008. If not repealed, this law will continue to increase premiums and eat away at the paychecks of single moms and young families all across the country. The reality, Madam Speaker, this Affordable Care Act is not so affordable.

Broken promise number four: the President claimed he would protect Medicare. But instead of protecting Medicare and making it stronger, he raided $716 billion from the program to fund his government takeover of our health. The millions of seniors who depend on Medicare deserve better. My mom, a Medicare beneficiary, deserves better.

Madam Speaker, we don't need this law, period. We don't need a law that tramples over our freedoms by allowing the government to make our personal health care choices. We don't need a law that restricts our access to quality and affordable health care. And we definitely don't need a law enforced by an agency actively targeting citizens with opposing political views.

I urge all of my colleagues to defeat the motion to recommit and stand today and repeal ObamaCare.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 230, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—190

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

NAYS—230

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson

McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Clyburn
Cole
Conyers
Duffy
Engel
Johnson, Sam
Labrador
Lewis
Markey
McIntyre
Quigley
Wagner

□ 1818

Messrs. BILIRAKIS, TERRY, CRAMER, DESJARLAIS, POSEY, HARPER, LUETKEMEYER, PETERSON, KINGSTON, HARRIS and ROSKAM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. OWENS, JEFFRIES, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Messrs. COOPER and THOMPSON of Mississippi changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—229

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

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Clyburn
Duffy
Johnson, Sam
Labrador
Lewis
Markey
Quigley
Wagner

□ 1826

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday May 16, 2013, I was in St. Louis, Missouri celebrating children's graduations. My son, Stephen Wagner today graduated from Washington University in St. Louis, and my daughter, Mary Ruth Wagner, has a Baccalaureate Mass for Ursuline Academy.

Due to these lifetime events, I was unable to be in Washington, DC and vote on the legislative business of the day.

On Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 215, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 45 to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health-care related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, rollcall Vote No. 150, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On Adoption of H. Res. 215, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 45 to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, rollcall Vote No. 151, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On Approval of the Journal, rollcall Vote No. 152, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 45, rollcall Vote No. 153, had I been present I would have voted "no."

On Passage of H.R. 45 to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, rollcall Vote No. 154, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 107

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I might remove my name from H.R. 107 as a cosponsor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BACHMANN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BRITISH-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. CICILLINE, Rhode Island

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. WOLF, Virginia
Mr. PITTENGER, North Carolina
Mr. MEADOWS, North Carolina

HONORING CIPRIANO GARZA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cipriano Garza, who this Saturday will be joining the ranks of the select few members in the South Dade High School's Alumni Hall of Fame.

Throughout his life, Cip—as he is known—has achieved high levels of personal success and excelled in his profession, making him a great example of the diversity and ingenuity of the south Florida community.

During his senior year at South Dade High, Cip set new State and school records for the 100-yard dash at the State Championships while crossing the finish line barefoot.

As a son of migrant farm workers, Cip has used his unique perspective in working with Dade County Public Schools to create innovative educational programs and eradicate the school dropout rate among children of migrant farm workers.

In 1993, after being appointed a special assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Cip became the first Mexican-American to receive a Presidential appointment in the State of Florida.

Cip's many accomplishments and dedication to the betterment of the community make him deserving of this great honor.

Congratulations to Cip Garza.

ACA REPEAL

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today, for the 37th time, the Republicans set a vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Yet again, this is a waste of time and taxpayer resources on pure political posturing, rather than working hard on behalf of hardworking American taxpayers.

As a freshman Member, I can tell you where I stand, and that is in 100 percent pure full support of the Affordable Care Act.

Republicans have ignored real problems affecting our country and instead have chosen to attack the poor and most vulnerable. Millions of Americans are already enjoying protections and benefits under the law. In my State of Texas, over 300,000 young adults are able to stay under their parents' plan. Over 3 million women and 1.8 million senior citizens have access to preventive care. Many more will have insurance coverage once the insurance exchanges are in place for 2014.

Republicans constantly talk about requiring more efficiency and reducing redundancy in Federal Government. How about we start reducing redundancy right here in Congress? Let's move beyond messaging bills and into actual substantive legislation. Let's focus on jobs and grow the economy rather than wasting money on repealing the Affordable Care Act.

SO-CALLED AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(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, Americans want and need greater access to health care, and they deserve reforms that will lower costs and expand access, but without undermining quality and innovation.

These were the promises of the President's health care reform law. They were worthy goals. Unfortunately, they are not reality.

To the contrary, over the past 3 years, families and businesses have seen a 400 percent premium increase for health care. Patients are being denied coverage that physicians will not accept. Employers have slowed hiring under new costs and the fear of what is ahead.

This Congress has rescinded funding for or completely repealed eight separate provisions of ObamaCare. Key provisions of the act are beginning to collapse under the weight of their own irreparable flaws. And even my Democratic colleagues have warned of the law's looming ''train wreck.''

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. Full repeal of this flawed policy is the first step to enacting commonsense reforms to actually lower costs and expand access. Only then can we enact a law that can be truly called the ''Affordable Care Act.''

AUTOMATIC IRA ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about legislation that I have reintroduced—the Automatic IRA Act of 2013.

According to Boston College's Center for Retirement Research, the United States has a retirement income deficit of $6.6 trillion.

One area I think we need to focus on is getting more low and middle-income workers into retirement savings.

It is estimated that 75 million workers—or half of American workers—have no employer-provided retirement plan or other opportunity to save for workplace contributions. The auto IRA is a commonsense solution to dramatically expand retirement savings in the United States.

Listen to this: this auto IRA proposal was jointly developed by myself, along with the Brookings Institution and the Heritage Foundation. It has garnered widespread support, including from AARP, the U.S. Black Chamber of Commerce, the Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement, and the Aspen Institute Initiative on Financial Security.

This is a commonsense piece of legislation that should be joined by both parties in advancing retirement opportunities for the American people.

PROMOTING OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE STATE OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to cosponsor legislation I have introduced to ensure that the State of Israel maintains its qualitative military edge.

Israel recently celebrated its 65th anniversary of independence.

Unfortunately, many of Israel's neighbors continue their relentless attacks against this Nation. While Iran pursues its nuclear program, it has launched cyber attacks against Israel.

Israel is under constant danger from both conventional and unconventional weapons. However, the current statutory definition of ''qualitative military edge'' does not include the threats posed by militia activity or cyber attacks.

These are very real threats against Israel and must be taken into account.

H.R. 1992 updates the definition of ''qualitative military edge'' so that the asymmetric and cyber warfare are considered and would require a 2-year reporting process.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee to advance this legislation and to increase our special relationship with Israel. I appreciate the chairman of Foreign Affairs, Mr. ROYCE, for his support and cosponsorship.

And I also would like to thank my friend from across the aisle, Mr. SCHNEIDER, for his support. Good policy knows no party line, and I look forward to working together to move forward this legislation.

REGARDING THE PATIENTS' RIGHTS REPEAL ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted a moment to reflect. This was a very sad day for me. Having been here during the emotional time during the debate on the Affordable Care Act, remembering the long hours and the deliberation in the committees in regular order, the opportunity for Republicans to offer amendments, and then today for the 37th time this particular act has now hurt millions of Americans.

My State is number one. Today, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to call the roll and ask those citizens of those States to call their Senators. For how can you vote for such a repeal of the Patients' Rights Act when Texas, Louisiana, Nevada, California, Florida, Georgia, Arkansas, Alaska, Mississippi, and Oklahoma all have uninsured over 20 percent, with Texas being 28.4 percent?

It is poverty that drives the need to expand Medicaid to my State, to my Governor. It is poverty that drives this. Whether you are poor, whether you are low-income, whether you are working middle class, the Affordable Care Act is to lift your boat to give you the opportunity to have preventive health care to be able to have access to doctors. Why would anybody vote to repeal the Patients' Rights Act?

□ 1840

RESCUING AMERICANS FROM THE TRACKS OF HEALTH CARE DESTRUCTION

(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. Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you why people would vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It has become very, very clear that no matter how well-intentioned it may have been, it will not work. Time after time, we are finding that the things that they told us just aren't panning out to be true; and Senator MAX BAUCUS, one of the law's main architects, recently described ObamaCare as a huge train wreck coming down.

We have a chance to save Americans from being casualties of the train wreck. We can yank them off the tracks. Today, I voted to show that I am trying to do just that.

I call on the United States Senate and the Senators to join us in rescuing the American people from the tracks of health care destruction.

SCANDALS IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the past few weeks, it seems as if you can't turn on the news without hearing of another drama, of another crisis in Washington undermining confidence in our government, whether it's Benghazi, the IRS, the Department of Justice, or the Department of Health and Human Services. It's hard to know what may be next.

Mr. Speaker, there is an age-old expression that goes like this: be careful to whom you give a gun and a badge.

Authority is a very delicate matter. A well-functioning government must ensure that those who are in positions of influence are committed to serving the public with impartiality and fairness. Recent revelations have done much to undermine the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, 8 months ago, our Ambassador to Libya was killed along with three other Americans. Not only is this an affront to America because we lost our Ambassador; it is also an attack on our Nation, and it undermines the international rule of law. The process by which we have tried to unpack the details of this attack has been careening all over the place. Even after several committee hearings on Benghazi, including a Foreign Affairs Committee hearing in which I participated last December, a core question remains unanswered:

Who said ''stand down'' when reinforcements were called for?

Now, there may be legitimate military and diplomatic reasoning here, but we simply need to know the answer to that question; or this could have been a very serious mistake with the gravest of consequences.

In the past week, we've learned of discrimination against specific groups by the Internal Revenue Service. These reports are causing a firestorm across our country. Our sensitivities are rightly heightened when it comes to the collection of taxes. No one wants to pay taxes, but we must have a revenue-collecting agency in order to have a functioning Federal Government. It is unconscionable, though, that this agency targeted citizens because of their political or religious beliefs.

The IRS, of all agencies, must be held to the highest of high standards of fairness and impartiality. The reported actions seriously undermine the foundation of trust necessary between citizens and their government. That's why, this week, the Taxpayer Nondiscrimination and Protection Act was introduced with my support. The legislation puts meaningful penalties in place when this foundation of trust is violated, penalties that could include prison time.

Perhaps it's also time for the IRS to implement a new policy. Everyone they are auditing, or perhaps have audited in the past 3 years, must be provided with a fuller explanation as to why they're going through this process so as to ensure that there is no improper targeting of American citizens based upon their religious or political beliefs. Just this morning, a friend of mine texted me, and another one called me just yesterday, worried that the audits that were undertaken against them were due to their own political leanings and engagements.

Mr. Speaker, the real issue is this: Just how deep and wide is the mind-set that pervaded the IRS that did target Americans based upon their religious or political leanings?

On another issue, we are learning that the Department of Justice seized phone records of Associated Press reporters, including records of their personal phone lines. Now, the ability to wiretap and probe needs to be in place in narrow circumstances, but the wide-ranging nature of what happened raises a number of questions, questions that beg us to ask: How do we protect the freedom of the press?

Another problem that hasn't been widely discussed is that the Department of Health and Human Services, in effect, is also targeting people based upon their beliefs. The Department is forcing Americans to pay for drugs and procedures that many find to be inconsistent with their deeply held, reasonable beliefs or their religious traditions. When the President introduced his health care plan, he told Americans that if they liked their health insurance, they could keep it. Now we are finding in some cases that you cannot keep your doctor, that you cannot keep your own health care plan, and now you may not even be able to keep your own faith tradition. This is a form of coercion that sets up a false choice and is un-American.

All of these events are converging to erode confidence in Washington. Now, thankfully, many of these concerns actually cross the political aisle. There is bipartisan concern. These are American issues, and these events underscore why we actually do have a balance of power in Washington. There is an executive branch that enforces the law, and there is a legislative branch that writes the law. The legislative branch also has the duty to provide oversight over the executive branch, which is a duty that Congress now is rightly embracing.

It is important that in each instance here the truth is uncovered and that swift and appropriate actions are taken to help restore confidence in the impartiality, fairness, and competence of the Federal Government.

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

THE INNOCENT AND THE INCONVENIENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Speaker.

With the recent murder conviction of abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell, we've got to encourage Americans to ask: How different, really, is Gosnell's house of horrors from abortions that occur in clinics throughout the United States? The tragic answer: not much. Not much at all.

Mr. Speaker, there are Kermit Gosnells all over America—predators, child abusers, exploiters of women. Some abortionists may have cleaner sheets than Gosnell did and better sterilized equipment and better trained accomplices, but what they do and what Gosnell did for four decades—kill babies and hurt women—is the same.

Will Americans ever be told the horrifying details as to how and how often abortionists dismember, decapitate, and chemically poison innocent babies?

Where is the outrage, Mr. Speaker, over the 55 million child victims who have been brutally killed by abortion over the last 40 years and over the millions of women who have been hurt physically, emotionally, and psychologically?

Why the appalling lack of compassion? Why the empathy deficit for the victims—women and children—by so many, including and especially by President Obama and Vice President BIDEN? Women and children deserve better.

Of course, Gosnell's trial isn't the first to rip the benign facade of legitimacy from the abortion industry. As far back as 1975, Dr. Kenneth Edelin was convicted by a jury in Boston of murdering an African American baby boy who was found dead and abandoned in the Boston City Hospital morgue.

□ 1850

An investigation that led to trial revealed that the child was yet another Kenneth Edelin victim. When the jury saw the picture of the dead baby, they were appalled and persuaded that indeed a homicide had occurred. Astonishingly, that conviction was subsequently overturned by the Massachusetts Supreme Court, which simply dismissed the murder as yet another legal abortion.

Mr. Speaker, how did Planned Parenthood react to the reversal of verdict? With euphoric celebration. Dr. Edelin, after all, was their guy. Years later, Dr. Edelin became the chairman of the board of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and was even given the Margaret Sanger Award in 2008. And I would note parenthetically that in 2009, Planned Parenthood gave the Sanger Award to Hillary Clinton. And like Gosnell, not a single tear was shed by Dr. Kenneth Edelin or Planned Parenthood for the murdered child victim.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, an undercover investigative organization, Live Action, released more undercover videos that exposed the abortion industry's absolutely appalling and callous disregard for human life, human rights, and Federal law. Previously, Live Action aired several videos showing Planned Parenthood abortion clinic personnel advising women at several clinics throughout the country, including in my own home State of New Jersey, as to how to procure sex-selection abortions simply because the unborn child happened to be a little girl and other equally disturbing videos showing Planned Parenthood staffers who counsel and offer to arrange secret abortions for teenager sex trafficking victims.

One of those was in a Planned Parenthood where I went to high school in Perth Amboy. A very young Latina, 14, 15, posing as a woman who had been trafficked with a man that was posing as a pimp, talks—and I advise and ask people to watch those videos. Just go to Live Action. Google it, and you can find it. Watch how they say, We cannot only abort this young girl who has been trafficked—and I wrote, Mr. Speaker, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to combat this hideous modern-day exploitation mostly of women and children. And there's Planned Parenthood personnel saying how this young girl could get a secret abortion, be back out on the streets and, of course, further exploited by this person who purported to be a pimp.

The first call should have been to the police to have them arrested; instead, they talked about how to get the secret abortion.

Live Action has released undercover videos showing a Bronx, New York, abortion counselor describing how, in violation of U.S. Federal law, a born-alive baby would be placed in a jar of toxic solution to ensure his or her death.

A D.C. abortionist is also captured on film who talks about leaving a baby born alive after a botched abortion simply to die due to the elements.

An Arizonan worker said that they would not resuscitate should a baby survive an abortion attempt.

This is not just violence against children; this is a violation of Federal law.

Live Action President Lila Rose has released yet another must-see video of a Maryland abortionist by the name of Dr. LeRoy Carhart, who compares a baby in the womb—you've got to watch this—to meat in a slow cooker and jokes about his abortion toolkit, complete with pickax and drill bit. I watched that, and I was sick. This man does so-called ''legal abortions'' right within range of this Nation's capital.

Mr. Speaker, some day—and I believe the day is fast approaching—Americans will look back and wonder how and why such a seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with education, advanced science, information, and wealth, opportunity could have so utterly failed to protect the innocent and the inconvenient. They will wonder how and why a Nobel Peace Prize winning President could also have simultaneously been the abortion President and Planned Parenthood's best friend, despite the tragic fact that Planned Parenthood is directly responsible for aborting over 6 million babies in their clinics.

History will not look favorably on today's abortion culture. We must instead work tirelessly to replace it with a culture of life. Women and children deserve no less.

I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I'm proud to rise in strong support of comprehensive immigration reform. There are many of my colleagues that have fought these battles long before I arrived in Congress, but today I join my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, in strong support of comprehensive immigration reform.

Comprehensive immigration reform is the single most important thing we can do to grow our economy. It will also help make sure that our laws reflect our values as Americans. We are, after all, a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants, and the two can and must be made consistent through comprehensive immigration reform.

I want to acknowledge the work of many of my colleagues both in the Senate and House in working towards this worthy goal. I've said in my district and here on the floor of Congress that never in my limited time here have I ever been more optimistic about getting immigration reform done than I am now.

Immigration reform is long overdue, and should this Congress fail to rise to the challenge, Mr. Speaker, the issue will not go away. There may be 10 million or 11 million people here without papers to be able to work, and that doesn't solve itself, so let's take this on. Let's take this on on behalf of the American people, on behalf of Americans of all ideologies, arm in arm with faith-based groups, with civil rights groups, with law enforcement, with the business community, all of whom have

come to Washington and met with Members back home imploring on us the urgent need for action.

There is a strong economic argument about how immigration reform spurs innovation, helps create jobs. We need to also make sure employers play by the same set of rules and some employers don't benefit by dealing under the table in an illegal way. This happens today.

I've spoken out about some of the steps that States and Congress have taken in the absence of comprehensive immigration reform because those measures simply don't work. Let's take, for example, programs like 287(g) and Secure Communities. These draconian laws have actually made our communities less safe by making our immigrant communities less likely to report crimes. Failure to access health care makes our communities less safe by deteriorating public health.

A recent poll showed that almost 30 percent of U.S.-born Latinos, Americans, are scared to report a crime, even if they're a victim, out of fear that they'll be asked about their immigration status or the status of their family and friends. In order to begin to address this important public safety issue, we have to pass comprehensive immigration reform and restore trust to community policing across the country.

There is a political imperative facing the United States Congress because a vast majority of Americans want to see us pass comprehensive immigration reform. Over 70 percent—a majority of self-described conservatives, of liberals, of moderates, majorities of Democrats, of Republicans, Independents—83 percent of Americans support a pathway to citizenship for immigrants who pass a background test and want to learn English and play by the rules.

I've heard some of my colleagues say, Oh, why don't they get in line? Well, the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is no line. Immigration reform is about creating a line. Of course, those who are here illegally will be in line behind those who are in the process legally. There's never been a question about that. But we need to create a line to have an orderly way of doing what is under the table and done extralegally today.

□ 1900

The American public wants us to act now and continues to demand that of this Congress, because the American people are wise. They know that nothing will help us grow our economy more, will shore up the budget deficit and the entitlement programs that we worry about, will reestablish the rule of law, will help us secure our borders and facilitate trade. Nothing will do that better than bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform.

I'm proud to say that the Senate markup of immigration reform is now underway. As we move forward, we'll be talking out for and against various amendments that support or undermine our principles. I think what's critical is to protect a pathway to citizenship for 11 million aspiring Americans living in the shadows, and we need to make sure that there's a realistic way for that to happen.

Let me be clear: no version of comprehensive immigration reform confers citizenship on anybody. Citizenship is earned over time. This is about creating a line and a process by which people have provisional status, maybe some day a green card, and then maybe some day if they want to learn English and take the citizenship test and forgo their foreign allegiances, we'd be happy to have them as our American brothers and sisters. If other immigrants choose not to and choose to work here for a period of time legally and return to another country, that is fine, too. This country has been built by immigrants from across the world. My own great-grandparents came to these shores, and today, I have the deep honor of serving in the United States Congress.

We need to make sure that immigration reform keeps families together, strengthens our family-based visa program for future immigrants, has realistic wait times that are consistent with people's lives so that parents can be with their kids as they grow up. Nothing can be more inhumane than the way immigration laws play out today in our country where an American child, an American citizen, returning home from school might find that their mother or father is in an indefinite detention process, and not because of anything their kid did. Why? Maybe they had a taillight out. Maybe they were going 10 miles over the speed limit. Is that really a moral justification for tearing up a strong family unit, Mr. Speaker?

I've met with many of these kids and I've met with their parents. We need to be a Congress that supports families. We need to be a Congress that helps parents have time to spend with their kids, make sure no kid has to worry about their parent, who has no criminal violation—we're only talking about civil violations, no criminal violation—and suddenly being missing for months or being sent to a country that the child might never even have been to.

There's a number of reasons in addition to the moral ones for immigration reform. Many of our fast-growing companies cry out for a skilled workforce. For America to be competitive, for innovative companies in the technology industry to be successful, for innovative companies in advanced manufacturing to be successful, we need to compete in the global talent pool. We are precluded. American companies are precluded from doing that today. And we wonder why jobs are being outsourced. Why are companies growing in India? Why are companies growing in England? Why are they growing overseas in Chile? Well, you know what? Many of those companies would rather grow here and hire people here, and our current laws prohibit them from doing so because they can't get the people they want.

I represent a district with two fine universities, great institutions: Colorado State University in Fort Collins, the University of Colorado at Boulder. Right down the road is the School of Mines in Colorado, DU. All these schools are educating the next generation of engineers, of mathematicians, of computer programmers, of scientists, some of whom are foreign nationals legally here on student visas. But once they're trained, once that young man from India, that young woman from France gets that advanced degree in computer science and a master's degree and is ready to go into a good job, guess what our government says? Our government says, Guess what, you've got to leave. You've got to take that job to France. You've got to take that job to India. You've got to take that job to Canada. Our government is saying we don't want that job in our country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, through comprehensive immigration reform, this Congress can make a statement that we do want that job here in America. We want to grow our economy stronger. We want to make sure that the people who have had the great benefit of learning at one of our premier institutions of higher education can employ their talents here to make our country stronger and grow our economy. That's what comprehensive immigration reform is all about.

I'm also optimistic that comprehensive immigration reform will provide a new mechanism for entrepreneurs from across the world to start their companies here. Currently, there is no visa classification for somebody who has an idea, has some backing, venture capital investment, and wants to hire 10 or 20 people. And guess what. It's not just about the 10 or 20 people that they hire. It's about the potential for that company to employ thousands of people years down the road. And again, what does our government say? No, go start that company in Chile; go start that company in China or India.

Well, I'm sure all those countries need companies, too, Mr. Speaker; but I, as a Congressman, represent America, and I want that company here. I want it in my congressional district and in my State, but I'll be happy as long as it is in America. So let's provide a way, through a start-up visa, that an entrepreneur from anywhere in the world who has a great idea and that idea is validated by receiving a real investment can come start their company here in our country. Hire Americans; grow that company; bring value to consumers; create jobs; live the American Dream. That's what this country is all about. That's what this country is all about.

And let's talk about the dreamers, Mr. Speaker. These are young de facto Americans. Why de facto Americans?

They know no other country. Maybe they were brought here when they were 2 or 5 or 1. They didn't violate any law in coming here. What does a 1-year-old know from the law. They grew up here. They played sports with your kids in school. They were cheerleaders with your kids in school. They got good grades. They're going to college. Guess what. They don't have any type of identification that allows them to work in this country. And technically, under the law, they would have to return to another country where they may not even speak the language or know anybody.

So while President Obama's deferred action program is a strong step in the right direction, and at least many of these dreamers no longer live in fear of indefinite detention and can go to work, that's only a 2-year timeout. Only Congress can provide a permanent status for these millions of de facto Americans who know no other country, are as American as you or me. American in fact; let's make them American in law. And that, too, should and must be a part of the comprehensive immigration reform package.

Our country is about family values and letting parents raise their kids without fear of government intervention, being able to live the American Dream. These are values that transcend our ideologies. These are values that conservative Americans and liberal Americans and moderate Americans can all agree on.

When I have town hall meetings in my district—and we always, as you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, attract a broad ideological diversity, as many of us do across this country, everybody from the far right to far left to people in the middle—I always like to ask, Is anybody happy with immigration today? Does anybody here think we're doing a great job; everything's right? Not a single constituent anywhere along the ideological spectrum has raised their hand and said, Yes, we just need to keep doing what we're doing.

It ain't working. There are 11 million people here illegally. Countries are violating the law every day. Families are being torn apart. Taxpayers are on the hook. Let's change it. It ain't going to change unless we change it. It doesn't change itself.

States have tried to move forward with what they can. They can't solve it. Some States have looked into issuing State work permits or in-State tuition or how they can make sure that people have driver's insurance who don't have Federal paperwork. But look, they're just cleaning up after our mess. That's all the States can do. We need to fix this mess here in Washington. Only the United States Congress has the authority to restore credibility and integrity to our immigration law.

□ 1910

Americans of all stripes are joining the call for comprehensive immigration reform now, strengthening our border security, and facilitating legitimate trade and commerce across the border, employer enforcement, making sure that employers aren't let off the hook for hiring people who don't have the right to be here, making sure we have the workers we need to fuel our economy, all kinds of jobs that we need.

We talked about technology and programmers. Well, guess what? We also need people in the fields picking tomatoes, in the fields harvesting oranges. We need people who clean buildings at night. We're happy, we're always happy to have Americans do that.

I was meeting with a farmer in Larimer County a couple of months ago. He said he'd love to hire Americans. He's never been able to have an American who agreed to keep that job and do that backbreaking labor for more than a couple of weeks. He relies on immigrant labor. He wants us to pass comprehensive immigration reform that includes a way that they can have seasonal workers to meet the needs that they have in the field.

I'm joined by one of my colleagues from the great State of California. Congressman TAKANO, despite being a freshman, has quickly become a vocal advocate for immigrant families. He's shown a strong commitment and true leadership in seeing that comprehensive immigration reform passes in the 113th Congress.

I'm proud to welcome and yield time to my colleague from the State of California.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding time.

Even though the economy is improving and job creation levels are the highest they've been in 4 years, the top priority for all Members of Congress must be putting people back to work and strengthening the economy.

Despite what opponents of immigration reform say, the bill proposed in the Senate does just that; and, moreover, it strengthens Social Security.

One of the Republican architects of the Senate bill, Senator MARCO RUBIO, sent a letter to the Social Security Administration's chief actuary, asking for the net effect of comprehensive immigration reform on the Social Security trust fund.

In his reply, Chief Actuary Goss stated that they are developing 75-year estimates, but, quote, and this is Actuary Goss speaking, ''overall, we anticipate that the net effect of this bill,'' meaning comprehensive immigration reform, ''on the long-range Social Security actuarial balance, will be positive.''

The actuary's office also states that over the next 10 years, comprehensive immigration reform will prevent 2 million illegal border crossings, create 3.2 million jobs, and increase the rate of growth on our gross domestic product by a third.

Opponents of immigration reform don't seem to understand that many of the undocumented immigrants in this Nation are already working. Yet because of their illegal status, they are forced into the underground economy, with no labor protections and no way to pay into the system.

Put plainly, undocumented immigrants are often paid cash under the table, and often drastically less than the minimum wage. Allowing these individuals to come out of the shadows and putting them on the pathway to citizenship brings them into the system, where they will pay taxes and receive basic protections against abuse.

For example, an undocumented worker in my district may only be making $4 or $5 an hour, instead of the California minimum wage of $8 an hour. If comprehensive immigration reform is passed, he or she will be eligible for the minimum wage, which will, in turn, increase his buying power, raise revenues for businesses, and drive up wages for everyone else, thus increasing our annual GDP growth rate, as shown here on this chart.

Now, just to be clear, without comprehensive immigration reform, our annual growth rate will only be 4.5 percent. But with comprehensive immigration reform, our annual growth rate shoots up to 6.1 percent.

If the priority of this body is putting Americans back to work and strengthening our economy, then it must pass comprehensive immigration reform that creates a pathway to citizenship and allows undocumented workers the ability to work under the same labor protections and pay into the same system as everyone else.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for sharing that information.

What better way can we grow our economy, create jobs for Americans, reduce our national debt, reduce the deficit than if we simply accomplish comprehensive immigration reform.

Many colleagues on both sides of the aisle have expressed concerns about how we can make sure that Social Security is viable and there for young people when they retire. Well, guess what? Making sure that we have our younger new immigrants paying in will help make sure that occurs and that today's seniors and tomorrow's seniors will be taken care of in their old age.

I think that comprehensive immigration reform is absolutely critical towards job growth and creation. And the gentleman from California talked about the difference between a 6.1 and 4.5 percent growth. That represents millions of jobs, millions of jobs for Americans. That's what's at stake with this discussion.

I want to ask the gentleman from California to talk about how important jobs are in his district and how you'd benefit from that additional 2 percent growth. What would that mean to folks in Riverside and folks in California?

Mr. TAKANO. Well, a 2 percent growth rate could translate into a reduction of our current 11 percent unemployment rate in my district, which

is located in Riverside County. We often, in the Inland Empire, as we call the region of California where I represent, we often lag behind the rest of the State when we are coming out of economic downturns.

What I find most interesting about Chief Actuary Goss's statement, his reply to Senator RUBIO's question was how comprehensive immigration reform will have a positive net effect on Social Security.

And if you think about that carefully, and you compare our Nation to, say, a nation such as Japan, where there is no inflow of immigration, and where the population is aging, or other advanced nations where there is no significant amount of immigration, and their populations are aging, they are facing tremendous stresses on the ways in which they are going to provide for their senior citizens.

It only makes sense that, to keep Social Security solvent, we want young, vibrant inflows of capable workers to pay the taxes that will support Social Security into the future.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from California has also been a leader in opposing the chained CPI adjustment to Social Security. Don't you think that this immigration reform concept is a better way to shore up Social Security than trying to change the formula to a chained CPI?

Mr. TAKANO. I agree. That's a very good question. Chained CPI, as you know, was—many Americans may not know what chained CPI means. CPI is the consumer price index, and that's the way in which the increase in Social Security benefits are calculated.

There are some economists who've proposed something called chained CPI, which assumes that seniors could withstand a slight reduction in their benefits because they could substitute other goods and services that are cheaper.

But the main goods and services that senior citizens consume are health care and medicines and prescription drugs. Those goods and services they can count on increasing faster than the rate of inflation.

Let's look at how this immigration bill is going to work.

□ 1920

For the first 10 years, registered provisional status for the immigrants who have been previously undocumented would mean that people would be legal in this country, on legal status. They would be paying taxes, but they could not be drawing any Social Security benefits out. I personally have some problems with this. But under this current law, for 10 years, we would see millions of workers who are under the Social Security cap who would be paying into the Social Security Trust Fund, but none of them would be able to draw anything out for at least 10 years. You just do the simple back-of-the-envelope math, and you have to understand what an inflow of revenue that would be to the system.

Mr. POLIS. This comprehensive immigration reform helps two ways. One, there's more people paying in, young people. The second way is more economic growth, which means Social Security is funded through a payroll tax. So when you have more people working, lower unemployment, we talked about getting that rate in Riverside down from 11 percent to 9 percent to 8 percent to 6 percent. Everybody working is then paying in, and that also makes Social Security stronger.

So this argument about the critical economic growth engine that we need not only creates jobs today but helps ensure that tomorrow's seniors are taken care of in their old age.

Mr. TAKANO. Yes, it's a double benefit that many people may not have been aware of, a double positive effect on our economy. For many people it's counterintuitive to think that by reforming immigration and by giving legal status to undocumented immigrants to allow them to come out of the shadows and to be protected by our labor laws that that would have a net positive effect on all wages, but it would. These people are already working, and they're working currently, many of them, at sub-minimum wage levels. If we bring them up to minimum wage, it will mean an even playing field for all workers. There's a kind of rising tide effect that lifts all boats.

Mr. POLIS. That's a good point because I, like yourself, I'm sure many of us sometimes hear from American workers. American workers say, hey, I'm frustrated because there are people that are here illegally working for less than minimum wage or working for cash. What I say to those American workers is, I say, that's exactly why we need comprehensive immigration reform. We need to make sure that people aren't allowed to compete under the table for cash. We're actually creating, by the failure of our own laws, an entire underground labor economy. And by the way, those workers aren't protected from abuse by their employers. Sometimes they do the work and they're not paid, and they can't sue.

I have some very exciting news to announce, to break some news. This just broke on CNN that the bipartisan House group has reached an agreement on immigration reform, announced by Republican Representative MARIO DIAZ-BALART. So I know that the group has been working for some time. Many of us have encouraged them and supported their work. We certainly hope to be able to see the bill soon.

So as the Senate continues the markup, hopefully there is a great additional dose of enthusiasm for us that it looks like here in the House our efforts will hopefully be moving forward as well on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. TAKANO. I associate myself with the gentleman's comments. I am very heartened by this announcement. I will, of course, temper my enthusiasm until I actually see the elements of this compromise. But what many folks here are saying on the Hill—which I'll reveal here on the floor of the House—is I think there is great hope on both sides of the aisle that if we can pass comprehensive immigration reform it will be evidence, the first evidence in a long time, that this body is functional and can work and that our government can do great things. So I am cautiously optimistic, and thank you for sharing that information.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on this issue. I agree that for Congress to ever be a trusted institution, it needs to solve problems. It needs to come up with practical, commonsense solutions. It's clear what that route is for immigration. It's not too different from what President Bush talked about that President Obama supports. It has long had bipartisan support. It's a comprehensive approach, not this piecemeal approach some talk about, oh, let's build a wall and then talk about something else, or let's do something in high tech and then talk about something else. Look, those are band-aids and the patient is bleeding. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAKANO. I agree. We need a holistic approach. I was very impressed that the AFL–CIO and the Chamber of Commerce were able to come together and sign off on what Senators, the Group of Eight in the Senate, had devised.

My goodness, if the Chamber of Commerce and AFL–CIO can come together, certainly Republicans and Democrats in this institution can come together, as well.

Mr. POLIS. Like yourself, obviously, I refrain from any particular comments about the House package until I see it, but I'm confident that with bipartisan support, like the Senate bill has, hopefully this House package will address a lot of these issues that you and I have discussed today, making families stronger, restoring the rule of law, reducing crime, creating economic growth and improving Social Security. Hopefully those benefits are included in this package, which I am very excited to examine and look at in the days and weeks ahead. Hopefully, we can join our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol in dealing with this critical issue.

Again, over 84 percent of the American people support a pathway to citizenship. You can't get 84 percent of the American people to agree on anything. And yet on this pathway for citizenship and immigration reform, you have 84 percent support.

I hope that Congress heeds that call. I know the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) is a leader in getting our colleagues to hear that call. He is joined by many of our friends, and it will take all of us working hard to ensure that Congress lives up to the expectations that the American people are setting and takes the right course on this for our country and for economic growth. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you for this time to share our vision for moving forward with the American people. I wake up each day excited to come to work, to work on their behalf. Despite our divisions, despite the rancor we see sometimes on the various cable shows, it's an enormous honor to serve in this institution, and it's a great honor to serve in this institution with the gentleman. I must bid adieu. I have to get going, but thank you so much.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for highlighting the argument of economic growth and the critical nature of economic reform. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as who how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. We have the unique opportunity here in the United States Congress to reflect the will of the American people. The will of the American people is clear in this regard. In my time here, seldom, if ever, have I seen an issue where 80 percent, 75 percent, 84 percent of the American people agree. And here we are, the faith community, the civil liberties community, the human rights community, the education community, the business community and the labor community all coming together to say, Congress, do something. And by the way, Congress, not do something like create some new program or do some new policy. It's, Congress, fix this. Only you can do it, Congress. The States can't do it. The States don't have control over this. Some nonprofit or private organization can't do it. Only the Federal Government and only the United States Congress can replace our broken immigration system with one that works for our country, one that reflects our country's need for human capital, for talent, for ideas and for innovation, one that helps make sure that we attract the best and brightest and hardest-working people from across the world to deploy their talents here to make our country stronger in a legal way, one that restores the trust with law enforcement, improves public safety in our communities, allows community policing and police officers to win the trust that's so critical for them to fight crime that affects all of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to talk about a commonsense issue that's received a lot of discussion in the press and continues to be on many of our minds, and that's how we can reduce violent crime in this country, gun violence and senseless murder and deaths that occur.

Now, this is no easy question. My focus here has always been improving education. I truly believe that improving our schools and making sure that our kids have access to the great opportunity that this country offers is the best way that we can reduce crime.

□ 1930

But we can do more, Mr. Speaker. We can do more in a commonsense way to make it harder for criminals to acquire weapons.

Now, how can we do this? Many States have already led the way. My home State of Colorado has long had a rule that has closed the gun show loophole and made sure that people that buy guns at gun shows have the same type of background check they would at a gun dealer. I think that's a commonsense rule that we should do nationally.

I also think we need a national way to make sure that when somebody buys a gun, that there's a background check. In doing so, we need to make sure that there's no national registry of gun owners. We need to protect gun owners' privacy. We want to make sure it doesn't inconvenience law-abiding Americans who want to be able to buy guns at dealers—and have done so and will continue to do so. But this is easy to accomplish. The Senate discussed such a bill. I understand there are several proposals, as well, in this body. And I have seen data. This has broad support from the American people, and it should be a commonsense idea for many of us.

There are people in this country who have lost the right to bear arms because they've committed a crime—armed robbery or rape—and as part of a judicial sentence they have lost that right. They may have lost the right to vote as well. Now, you're not going to stop them from getting a knife or a gun—no law will stop them from doing that—but we should make it harder. We should make it so they can't just go to a gun show and buy a gun for cash. There should be a background check to make sure that the person buying the gun is a law-abiding American and has the right to do that. I think law-abiding Americans want to protect their Second Amendment rights and want to make sure that it's not abused by criminals. I think that's a common step measure that I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take up and pass to help reduce violence in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk about the urgent need to improve our schools. Across our country we have schools that many parents would be proud to send their kids to. We also have schools that continue to fail year after year, that anybody who has the means to have choice—meaning, they're able to afford to be able to drive their kids somewhere else or pay a private school tuition—would never send their kids to that school. Thus, families that are essentially forced to have their kids go to that school have no choice, have no alternative. It's incumbent upon our school districts, our States, and, yes, our Federal Government because we, too, fund part of public education through IDEA, special education, to ensure that those schools don't continue to operate the way that they have been.

That's why I introduced last session and will introduce again a school turnaround bill. This bill will help address the lowest 5 percent of schools, the bottom performing 5 percent. We're talking about high schools that are dropout factories, where half the kids that go in the front door in 9th grade don't graduate in 12th grade. We're losing half of them. And what options do you have in life to support yourself and your family if you don't have a high school degree? It's hard, and it's getting harder in the 21st century information economy, Mr. Speaker.

We need to turn around these schools, make the tough choices, empower the superintendents of those school districts to use the creativity that they have to turn those schools around. And we need to make sure that they take action. As I told one of our local superintendents in Colorado, our goal, through public policy at the Federal level, should be to give you, the superintendent, the flexibility for you to be able to do what works but not the flexibility to do nothing, because we know that in doing nothing we will fail to change models that fail.

And whether the model that works is turning it into a charter school or extending the learning day or closing it down and opening three new schools in the same building, there's a lot of options, and many more, that a superintendent can choose from and apply, depending on the community needs and the buy-in from parents and families, which are important to make any education reform work. But it's critical that they take action, because without taking action, they're guaranteed more of the same.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support comprehensive immigration reform today. In my time on the floor in the last hour—and I could continue for even longer to articulate all of the reasons why comprehensive immigration reform benefits our country. Whether one cares about the safety of our communities from crime, whether one cares about the public health and infectious disease, restoring the rule of law, securing our borders, preventing terrorism, growing our economy, high-skills jobs, making sure that our farmers can thrive and grow, making sure that families stay together so that their American kids can grow up in wholesome family homes, for all these reasons and more, I call upon my colleagues to support comprehensive immigration reform.

I thank the Speaker for the time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

CORE AMERICAN BELIEFS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROKITA. I want to start out this evening by saying it's been a busy day here in the Capitol and it's been a busy week—some of it good, a lot of it not so

good. But it caused me to come to the floor tonight to talk with my colleagues, talk with the Speaker about some of the things that really are our core values, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans.

First of all, let me say that all of us—Republicans, Democrats, all Americans—believe in diversity, and we are here as a Congress in so many respects to celebrate that diversity. A great, free Republic like this is going to have divergent views, divergent opinions. We're going to have diversity in just about everything we do, everything we say, everything we are, and that's okay. We are open to all races, genders, and other classifications.

We're a family. We're one big national family. And like any other family, we're going to have our struggles, we're going to have our disagreements. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm here to remind us all tonight that that's okay. That's what it means to be in a free Republic. Because the alternative is much, much worse. You see, the alternative is not being able to have diversity at all, not being able to have an opinion different than the commanders at all, not being able to have free speech or free association.

Mr. Speaker, like any family, we face issues that make it difficult—especially seemingly these days—to find consensus. And like any family, we need to have open and honest dialogue, preferably without yelling or judging each other.

Just like any other family, the neighbors down the street, so to speak, are going to be judging us, be watching us. We don't have to worry so much about them, just to make sure that we continue having our discussion in a respectful way.

Like I said, although we have severe disagreements over some issues, there are core things that we all should be about, regardless of our diversity otherwise. I want to go through some of those tonight.

For example, we believe in the power of the individual, not the power of government over the individual. This isn't a Republican theme, although I am a Republican. This is a constitutional theme. This is what our Founders fought for and wrote for in those two great documents we call the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.

We believe, as Americans, that people are capable of making their own decisions—for example, about health care—much better than government can. And, Mr. Speaker, we saw a great debate on that very point just a few hours ago on the very floor of this very House. It is because individuals, families, and people can make decisions for themselves, regardless of whatever it is, better than the government can that I oppose this Affordable Care Act, that we oppose ObamaCare.

We believe that freedom is more when government is less—this is called the power of individualism over collectivism—and it's key, it's key to what this country has been successful about for over 200 years. But perhaps it's better to illustrate what I'm talking about when you realize what happens when freedom is absent.

I want you to take a look at this view from space. This is the Korean Peninsula, and here is the dividing line between North and South Korea.

□ 1940

It is obviously taken at night. And what you are seeing is an actual representation of the lights in both countries, lights generated from electricity by power plants, lights that in South Korea show bustling commerce, show vitality, show economic freedom, show individual freedom.

But look to North Korea. Almost complete darkness. Only one group of lights right around here. The capital city of North Korea where all the elites live, more specifically where all the government officials live, and more specifically than that where all the government officials in a closed tyrannical society live.

Freedom is more when government is less, when government is limited. We believe that the best way to ensure that government remains limited is to stop feeding it so much. Around here, the government's food, what it lives on, what it grows on day by day is money; what it grows on is our tax dollars. More and more these days it is also growing on the taxes of individuals who don't even exist yet, Mr. Speaker—the children of tomorrow. Yes, they are being taxed here today. It is called our nearly $17 trillion worth of debt. And it is also represented by the $100 trillion of debt that is on its way. I would like to get to that in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that money is the fruit of our labor. We believe that money is our property, the same way this suit is my property, the same way that the land and the homes that some of us may own are our property, the same way that a bicycle that we ride might be our property, so is our money. We believe that when government taxes us, they confiscate our property, and that that property is the fruit of our labor.

We can't forget that. I remember recently being in my district, and specifically in the city of Lafayette, a great place, and West Lafayette, home of Purdue University. And I was struck at a Rotary Club meeting when I used the term ''confiscation'' to describe what government does with our property in the form of taxation and got a good degree of pushback—very annoyed with me that I would use such a word to describe what government does—confiscation of our property—when clearly the government needs our money in order to function.

And that's true. Government absolutely has a valid role in a free society, as long as it remains in a limited form. And more and more, Mr. Speaker, what I see being debated here on this House floor, and when I see us enact in terms of laws some new laws, some laws that have been on the books for years, is government being involved in things that the Constitution and the people and the free society do not require, in fact, should not have the government be doing.

We believe that individuals, families, communities are always better at making decisions for ourselves than government is. Today, some believe that just having more power over your life, if they could have that kind of control, it would be that much better.

For example, they believe they have the right to tell you what kind of light bulbs to buy, they believe that you should only be able to buy cars with certain gas mileage standards, they believe that they have a right to dictate what goes inside your child's lunchbox before they go to school, and at school they believe they have the right to make sure your child learns certain things, but also to make certain that they don't learn other things. They believe that they can make better health care decisions for you than you can. They believe through the EPA that they can tell you how much electricity to use. And under the guise of making things cleaner, they are simply controlling your life.

That is not America; that is not Americans. We believe the opposite. The Founders knew exactly that the opposite was true—that decisions are best made by individuals and communities at the local level.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we believe that government is the servant of the people and that people aren't the servants of government.

Right now, we in the House are fighting to hold the executive branch accountable for a possible cover-up in Benghazi. This is not only about lives being lost, but about trust being breached. The Obama administration lied about the cause—Islamic terrorism—then they tried to cover their tracks. And now they claim that those of us who are demanding the truth are the ones who are politicizing the situation.

The executive branch owes the people the truth. It is basic accountability. They are our servants; we are not theirs.

We also believe in the right of a free press. Unfortunately, right now we have a Department of Justice that tries to spy on and intimidate members of the press. We found out in recent days that through subpoenas, which is a government action, individual reporters' names, their cell phones, and their phone records have been compromised, have been taken by the Federal Government.

It is my opinion that this administration is simply afraid of being held accountable, whether it is by a free press or by this Congress. Now, the Founders knew that both the free press and Congress with oversight are necessary to prevent tyranny. That is why

our job is so important today. That is why Americans are expecting and counting on us to take the Benghazi investigation, to take the AP, as it is called, the Associated Press, investigation as far as it goes until we find out what the truth is.

Perhaps a fundamental right is the one of free speech. It is the one that is absolutely necessary in a free society. It is the one that is core and fundamental in our Bill of Rights.

But, today, Mr. Speaker, we have an IRS that is targeting groups of private citizens simply because of their political beliefs, violating their right of free speech and violating their right of free association. This is nothing more than an abuse of power. It violates the Constitution's guarantee of equal protection under the law and should frighten each one of us, regardless of political party.

I guarantee you this, Mr. Speaker, this American, along with many others in this Congress, is going to go as far as we need to go with this investigation in order to find the full truth. The government must remain a servant of the people and not the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, we believe in giving a hand up, not necessarily a handout, because we believe that hand up is what made America strong, while a handout is what basically caused other nations in history to fail, resulting ultimately in tyranny.

A government can't be all things to all people; it can't do everything for everybody. It has been tried before. This is not a new idea, Mr. Speaker. But every time it has been tried in our history, it has resulted in terrible tyranny or ultimate failure altogether.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. Approximately 48 million Americans are on food stamps, more than at any other point in our history. Now, I know we have been going through some tough times, but that is not because too few people are getting food stamps.

The government is handing out free cell phones; but welfare programs are supposed to be for the poorest of the poor, for those who need that hand up. We shouldn't be giving handouts.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are. Just look at the facts. Under the Census Bureau's definition of ''poor,'' 80 percent of poor households have air-conditioning. In 1970, only 36 percent of the entire U.S. population enjoyed air-conditioning. Ninety-two percent of poor households have a microwave. Nearly three-fourths have a car or truck, and 31 percent have two or more cars or trucks.

□ 1950

Nearly two-thirds have cable or satellite TV. Two-thirds have at least one DVD player, and 70 percent have a VCR. These are all poor households. These are mostly households that would qualify also for food stamps and for other welfare programs. Half of them have a personal computer, and one in seven have two or more computers. Forty-three percent have Internet access. One-third has a wide-screen plasma or LCD TV.

Now, we are a giving Nation. We want to help out. Our volunteerism and our charity work are second to none in this entire world. It is actually part of our American exceptionalism. It is what makes us unique and different from any other place on this Earth. I'd like to know the American who thinks that given everything I've just listed that that fits his definition of ''poor'' and that that's whom we should be helping and not others who really, really need, again, that temporary hand up and not the permanent handout.

We believe in the freedom of individuals to make their own choices and also in the responsibility to live with the choices that they make. Perhaps more than anything else I've said here tonight, we are losing sight of that in this Congress, in this Federal Government.

The free enterprise system is a beautiful system. It's a wonderful system that rewards risks and rewards those who do useful work. Is it a perfect system? Absolutely not. Is it the best system ever devised by man to raise the condition of all men? Absolutely. Nothing in history has ever compared to it, and no experimentation that we are going to do now—mind you, they're not new experiments; these experiments have been tried—is going to make it any better. The free enterprise system absolutely works.

We believe that each generation should leave the next generation better off to enjoy life, to enjoy liberty, to enjoy the pursuit of happiness. Unfortunately, everyone knows on the floor of this House and elsewhere, day by day, that we are not leaving the next generation better off, that we are going to be the first generation in the history of this great Nation—based on the facts, based on our budget, based on our debt, based on our standard of living—that will not leave the next generation better off if we don't start living within our means again and if we don't stop printing and borrowing the money that we are to fund this beast called the Federal Government.

The Book of Proverbs commends hard work and enjoying the fruits of one's labor. With the money we earn, we provide for our families, and we can bless other people who are in need. Proverbs says: ''A good man leaves an inheritance to his children's children.'' I can't think of a higher source to make the point. We are breaking the promise to the next generation.

The good news is that, again, these are our core values. They're not Republican core values necessarily, and they're not Democrat ones. They are American ones. You might find things that sound like them in the Democratic Party platform. I know we practice them in the Republican Party platform, but, again, they're not ours—they're America's.

Everything I've said here tonight is defined explicitly in the Constitution—that great founding document that is, in my opinion, the core of our American exceptionalism. Now, when I say ''American exceptionalism,'' it's not that I'm thinking about it as our President has thought about it. I don't mean to say that we are a country that judges others. I don't even mean to say that we are a country that thinks categorically we're better than everyone else. Like I said at the outset, we have our own struggles in this family, this national family, but the fact of the matter is we are different, and it's this document—this Constitution—that, in large part, sets off that difference. Here is why:

The Constitution and the core values it contains—the things that I've just recited—all represent the best ideas for self-governance that the world has ever known. Never before in world history have those ideas ever come together at the same time and in the same place except for in the United States Constitution. That's unique. That makes us exceptional.

Now, the President when asked about this said, Oh, yes, America is exceptional. We believe we are exceptional just like the Brits think they're exceptional and just like the Germans might think they're exceptional—entirely missing the point and lacking the understanding of the founding of this country.

I bring that up today, Mr. Speaker, to get the word out, to make a record in this House of Representatives, that that's not at all what this country was about. Again, it doesn't mean we're judging. It doesn't mean we think we are better. We are different, we are unique, and we are the best experiment in self-governance the world has ever known. The only thing that can mess that up, that can destroy that exceptionalism, is us. That's what brings me to the floor at 8 o'clock on a Thursday night. It's important stuff.

In my time remaining, I'd like to focus on this debt that I've mentioned a few times now. Of all the issues that we face, of all the issues that we can properly and rightfully alleviate as a Federal Government, as a Congress, it's this spending. That is one of our chartered things, one of our enumerated powers, to set a budget of this Federal Government's size and its spending levels—and we have failed.

As I talk with you tonight, we are nearly $17 trillion in debt, but that's not even the half of it. The worst part, Mr. Speaker, is this red section—this $100 trillion that's on the way in the next 25 or so years. Do you see how vertical that line goes? The real fear is that, if we don't get our spending under control now, we might never be able to catch it. The fact of the matter is that the drivers of our debt—the social entitlement program of Medicaid, the health care program of Medicare, Social Security, the net interest we owe ourselves and other countries—mean

that it's growing so fast we may never be able to catch it. That's a huge problem.

Now, the slides I'm showing the House tonight are not TODD ROKITA slides. They are the House Budget Committee slides. The Democrats on the House Budget Committee don't disagree with the data. There certainly is disagreement about how to fix the problem, but more and more every day, more astonishingly, I find out that many believe there is not a problem with that graph I just showed you. Here is what the Federal Government is spending its money on. I pulled out two pieces of the pie to show that that's what we vote on in terms of our budget: non-defense discretionary and defense discretionary.

We call this funding ''discretionary'' because we can dial it up or we can dial it down depending on our wishes and our votes here in this Congress and if the Senate agrees or doesn't. Then the President chimes in, albeit late—certainly not on time—with his budget, but it all focuses on not more than about 40 percent of our total Federal spending. The rest of it is all on autopilot. We don't get to dial it up or dial it down. I don't get to decide what the retirees in this country will get in terms of a Social Security check. I don't get to decide what services they're going to get or what fees their health care providers are going to pay for those services through Medicare. That's all decided in the underlying, substantive bills we've passed regarding those programs.

Unless we amend those programs, unless we amend that law, we will never get to what's driving most of our debt, representing about two-thirds of our Federal spending. Again, Social Security: $768 billion per year; Medicare: $466 billion per year; Medicaid: $251 billion per year; the interest we owe ourselves and other countries for this debt: $223 billion per year; other mandatory spending that I can't dial up or dial down nor can you, Mr. Speaker: $547 billion per year—all on autopilot. Until we get to this, we will never get to reducing or to even stabilizing our debt. That's the problem.

□ 2000

Some people have asked about military spending. Some people have asked about cutting it more, even though we've had drastic cuts already. Some people have asked about foreign aid spending. Some people have asked about earmark spending and wouldn't that solve the problem.

I believe that all that should be looked at, including the military. This is a Republican saying that. I believe there is tremendous waste, fraud, and abuse in our military system. I think it's immoral to have that waste, fraud, and abuse and not get every possible dollar we can to the troops.

But having said that, even if we had no military, it would only solve 20 percent of our Federal spending; and, of course, one of our first constitutional duties is to provide for the common defense. A military is necessary. It needs to be run a lot better. And there's a lack of leadership right now amongst our military ranks. It's not leading when you come here to the Congress asking for more money for your pet projects and not doing what you can to eliminate the waste, fraud, and abuse in the military.

I know there's waste, fraud, and abuse in the military because they can't even be audited. It's not because there's a statute, Mr. Speaker, against them being audited. It's because they can't even bring themselves to an audit table to be audited. They're so big and they're so sloppy; they don't know what they spend their money on most of the time. That is wrong. That's wrong for our troops.

Regarding the social entitlement programs, regarding our health care programs, many folks come to me and say, Wait a minute, I paid into those programs. I've been paying into those programs through my paycheck all my life. Don't you dare call them ''social entitlement programs.'' You know what? They're right. We do pay into these programs—most of us—through our working lives.

Here's another truth, and here's a more specific truth, Mr. Speaker. Look at this graph. On average, a couple who made $71,000 or so per year through their working lives—this is about Medicare—will have paid in about 35 percent of what they're actually taking out of Medicare. And that 65 percent difference, Mr. Speaker, that comes out of our kids. That comes out of the grandchildren that don't exist yet. That's part of our national debt. That's part of the $17 trillion and the $100 trillion that's coming. That's what's wrong.

We are taxing the children of tomorrow who don't have any voice in this, except for mine, yours, and others who decide to stand for them. They don't have any voice in this. We're taxing them so, frankly, we can have more on our plate now. That's what's got to stop. It's got to stop with the debt ceiling that's going to come up probably for a vote this fall.

Which way will we go, Mr. Speaker? What will we do to ensure that the children of tomorrow don't have to pay for the bills of today? It will take courage. Frankly, it will take, Mr. Speaker, more than this Congress. We can't wait for Washington to do this alone. We need the help of the people; and that's why I take to the floor tonight ultimately, Mr. Speaker, to get the word out.

I know that this American family, once they know the facts, once they know the truth, they will speak that truth to power. They will demand change; they will demand to live within their means again because that's what every American generation has done before, wanting the next one to be better off. That's what Americans today want too.

I tell this to you, Mr. Speaker, and all the Members of this House, that when there's a direct conflict between the people in the here and now and the people of tomorrow—those without a voice, those who don't exist yet—that's why they don't have the voice—when there's that direct conflict in terms of a vote on an issue, on a bill, at every turn we ought to be thinking about the kids. We ought to be thinking about the grandchildren; we ought to be thinking about those who don't yet exist. And we ought to vote for them, even if it means voting against us in the here and now.

And the debt ceiling is an opportunity to do that, because if and when we raise this debt ceiling, the amount we raise it by will simply be another tax on top of a debt that we've already given them.

What are we going to get for that? If they have to pay that tax, how can we ensure through reform that these programs and other items, that by the time they become an age of majority, that they won't have to pay that kind of debt load? That's the question before us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time. I thank this House for the time. I thank the staff for their work, and I look forward to talking with this House again about these issues throughout the summer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and for the balance of the week on account of a minor surgery due to unforeseen medical reasons.

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and for the balance of the week on account of her son, Stephen Wagner's graduation from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 17, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1505. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's support of the National Boy Scout Jamboree; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1506. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native

American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulation [NPS-WASO-NAGPRA-11600; PPWOCRADN0-PCU00RP14.550000] (RIN: 1024-AD99) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1507. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Recreational Closure Authority Specific to Federal Waters Off Individual States for the Recreational Red Snapper Component of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery [Docket No.: 130213132-3132-01] (RIN: 0648-BD00) received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1508. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; False Killer Whale Take Reduction Plan [Docket No.: 110131070-2626-02] (RIN: 0648-BA30) received May 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1509. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Griffin, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1219; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-43] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1510. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Palm Beach, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0922; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-38] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1511. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Immokalee, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1051; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-39] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1512. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0288; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-214-AD; Amendment 39-17435; AD 2013-08-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1513. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0936; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-269-AD; Amendment 39-17433; AD 2013-08-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1514. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1073; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-078-AD; Amendment 39-17430; AD 2013-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0937; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-270-AD; Amendment 39-17432; AD 2013-08-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1516. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1303; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-049-AD; Amendment 39-17434; AD 2013-08-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1517. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0631; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17282; AD 2012-25-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1518. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0951; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-52-AD; Amendment 39-17437; AD 2013-08-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. YODER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HALL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2009. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H.R. 2010. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to apply to Delegates and Resident Commissioners to the Congress, and to employees of committees and leadership offices of Congress, the requirement of such Act that the only health plans that the Federal Government may make available to Members of Congress and congressional staff are plans created or offered through an Exchange established under such Act; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 2011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a two-year extension of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2012. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 2013. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2014. A bill to repeal section 2703(c)(2)(C) of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2015. A bill to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HANNA, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2016. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify various authorities relating to procedures for courts-martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 2017. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve the operations of the Election Assistance Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 2018. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to identify the persons who are eligible to request headstones or markers furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and or other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 2019. A bill to eliminate taxpayer financing of presidential campaigns and party conventions and reprogram savings to provide for a 10-year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 2020. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain institutions of higher education to provide notice of tuition levels for students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 2021. A bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the Hobbs Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. HALL, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2022. A bill to prohibit the implementation or enforcement of any requirement of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until certifications are made that taxpayer information is not and will not be used for targeting any individual or group that provides information to the Internal Revenue Service for political reasons or on the basis of political views, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2023. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a national strategic action plan to assist health professionals in preparing for and responding to the public health effects of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2024. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to require disclosure of ownership and transfers of ownership of patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the termination of employment of IRS employees for discrimination against any taxpayer on basis of political affiliation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 2026. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt certain silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 2027. A bill to amend section 1877 of the Social Security Act to modify the requirements for hospitals to qualify for the rural provider and hospital exception to physician ownership or investment prohibition in order to take into account hospitals that were under construction or development at the time of imposing such requirements, hospital expansions, and hospitals in financial distress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2028. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2029. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, to establish a program to provide for workforce training and education, at community colleges, in sustainable energy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FARR, Ms. CHU, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2030. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2031. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to expand the clinical trial registry data bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2032. A bill to prohibit certain transfers of radioactive metal by the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2033. A bill to provide for medical neutrality and to establish accountability for violations of the principle of medical neutrality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2034. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of Advanced Composites Development Centers; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Armed Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 2035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal saving and retirement savings coverage by enabling employees not covered by qualifying retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRA arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2036. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to help alien children in the child welfare system apply for all available forms of immigration relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2037. A bill to establish a demonstration grant program to recruit, train, deploy, and professionally support psychiatric physicians in Indian health programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2038. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand the eligibility of certain veterans while they have disability claims pending under title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2039. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish headstones and markers for certain deceased veterans buried in veterans' cemeteries of Indian tribes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2040. A bill to simplify the process for determining the need and eligibility of students for financial assistance under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PITTS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 218. A resolution calling on the Secretary of State to list the Socialist Republic of Vietnam as a ''Country of Particular Concern'' with respect to religious freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

26. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 urging the Congress to maintain operation of the 179th Airlift Wing at Mansfield-Lahm Regional Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

27. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of North Dakota, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4017 expressing opposition to the current form of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

28. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, relative to Senate Resolution No. 18-09 asking the Governor to appoint a special representative for the purpose of commencing discussions on issues and matters that are currently affecting the relationship between the United States and the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

29. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 1 requesting that the Congress overturn the Department of Veterans Affairs regulation prohibiting the provision of service or therapy dogs for veterans with emotional and mental disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

30. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3 encouraging the Congress and the President that the congressional intent of the federal Uniform Controlled Substances Act is not to prohibit the production of industrial hemp; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

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. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2009.

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

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Clause 3 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution. The bill stops the IRS implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which exceeds the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution. Finally, the bill removes government intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship, which is protected by the Nine and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2010.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3, which provides Congress the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.''

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2011.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States, but All Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throught the United States . . .

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2012.

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

Article I. Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2013.

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

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 2014.

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

The bill helps guarantee the rights secured by the First Amendment to the Constitution (''Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press'') and the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution (''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated'').

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 2015.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause, 18.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause, 2.

Amendment V

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 2016.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2017.

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

Section 4 and Section 5 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2018.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 2019.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2020.

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

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2021.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2022.

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

The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution as well as Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority to lay and collect taxes and duties. It is the inherent duty of elected members of Congress to protect U.S. taxpayer information from misuse.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2023.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2024.

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

Article One, Section 8(8) of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2025.

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

The 16th Amendment, Section 5; Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 2026.

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

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2027.

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

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United Stat,es Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2028.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2029.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2030.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2031.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2032.

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

Article I, §8, clause 3

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2033.

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

Article I Section 8—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2034.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 2035.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Afticle I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 2036.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2037.

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 Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2038.

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

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2039.

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

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2040.

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 ther Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in an Department or Officer thereof..

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 7: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 12: Mr. KILMER and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 45: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 164: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 184: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 241: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 301: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 322: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 354: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 358: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 367: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 375: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 419: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 433: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 436: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RADEL, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 451: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 485: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 494: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KLINE, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 508: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 526: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 580: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 630: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 640: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 647: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 655: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 664: Mr. ENYART, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 671: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 685: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 693: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 708: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 712: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 724: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 728: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 732: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 736: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 769: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 792: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 798: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 811: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 846: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 850: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 888: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 904: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 920: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 940: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 946: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 949: Mr. VEASEY and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 955: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 963: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 979: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 983: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 996: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1000: Mr. FARR and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1009: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1014: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1020: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1024: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1029: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1122: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1128: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1129: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1151: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1153: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1155: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1205: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1209: Mr. BARBER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1214: Mr. JONES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1250: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1252: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. McGovera, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. CHU, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1303: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1313: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1322: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1339: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1344: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1346: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1390: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1403: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1416: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1440: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1441: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1449: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1451: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1461: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1462: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1485: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1494: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1496: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1509: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1518: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1523: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1528: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1529: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1554: Mr. FATTAH and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1555: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1556: Ms. CHU, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BASS, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1565: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1573: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1588: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1594: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1595: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1598: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1632: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 1652: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1678: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1692: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1706: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1708: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1714: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1726: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1731: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BASS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1738: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENYART, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1742: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1751: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1755: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1761: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1768: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1771: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1780: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1787: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1797: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1799: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 1809: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1825: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 1830: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YODER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. RIBBLE, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1838: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1845: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1847: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1848: Mr. RADEL, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1851: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1854: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1855: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1856: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1864: Ms. FOXX, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1867: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1874: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1882: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1892: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1900: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 1902: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1904: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. COLE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1911: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1918: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1933: Mr. RUSH and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1940: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1941: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1946: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1950: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1961: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1963: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1971: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1972: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1976: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1979: Ms. WATERS and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1992: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. RADEL, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1995: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2005: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2008: Mr. JONES.
H. Con. Res. 27: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Con. Res. 34: Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 24: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 36: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 104: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. ENYART.
H. Res. 109: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 131: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. WOLF.
H. Res. 167: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 190: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. VEASEY.
H. Res. 214: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 107: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1550: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H. Res. 36: Mr. MICA.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

17. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, relative to Resolution 2013-28195 urging the Congress to support National Immigration Reform; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2013 No. 69

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You don't disappoint those who look to You in faith. Guide our lawmakers by Your truth and instruct them with Your wisdom. Lord, lead them to do what is right and to stay on Your path. Keep them from being intimidated by the many challenges they face, knowing that Your grace is sufficient for every need. May they be true to You, living so that their words and actions will receive Your approval. Help them to live this day with a sense of accountability to You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHATZ thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks the Senate will be in executive session to consider the nomination of Ernest Moniz to be Energy Secretary. There will be up to 3 hours of debate on the nomination. At about 2 p.m. there will be a rollcall vote on confirmation of that nomination.

BENGHAZI ATTACK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for months my Republican colleagues have argued the Obama administration has engaged in a coverup regarding the tragic events surrounding an attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi. The administration provided Members of Congress with over 100 pages of e-mails—sent following that attack—during closed-door sessions. The e-mails proved there was simply no coverup.

Yet Republicans, with full knowledge of these e-mails, claimed the White House was hiding the truth. Yesterday, the administration released even more e-mails to the public. This is only the latest effort by the administration to ensure transparency for the media and the public regarding this awful attack on Americans.

This new information came out for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that we know the press corps spent most of the past week chasing a story based on an e-mail that didn't exist. It was fabricated by a Republican aide and then reported as fact. It is a sad commentary that Republicans are so dead set on embarrassing the President, the Foreign Service, the CIA, and our military they would actually lie to a news organization about the contents of an e-mail and let that news organization report their lies as facts.

The attack on Benghazi is an issue of life and death. We should be focused on tracking down the terrorists who committed this act and bringing them to justice, not on smear politics and false scandals. I hope the media will realize they were fed a false bill of goods and be more skeptical next time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 6 short years ago the prospects for a bipartisan solution to America's broken immigration system seemed bleak. Despite support from congressional Democrats and a Republican President, an immigration reform proposal had been defeated on a procedural vote. Let's say that again. Despite support from congressional Democrats and a Republican President, we couldn't get enough Republicans in the Senate to move forward on a reform proposal. It was defeated, I repeat, on a procedural vote in the Senate.

But one man, who was a long-time member of the Judiciary Committee and who had been chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and Border Security for decades—Senator Ted Kennedy—reminded us all the reform for which he had fought so hard would pass one day and that day could not be far off. This is what he said when that bill was defeated:

America always finds a way to solve its problems, expand its frontiers, and move closer to its ideals. It is not always easy, but it is the American way. . . . I believe we will soon succeed where we failed today, and that we will enact the kind of comprehensive reform that our ideals and our national security demand.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Ted Kennedy said that in 2007. He always spoke from back here, and I can still hear his booming voice, and I can hear him saying this. Our friend Ted Kennedy was right, and I believe the time for commonsense immigration reform has come. I am sorry Senator Kennedy is not alive to see the widespread bipartisan support for the legislation being considered today in the Judiciary Committee, legislation that I will shortly bring before the full Senate. Senator Kennedy would be very satisfied with the efforts of the Gang of 8—four Democrats and four Republicans.

Even though Ted Kennedy was known as one of America's great progressives, his legacy is that he worked with liberals, conservatives, Independents—he worked with everyone—to get work done. He always was willing to set aside partisanship, and that is what the Gang of 8 has done and that is why he would like this so much.

This Gang of 8 has addressed a critical issue facing our Nation, and he would applaud the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the leadership of his long-time friend he served with on that committee for, oh, it must be four decades. Kennedy and LEAHY, they did a lot of work together, and Senator LEAHY has done so much in this committee—work that he has done in the last several weeks to refine and perfect the reasonable proposal of the Gang of 8.

So it is gratifying to see the momentum behind commonsense reforms that will make our country safer and help 11 million undocumented immigrants get right with the law. Although neither Republicans nor Democrats will support each and every proposal or aspect of this legislation, it is reassuring to see the diverse coalition that has formed in support of real reform, commonsense reform—reform that improves our dysfunctional legal immigration system, reform that continues to secure our borders, reform that requires 11 million undocumented people to pass a criminal background check, and pay fines and taxes to start on the path to earn their citizenship. We can't do this piecemeal, and we can't do it without a pathway to earning citizenship.

The thorough and open process underway in the Judiciary Committee is exemplary of how the Senate should work. So far the committee has considered 62 amendments to the original proposal, some from Democrats and some from Republicans. In fact, the committee has adopted 12 Republican amendments, including measures to strengthen the border and improve our legal immigration system.

The Senate completed work on important water resource legislation yesterday—a lot is going on in the Senate—and we are now going to begin consideration of a crucial piece of legislation dealing with agriculture. I commend and applaud the chairman of that committee DEBBIE STABENOW. She is a very good legislator. They got the bill out of that committee in a very quick fashion. So I repeat, I admire what she has done. She also has a new ranking member there, THAD COCHRAN from Mississippi, who is a fine man and a good legislator.

As I have said, as soon as it is ready, I am going to bring that immigration legislation to the floor. We are going to start on the farm bill Monday, and I am going to bring the immigration bill to the floor regardless of whether we have completed action on the farm bill. Although immigration is a complex and controversial issue that deserves ample time for thoughtful debate and consideration, it is also too important to delay action any longer.

As a Senator from Nevada and whose father-in-law was born in Russia and immigrated to the United States, I have witnessed firsthand the heartbreak of our broken immigration system. I see the heartbreak it has caused for immigrants and their families. So this issue is very personal to me, as I have just indicated, and it is very personal to every immigrant family striving to build a better life in America. That is why they came here.

The time has come for permanent solutions—solutions that are tough but fair, solutions that fix our broken legal immigration system, solutions that punish unscrupulous employers that exploit immigrants and drag down wages for every worker in America, solutions that pull 11 million people out of the shadows so they can pay taxes, learn English, and get right with the law, solutions that put them on the path to citizenship so they can contribute fully to their communities and to this country.

I will do everything in my power to have this bill become law. I am confident the time is right. As Senator Kennedy put it, the kind of comprehensive reform that our ideals and our national security demand.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would you announce the work in the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ERNEST J. MONIZ TO BE SECRETARY OF ENERGY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Ernest J. Moniz, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Energy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 3 hours for debate equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Republican leader finishes his time and a quorum call is made, that the time during the quorum be equally divided between the two sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

IRS INVESTIGATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last night the President took an important symbolic step in accepting the resignation of acting IRS Commissioner Miller. I had called for this resignation on Monday, when we learned Mr. Miller signed his name to one, if not more, letters that we now know couldn't possibly have been truthful—couldn't possibly have been truthful. But let us be clear: This symbolic step was just that, symbolic.

What Americans want right now is answers about what happened at the IRS, why it wasn't disclosed earlier, who is ultimately accountable for this behavior, and assurances this kind of thing isn't going to go on at the IRS or anywhere else in the Federal Government because the allegations of ideological targeting only continue to multiply. This is continuing to multiply.

This morning I would like to focus on just one of those incidents. It is the case of a group called the National Organization for Marriage. Last May Senator HATCH, the top Republican on the Finance Committee, sent a letter to the IRS inquiring about reports that someone—someone—at the IRS had leaked confidential donor information from NOM—the National Organization for Marriage—to an advocacy group whose political goals were in direct conflict with its own.

NOM has since released documents suggesting that this information came from one source—from within the IRS itself.

All this took place, by the way, in the middle of a national political campaign. Significantly, one of the NOM donors whose name was leaked was none other than Mitt Romney.

And what about the group it was leaked to?

It was headed by a guy who was named a national co-chair of the Obama campaign, and who published the confidential donor information on the website of the organization he ran, an organization opposed to the goals of NOM.

So here is another situation that, at the very least, clearly merits investigation.

There are allegations here that someone at the IRS committed a very serious crime that had the effect of chilling the speech of a political organization that happened to be on the wrong side of the current administration.

Yet, a year later, Senator HATCH has yet to hear anything back from the

IRS. And, according to the folks at NOM, neither have they.

Last year the people at NOM said they brought their concerns about this potentially illegal activity to the IRS and the Justice Department. They say they even hired a forensic specialist to prove that the document that was leaked had originated at the IRS.

According to NOM, the forensics guy knew the document came from the IRS because it bore a watermark distinctive to the agency. And they say they had to hire him—get this—because the IRS asked NOM if they had leaked the confidential information themselves. So they say they provided evidence to show they had not leaked it themselves, and then earlier this year they asked the IRS to release all the information about their complaint, which had apparently reached a dead end at the IRS. And here is what they say they've gotten back: crickets.

They say they have not heard a thing from the IRS or the DOJ about this potentially illegal breach of their confidential donor information—even as they have poured significant resources of their own into the investigation, and, according to them, seen some of their supporters scared off.

Think about that: the IRS has not had the time to respond to this group, or the Finance Committee—a full year after their confidential donor information appears to have been leaked, from inside the IRS, to one of NOM's ideological opponents.

But when the liberal group ProPublica requested confidential information about conservative groups, the IRS got back to those folks with the information they wanted in about two weeks.

This is exactly the kind of thing I have been warning about for more than a year. Here is a group with an agenda that runs counter to that of the administration. Somebody over at the IRS gets a hold of their donor lists. And leaks it to their opponents.

Why? So anybody who thinks about supporting them thinks twice. This is what government intimidation and harassment looks like. It is completely unacceptable.

The idea that you have got to move heaven and earth to get somebody in the Federal Government to lift a finger to get to the bottom of it is an outrage. This is the kind of thing that people should be tripping over themselves to resolve. Yet Senator HATCH is still waiting on a response to a letter he sent about it to the IRS commissioner—last May!

No one should be intimidated by the government into shutting up as part of our political process.

That is why the Republican members of the Finance Committee are sending a letter today to Treasury's Inspector General for Tax Administration requesting investigation into this very issue.

Because, without this sort of inquiry, we may never have confirmed the inappropriate harassment of conservative groups that was going on at the IRS for two years.

Apparently, this is the only way to get this administration to take responsibility for its actions.

We are determined to do that, because there is a very dangerous precedent being set here. I will say it again: Americans, be they conservative or liberal, should be free to participate in the political process without fear of harassment or intimidation from their own government.

I would also like to note that, last month, the Secretary of Energy nominee, Dr. Ernest Moniz, was cleared by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee with robust bipartisan support. The full Senate will likely vote on his nomination today.

A number of my colleagues and I are optimistic about Dr. Moniz's pragmatic approach to solving America's energy challenges.

In particular, I look forward to working with him on finding a sustainable, long-term solution for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant—a facility that benefits our country, its community, and the many dedicated workers who work there.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the nomination of Dr. Ernest Moniz to head the Department of Energy is now the pending business in the Senate. I would like to discuss the nomination. I note my friend and colleague Senator MURKOWSKI is here. Both of us will take a short amount of time to discuss Dr. Moniz's qualifications.

I urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the nomination of Dr. Ernest Moniz to serve as the Secretary of Energy. Dr. Moniz is smart about energy policy, he is savvy about how the Department of Energy operates, and he is solution-oriented, which is what Democrats and Republicans on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee saw when he was before our committee to consider his nomination.

I am going to talk about why I believe Dr. Moniz is well qualified to spearhead our efforts to evolve our country's energy system, to increase domestic sources, emit less carbon, and to bolster our economy. First, though, I would like to talk for a few minutes about the job Dr. Moniz will be stepping into once he is confirmed.

Right now the Energy Department is at the center of issues that are hugely consequential to our economy and the environment. They are how to manage the newly accessible reserves of natural gas, combating climate change, and making our economy more efficient. Certainly front and center is how, on a bipartisan approach, we can support the development of new energy technology. I believe our country needs that kind of energy to transition to a lower carbon economy. It is built on three pillars: strong economic growth, shrinking our carbon footprint, and spurring energy innovation.

What is unique about this moment is that now, on the issue of energy, our country is truly in a position of strength. Historically, lawmakers have avoided energy issues until there was a short-term crisis. Usually that crisis is a spike in the price of gasoline. Then, as we know, there is a big hue and cry to pass a ''comprehensive energy bill,'' and it ends up being ''comprehensive'' and still lasts a relatively short period of time, maybe a year and a half or 2 years, until there is another hue and cry to pass yet one more comprehensive bill.

Right now, the Congress and the executive branch—the Energy Department—are in a rare position, a position where we can make policy at a time when our country does not face those kinds of short-term calamities. I say that in no way minimizing the extraordinary challenge of climate change. In my view that is a potential catastrophe that needs real and immediate action, and it is something that cannot be ducked or ignored.

On energy, however, the usual calculus has been flipped on its head. New technologies have located potentially huge supplies of natural gas as well as new oil reserves. At the same time, thanks to a combination of improved efficiency, increased renewable power generation, and a rise of affordable natural gas supplies, our carbon emissions actually fell recently. A decade ago no one dreamed of either of those facts.

One of the most immediate issues that will face Dr. Moniz, if he is confirmed, is the question of how our country can maximize the benefits of unconventional shale gas. Abundant, low-cost natural gas provides our country right now with a competitive, economic advantage. The reality is all over the world others want our gas. Our competitors in Europe and Asia—where the costs are four or five times as high as our manufacturers—want what we have.

I think it is obvious that this is also a national security advantage. We will be able to rely on our own energy resources instead of sources which come from unstable parts of the world that certainly don't wish the United States well.

I was encouraged by the commitment Dr. Moniz made to me to use the best, most recent data to look at questions, such as how building natural gas export terminals is going to affect the areas adjacent to those facilities as well as the larger American economy.

From my experience of working with Dr. Moniz, I think he is more than up to the big challenges our country faces as we deal with this historic transition in our energy sector. He knows how the Department works from the inside, and he knows it because he actually has experience there.

With his background as a well-respected scientist, I am confident Dr. Moniz is going to use the best science and most current data in considering key policy issues. He has shown he will

take an independent, data-driven approach as a professor of MIT and director of that university's energy initiative. They have led numerous cutting-edge studies on a range of energy issues.

In one sense the Department of Energy ought to be called the department of innovation. One of the bright lights there is the Advanced Research Projects Agency, what is called ARPA-E, which funds research with the potential to produce major breakthroughs in energy technology. It was authorized in 2005, and it was Dr. Moniz's predecessor, Secretary Steven Chu, who oversaw the first project there and, to his credit, he was an important champion for that agency in its early days.

One of the dozens of efforts that was supported by ARPA-E, for example, is a project at the University of North Dakota which aims to reduce water usage of powerplants. According to the Department of Energy, the university is testing an air-cooled absorbent liquid that retains and releases moisture to cool powerplants that could result in efficient power production with minimal water loss.

I think it would be fair to say we could put together a pretty impressive filibuster if any one of us wanted to describe the various types of research going on or the research funded by the Department. They are leading research in a number of areas our country needs to work on if we are to achieve that objective I have staked out, and that is to secure a lower carbon economy.

As far as energy efficiency, the lowest cost way to reduce energy use and cut emissions is going to be a big part of the Department's mission in the next 4 years. Our committee is moving ahead in that area, starting with yet another bipartisan bill, the Shaheen-Portman legislation that, in my view, is the standard bearer now for energy-efficient legislation. We passed it out of the committee with broad bipartisan support, and I hope it will come to the floor of the Senate very soon.

The Department is also doing important work on carbon capture, carbon sequestration, and utilization—trapping emissions from fossil fuel operations and storing them underground to reduce the impacts to our climate. The chair of our Public Lands, Forests, and Mining Subcommittee—my friend Senator MANCHIN—has a great interest in this particular area, and Dr. Moniz, to his credit, has said this is an area which deserves a significant amount of attention.

DOE research has also helped show that natural gas and renewables are not mutually exclusive. This country does not have to choose between the two. In fact, natural gas plants, in my view, make great partners for intermittent renewables such as wind and solar because they can fire up and power down quickly. That is a very important part of our future energy agenda. We want to have more wind and solar. We know they are intermittent sources.

Some of the challenges, as the President of the Senate knows, are about how to find innovative approaches to storage, and looking at natural gas to help us get wind and solar into our baseload power structure. So this is an important issue.

Renewables can also benefit natural gas. The Energy Department's Pacific Northwest National Lab in Richland, WA—across the river from Oregon—is going to soon test a project to use solar energy to make natural gas plants 20 percent more efficient.

I am not going to pretend to know everything about engineering, but I think it is worth noting that the New York Times said earlier this month the idea that is being explored in Richland, WA, would use concentrated solar rays to heat natural gas and water to about 1,300 degrees Fahrenheit and break open the natural gas and water molecules. The result would create synthetic gas, which burns more efficiently than natural gas alone. This would give us more energy for every molecule of gas burned, which means lower costs and reduced greenhouse gas emissions. This is just one of many projects the Department is backing. They are not sure which are going to ultimately pan out, but the potential for breakthroughs—such as the one I have described—is exactly why it is so important for the Energy Department to have a broad research portfolio.

Our country's competitors are not sitting back waiting for our country to do all of the world's innovation. China, Germany, and others are pouring resources into R&D to try and get an advantage. The fact that we have our Energy Department on the front lines of this fight to show the world how to innovate is a huge American asset.

A significant portion of the Energy Department's budget goes into an office that is described as Environmental Management, which essentially means cleaning up America's radioactive nuclear waste. There are 17 active sites the Department is currently cleaning up, including the Hanford site in southeastern Washington. Whistleblowers and independent watchdogs, such as the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, have identified some troubling problems with how waste is stored in Hanford—including the potential for hydrogen to build up and explode in several waste tanks. They have also flagged ongoing design issues with the facility that will treat the site's nuclear waste—another matter the Department of Energy must solve.

People who live near Hanford and depend on the Columbia River received some welcome assurances from Dr. Moniz. At the hearing, Senator MURKOWSKI and I brought some of these issues up where Dr. Moniz said the status quo with respect to the Department of Energy on Hanford is not acceptable. I look forward to working with them on that long-term solution.

Finally, I think it is fair to say Dr. Moniz—and it is appropriate to close with this—has a long track record of collaboration. That is why I mentioned early on he showed in his confirmation hearing—and he showed Democrats and Republicans alike—that he is solution-oriented and collaborative on the difficult questions which are ahead. He brings that scientific credibility, which I have outlined, with real-world policy experience that is so important to managing a major Federal agency.

There has been bipartisan support expressed from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for Dr. Moniz in a usually gridlocked Congress. I feel as though C–SPAN ought to put out a warning to viewers not to adjust their television because this really is how the Senate ought to be working.

One of the reasons we had the bipartisan approach on energy issues I have been discussing—and it was demonstrated again this morning in the energy committee meeting—is because my friend and colleague Senator MURKOWSKI consistently meets me at least halfway, and often more, on these big issues. I thank the Senator from Alaska for that cooperation on the Moniz nomination and many other matters. I look forward to Senator MURKOWSKI's comments.

I see other colleagues here who may wish to speak at this time, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to follow my friend and colleague Senator WYDEN from Oregon, the chairman of the energy committee, to speak today about the confirmation of Dr. Ernest Moniz to be our Nation's Secretary of Energy.

I think it is good when we are able to stand as the chairman and the ranking member and come to terms of agreement so far as support for an individual for a position such as Secretary of Energy. This is an important position within this administration. It is an important position just from the perspective of how we move forward in this country while we deal with our energy issues and our energy future, which I think is where we get relatively enthusiastic about this nomination.

Again, I thank the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, my friend from Oregon, for his leadership in advancing the nomination to the finish line.

I also want to recognize and thank the members of our committee for their very thoughtful questions. When we had Dr. Moniz before the committee, it was perhaps one of the smoother confirmation hearings we have had in quite some time.

I also thank the full Senate for working with us so we can fulfill our constitutional responsibility for advice and consent here today.

Before I speak to Dr. Moniz's qualifications—and I do think Senator WYDEN has addressed those very well—I wish to take a moment to discuss the agency he will soon lead.

The Department of Energy was created back in 1977. It was created following the oil embargo which caused the gasoline shortages we saw around the country. The architects—those who put together the contours of DOE—were surveying a very different energy landscape than we face today.

Back in 1977, energy was viewed from the position of scarcity rather than the abundance we recognize today. Those architects, as they defined what a Department of Energy would look like and what it would hope to achieve, as well as the mission set there, had some pretty high hopes for what the Department would accomplish.

I think what we need to do is look back to that organic act which states that DOE would ''promote the general welfare by assuring coordinated and effective administration of Federal energy policy and programs.'' That is pretty simple.

That same act goes on to list 18 different purposes, a few of which bear repeating. One of them is to assure, to the maximum extent practical, that the productive capacity of private enterprise shall be utilized in the development and achievement of the policy and purposes of the act.

Another one of those purposes is to provide for the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments in the development and implementation of national energy policies and programs.

A third purpose is to carry out the planning, coordination, support, and management of a balanced and comprehensive energy research and development program.

Looking back at DOE's creation is a reminder of how far we have come and yet how far we still have to go in achieving these various purposes that were set out in that organic act.

Today the Department is a major department. It has a budget of more than $25 billion each year. Thousands of scientists work on cutting-edge technologies at our national labs as they look for breakthroughs and manage our nuclear weapons programs.

Yet more than three decades later, it would be difficult to find many who truly believe we have achieved this coordinated and effective administration of Federal energy policy. In fact, we are going to have some who would disagree as to whether we have developed a Federal energy policy that adequately serves our national needs. Instead, we have seen energy-related programs and initiatives that are fragmented and scattered throughout the Federal Government. Not enough money, in my view, is getting to the bench for research and development, which is a critical aspect of how we build out that energy policy. It is also a critical component of how we move toward our energy future.

All too often it appears we have silos within the Department that stand in the way of progress. In recent years I have become concerned that DOE is not clearly and unambiguously working to keep energy abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure, principles that I think go into defining a good, strong Federal energy policy. As I see it, DOE, in particular, must be a stronger voice in the councils of this administration for energy supply. In light of several costly failures, the Department must become a better steward of taxpayer dollars.

So all of these challenges, and more, will be inherited by our next Secretary of Energy. Along with the challenges, I think we also recognize there are great opportunities within the energy sector. That is why I believe we will do well to place Dr. Ernie Moniz, who is clearly a man with talent and experience in both the laboratory and as a public policymaker, to place him at the helm of this department.

Dr. Moniz has some pretty impressive credentials. He is a physicist, having graduated from Boston College before completing his Ph.D. at Stanford. He served in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and as an Under Secretary of the Department of Energy during the late 1990s. For the vast majority of his career, he has also served as the director of the MIT Energy Initiative. He has studied and written about nuclear energy, natural gas, innovation—really any number of topics with direct relevance for the future of our energy policy. So he has both. He has the academic experience, most certainly, as we see at MIT and at Stanford, but he also has that practical application. My colleague from Oregon described him as solution oriented, and I think that is a very apt description. He is an impressive nominee.

In our meetings where it is nice and casual and relaxed and people can have a pretty good conversation, I was very impressed with not only Dr. Moniz's background and experience but how he views moving forward within the Department of Energy. There is a level of comfortable confidence I found encouraging. He has shown he understands what his job requires, and because of that I believe he will be a capable Secretary. He is knowledgeable, he is competent, and he is refreshingly candid, and I think that is an important part of it.

I kind of challenged him in the confirmation hearing before the Energy Committee to keep that up: Don't be afraid to speak out, to be refreshingly candid. I think that is good advice.

He also has proven the Senate's confirmation process can be navigated successfully without undue delay, as long as questions are answered and concerns raised by Members are taken seriously, and I think he did attempt to do that.

It is my hope that after his confirmation, Dr. Moniz will guide our Nation's energy policy as the respected scientist he is and do so rigorously, robustly, free of preordained conclusions, and, again, not afraid to speak up or to speak his mind. His Department will benefit, and I think the country will as well.

As I have indicated in my comments, I think the Department of Energy needs good, strong direction. It needs that leadership, and I believe Dr. Moniz will provide both. That is why I am supporting his nomination, and I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in voting to confirm him later this afternoon.

I note my colleague from New Jersey is here. I have some comments I wish to make about the Arctic Council meeting, but I will certainly defer to my friend from New Jersey for his comments this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I wish to thank the distinguished ranking member for her courtesy. I intend to support this nominee for all of the reasons the distinguished chairman has said.

(The remarks of Mr. MENENDEZ pertaining to the introduction of S. 980 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARCTIC COUNCIL MINISTERIAL MEETING

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, while we are waiting for colleagues to come and join us on the floor to speak about the nomination of Dr. Ernest Moniz to be Secretary for the Department of Energy, I thought I would take a few moments and fill in my colleagues about a meeting I just returned from in Kiruna, Sweden. This was the Arctic Council ministerial meeting.

The Arctic Council is comprised of the eight Arctic nations, of which the United States is one by virtue of the State of Alaska, but not to diminish the fact that we truly are an Arctic nation, and our role as such, involved with other Arctic neighbors, is a growing role and a role the rest of the world is looking at with great interest and great anticipation as to how the United States is going to step forward into this important arena.

This is the second Arctic Council meeting I have attended. I was in Nuuk, Greenland, with Secretary Clinton and Secretary Salazar 2 years ago. That was the first time the United States had sent a Cabinet member, sent the Secretary of State to the Arctic Council, and it caused great waves throughout the Arctic world and certainly gained the attention of nations around the world. The sentiment was the United States is finally stepping up, the United States is moving forward, recognizing its role as an Arctic nation. So it was exceedingly important that Secretary Kerry continued

that good work of Secretary Clinton in leading the United States in its role at this ministerial meeting.

I will tell you, Secretary Kerry has been very involved here in this body as a Senator in his leadership on certain issues, specifically advancing the Law of the Sea Treaty—ratification of that important treaty—speaking out and being very forthright on the issue of climate change. His leadership at the council meeting in Kiruna yesterday was clearly evidenced as he worked to bring the parties together in terms of an agreement to move forward with how we treat observers to the Arctic Council. I commend Secretary Kerry for his leadership, certainly for his initiative, in ensuring that the United States continues to have a high profile and a growing profile.

Why is this important? Why do we need to not only be engaged but to step up that engagement? Well, yesterday, the chairmanship of the Arctic Council transferred from Sweden to Canada, so our neighbors to the North will chair the Arctic Council for these next 2 years. In 2015, the gavel of that chairmanship will pass from Canada to the United States, so we will be working to set the agenda, although it is a very consensus-driven process. But we will clearly be in a leadership role amongst the eight Arctic nations and those observer nations. It is critically important that we are ready, that we be working toward assuming this leadership position.

In doing that, it is more than just attending meetings every other year. It is the agreements that come out as a result of these ministerials, these consensus initiatives that help to advance the dynamic in an evolving part of the world.

In Nuuk, the first-ever binding agreement of the parties was entered into, and this was a search-and-rescue agreement. If there is an incident up in the Arctic—and the world up there knows very little in terms of boundaries and what happens with ice, but we recognize our infrastructure is severely limited. So who is in charge? How do we work cooperatively, collaboratively with search and rescue? It was an exceedingly important initiative that was adopted 2 years ago.

Yesterday, in Kiruna, it was the adoption of the Agreement on Cooperation on Marine Oil Pollution Preparedness and Response in the Arctic. There is a recognition that in the Arctic, where some 15 percent of the world's known oil and gas reserves are situated, there will be activity. We are seeing it in Russia to our left-hand side; we are seeing it in Canada to our right-hand side. In the United States, as we all know, Shell attempted to begin exploration this year. There have been previous exploration efforts up in the Beaufort and in the Chukchi. Whether you are for or against oil development here in this country, the recognition is that within the Arctic nations there is activity. There are ongoing efforts, whether it is through exploration or, hopefully, production that will move forward.

What we are trying to do within the Arctic Council and other entities is make sure that when that happens, we are prepared. So we are putting forward collaboration and collective agreements so there is an understanding that in the event—hopefully, a very unlikely event—something would ever happen, there is an understanding as to how all the nations act, the level of preparation that moves forward.

There are incredibly important initiatives as we deal with an evolving Arctic. Think about the world up north there. Really understand what is happening. This is no longer an area that is locked in ice and snow, an area where we are not able to transit, an area where there is no human activity. The Arctic has clearly seen an opening, as we see the sea ice receding. We are seeing a level of activity that is unprecedented. It is truly the last frontier—a new frontier, so to speak.

Again, how we prepare for a world where there is more movement, where there is more activity, is going to be a critical key to the success and the opportunity. We recognize the volume of shipping now coming through the Northwest Passage, coming from Russia on down through the Bering Strait, through very narrow channels there out to Asia, down into the Pacific. There is incredible movement. So how are we preparing ourselves for an increased volume of shipping traffic? Do we have the navigational aids we need? Do we have the ports and the infrastructure that will be necessary? These are some of the initiatives that were discussed.

Obviously, when we think about an Arctic that is changing, a key focus is on climate change and what is happening. We are seeing the impact of climate change in the Arctic more noticeably than in other parts of the globe. So there is a great deal of science and research that is going on that is necessary. How we collaborate, how we share that with all of our other Arctic neighbors is going to be key.

How we map our resources, whether it is understanding the sea floor, whether it is understanding the coastline, this is an area that—we use the term ''frontier.'' When we go out into a new frontier, it is important to know what it is we are dealing with; how we can work cooperatively on things such as mapping; what we can do to ensure that as we see changes, as we see development, as we see increased economic activity in the Arctic, that the indigenous people—the people who have been there for thousands of years, living a true subsistence lifestyle—that their lifestyle remains intact, that there can be a balance and a harmony with their world and this changing scenery and landscape in front of them.

This is a story that was conveyed to me several years ago. I was up in Barrow, which is, of course, the northernmost city in the United States. Barrow is a relatively small community of several thousand individuals. One afternoon there was a group of folks who were in town and they were all speaking German.

Somebody asked: Well, how did you get here? Where did you come from?

They did not see that many people getting off the Alaska Airlines jet. The German tourists pointed to a cruise ship that was offshore. They had lightered these German tourists into the community. Just a few years back, a cruise ship in these waters was unheard of. What we are seeing now are cruises. We have a level of tourism that would never have been anticipated. So how we prepare for all of this is a challenge for us.

The work of the Arctic Council is again focusing on collaboration and cooperation in an area, in a zone of peace, as many would suggest. This is an important opportunity for us from a diplomacy perspective. Think about how many hot spots we have in the world, how many places on this planet where we are trying to put out fires that have been simmering or smoldering for decades, for generations, for some, millennia. If we have a part of the world where we can work together, what kind of a message, what kind of a symbol does that represent? So we have some enormous opportunities within the Arctic.

Part of my challenge—and I shared this with Secretary Kerry—is impressing upon people in this country that we are an arctic nation. The Presiding Officer hails from the State of Massachusetts. My colleague and chairman of the Energy Committee comes from Oregon. I would venture to say that most of the Senator's constituents do not view themselves as people of the Arctic, but we are. As 50 States, we are. So how we work together to make sure America's role as an arctic nation is represented is key.

I will conclude my remarks by noting that on Friday the White House released its Arctic strategy. This is a document to advance national security interests, how we responsibly manage the Arctic ecosystem, how we bolster international relationships—all very worthwhile goals. I think we recognize that it is perhaps a little bit light on detail, but the good news is that so many of our Federal agencies are working to help advance these goals.

What we need, in addition to a coordinated strategy, is a policy that is going to make sense from all of the different levels, whether it is how we deal with the energy, how we deal with the human side, how we deal with the security aspect of it. These are complicated issues, but it is an opportunity that is almost unprecedented to be able to take a blank page and be able to create opportunities, to be able to create policies that really began with a level of collaboration and cooperation. This is what we are hoping to build not only

with our Arctic neighbors but beyond that.

It was interesting to note the recognition of six nations that joined as observers: China, India, Italy, Japan, Singapore, and South Korea. No one would ever suggest these are Arctic nations, but the reason they want to be engaged as observers is they recognize the importance of the Arctic to the rest of the globe. They recognize the importance, whether from a shipping perspective, whether from an environmental perspective, whether from just an opportunity for resources. There is a keen awareness of what is happening in the Arctic, that this is the place to be right now.

So my urging to my colleagues is to pay attention to not only what is happening in the Arctic but pay attention to how an increased role in the Arctic impacts them and constituents in their States because whether it is sending goods from one nation to another, this is an opportunity to allow for transit and commerce that has only been a dream. Whether it is how we access our energy resources in a way that is done responsibly, safe, and with an eye toward environmental stewardship, there are opportunities for us—challenges, yes, but opportunities for us as well.

So I will be talking much more about our role as an arctic nation, our responsibilities as an arctic nation, but I would ask that we start thinking about this: Where does Massachusetts, where does Oregon, where do they fit in as part of an arctic nation?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH.) The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Dr. Ernest Moniz—a native son of Massachusetts—to be Secretary of Energy. In voting yes on his nomination, the Senate will confirm someone who is extremely well qualified for the role of Secretary of Energy and someone who is proof positive that the American dream is alive and well.

Dr. Moniz is a son to first-generation immigrants to America, to Fall River, MA, a historic city on the south coast of Massachusetts rich with a history in the textile and garment mills and now with a bright future in the innovation economy.

It was in Fall River that Dr. Moniz first developed his love of science, both at home and in the Massachusetts public schools. With the help of scholarships from his father's labor union, Dr. Moniz was able to attend and receive his bachelor of science degree, summa cum laude in physics, from Boston College. From there, Dr. Moniz went on to do even greater work.

In Massachusetts, we are grateful for the decades of service he has given to one of the finest institutions not just in the Commonwealth but in the world, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—otherwise known as MIT—where he has been a faculty member since 1973. Dr. Moniz has led many groundbreaking initiatives at MIT, including most recently serving as the funding director of the MIT Energy Initiative and leading the MIT Laboratory for Energy and the Environment. Through the MIT Energy Initiative, he has been at the forefront of multidisciplinary technology and policy studies on the future of nuclear power, coal, nuclear fuel cycles, natural gas, and solar energy. The initiative has spun out numerous startup companies from the campus lab into the emerging and important clean energy economy.

In addition to his many years of service to the Commonwealth, Dr. Moniz also knows his way around this town, which I am sure will serve him well in his new position. He served previously as Under Secretary of the Department of Energy and before that as Associate Director for Science in the Office of Science and Technology Policy for President Clinton.

One of the biggest challenges he will undoubtedly face as Secretary is how to continue critical U.S. investments in emerging energy technologies, including fusion, in the face of a difficult budget climate. While I recognize that, as Secretary, Dr. Moniz will need to recuse himself from this particular issue, I strongly support continued DOE funding of the domestic fusion energy research program at MIT, the C-Mod Program, which has for years led in fusion science and is an incubator for the next generation of fusion scientists. Unless additional action is taken by DOE, the C-Mod research facility at MIT will be abruptly terminated, 130 fusion scientists, engineers, graduate students, and support personnel at MIT would also be terminated, and hundreds of millions of dollars invested in this program over the past generation will be lost.

Our Nation's domestic fusion program simply cannot withstand the proposed reductions without a severe negative impact to our fusion research and our scientific contributions to the international fusion research community. This shortsighted approach could eliminate the ability of the United States to take a lead role in the development of the next generation of energy research.

The Department of Energy has significant responsibilities that impact America's economic energy, environmental, and security future. It is my strong belief that Dr. Moniz has the ability, knowledge, experience, and vision to be an excellent Secretary of Energy for the people of the United States. I look forward to casting my vote to confirm this brilliant scientist, dedicated public servant, and, yes, native son of Massachusetts.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NLRB

Mr. CASEY. I rise to speak about the National Labor Relations Board. This is a board and a set of issues we are going to be debating and have begun to debate recently. It will be with us for a while, and it is an important debate we are having.

As the Senate considers the National Labor Relations Board member nominations, I think it is very instructive, and I would even say essential, to look back at the history of the Board and the National Labor Relations Act, the legislation that created the Board, to recall why this Board and the act are so important to our economy, our workers, and our businesses.

The National Labor Relations Act played a key role in making the United States the prosperous Nation we are today. A properly functioning labor board and a revived, modernized National Labor Relations Act could be key players in a more prosperous future.

Congress passed the act in 1935 during the depths of the Great Depression. The National Labor Relations Board Act legitimized and gave workers the right to join unions. It encouraged and promoted collective bargaining as a way to set wages and settle disputes over working conditions, and it led to a surge in union membership and representation. It is worth remembering as well why the act was passed in the first place.

To quote section 1 of the act: ''The inequality of bargaining power between employees . . . and employers . . . substantially burdens and affects the flow of commerce, and tends to aggravate recurrent business depressions by depressing wage rates and the purchasing power of wage earners.''

I am quoting in pertinent part the most significant words in that part of the act which are the flow of commerce, how important it is to settle disputes so we can have a free-flowing commerce, and that workers have the rights they are entitled to.

As I said, it was passed in 1935. The economy was reeling. One-fourth of the workforce was jobless. Millions of Americans were poor, hungry, and homeless. Balancing the bargaining power of employers and employees, Congress hoped to restore the Nation to economic prosperity. Giving workers the right to organize and bargain collectively would allow them to stand up to corporate power and demand higher wages, thereby increasing their incomes and their purchasing power. That, in turn, would increase consumption and demand for goods, increasing production and, in fact, increasing employment.

As former NLRB Chairman Wilma Liebman said: ''The law was enacted less as a favor to labor, than to save capitalism from itself.''

We know that before the New Deal, the Federal and State governments, the courts, and the law had all been hostile to the collective rights of workers in their struggles against corporate power. For decades, going back to the late 1800s, the majority of production workers in America's heavy industries had labored in harsh and often dangerous conditions for low wages, with little security. I know this from my own family's history, but I also know it from the history of my own region of northeastern Pennsylvania, the so-called hard coal or anthracite region of Pennsylvania.

Stephen Crane, the great novelist, wrote about the coal mines right around the turn of the century. Actually, they are the coal mines of my home county. He talked about all the ways a miner could lose his life in the coal mines. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that part of Stephen Crane's essay about the coal mines.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The novelist Stephen Crane toured a mine near Scranton in 1894, just ten years before my father went to work in the mines. He described the scene in McClure's Magazine:

The breakers squatted upon the hillsides and in the valley like enormous preying monsters, eating of the sunshine, the grass, the green leaves. The smoke from their nostrils had ravaged the air of coolness and fragrance. All that remained of vegetation looked dark, miserable, half-strangled. . . .

The [boys] . . . are not yet at the spanking period. One continually wonders about their mothers, and if there are any schoolhouses. But as for them, they are not concerned. When they get time off, they go out on the culm heap and play baseball . . . And before them always is the hope of one day getting to be door-boys down in the mines; and, later, mule boys; and yet later, laborers and helpers . . .

A guide then led Crane into the mine:

It was a journey that held a threat of endlessness. Then suddenly the dropping platform slackened its speed. It began to descend slowly and with caution. At last, with a crash and a jar, it stopped. Before us stretched an inscrutable darkness, a soundless place of tangible loneliness. Into the nostrils came a subtly strong odor of powder-smoke, oil, wet earth. The alarmed lungs began to lengthen their respirations.

Our guide strode abruptly into the gloom. His lamp flared shades of yellow and orange upon the walls of a tunnel that led away from the foot of the shaft. Little points of coal caught the light and shone like diamonds. . . .

The wonder of these avenues is the noise—the crash and clatter of machinery as the elevator speeds upward with the loaded cars and drops thunderingly with the empty ones. The place resounds with the shouts of mule boys, and there can always be heard the noise of approaching coal cars, beginning in mild rumbles and then swelling down upon one in a tempest of sound. In the air is the slow painful throb of the pumps working at the water which collects in the depths. There is booming and banging and crashing, until one wonders why the tremendous walls are not wrenched by the force of this uproar. And up and down the tunnel there is a riot of lights, little orange points flickering and flashing. Miners stride in swift and somber procession. But the meaning of it all is in the deep bass rattle of a blast in some hidden part of the mine. It is war. It is the most savage part of all in the endless battle between man and nature. Sometimes their enemy becomes exasperated and snuffs out ten, twenty, thirty lives. Usually she remains calm, and takes one at a time with method and precision. She need not hurry. She possesses eternity. After a blast, the smoke, faintly luminous and silvery, floats silently through the adjacent tunnels . . .

Great and mystically dreadful is the earth from the mine's depth. Man is in the implacable grasp of nature. It has only to tighten slightly, and he is crushed like a bug. His loudest shriek of agony would be as impotent as his final moan to bring help from that fair land that lies, like Heaven, over his head. There is an insidious, silent enemy in the gas. If the huge fanwheel on the top of the earth should stop for a brief period, there is certain death. If a man escapes the gas, the floods, the squeezes of falling rock, the cars shooting through little tunnels, the precarious elevators, the hundred perils, there usually comes to him an attack of miner's asthma that slowly racks and shakes him into the grave. Meanwhile, he gets $3 per day, and his laborer $1.25.

Mr. CASEY. When unions sprang up to defend the rights of workers, they were treated as illegal conspiracies, ruthlessly smashed by companies that either used violence or called on the police or military to defend their interests. The unions rarely made more than temporary gains.

When America began to industrialize in the 1800s, the relationship between workers and their bosses changed dramatically. Craft work by skilled employees was replaced by mass production with hundreds or even thousands of people working for a single, impersonal corporation. Giant powerful entities generally treated their workers like faceless, expendable commodities—inputs into the production process, whose costs had to be kept low in order to maximize profits in the incomes of robber barons. That was certainly true in my home State of Pennsylvania.

The corporations amassed enormous wealth, but the employees were mostly left behind, with lives of misery and hardship. In Pittsburgh, for example, the western corner of our State, a remarkable in-depth sociological study by the Russell Sage Foundation of the lives of working families in the early 1900s found widespread grinding poverty and child labor, poor health and education, and astonishing levels of work-related injury and illness. In Allegheny County, where Pittsburgh is located, with a million residents, more than 500 workers died in industrial accidents in a single year, most of them in the steel mills. The same was true in the coal mines.

To give you an example, in 1907, 1,516 workers were killed in the coal mines of Pennsylvania. In over about a 98-year period, 31,047 known fatalities happened in the coal mines of Pennsylvania.

If the United States today had a proportional number of occupational fatalities as they had in Pittsburgh when 500 workers died, the number would be 150,000 workers today losing their lives on the job. Workers were chewed up and discarded with no workers' compensation system and no hope of suing the corporation for negligence. The law of labor relations was seriously unbalanced. Whereas business owners were able to act collectively, joining together in corporations to be treated as a special kind of person under the law, while escaping individual liability for corporate acts, unions were sometimes treated as criminal conspiracies, their strikes were considered illegal restraints against trade, and courts intervened to issue injunctions to hold unions liable for the acts of their members.

When workers tried to form unions to defend themselves or to win a fair share of the profits, they were usually met by fierce resistance by employers, fueling anger and resentment, often leading to violence.

One of the most famous and, I should say, infamous tragedies involved Carnegie Steel, which for 10 years had a collective bargaining contract with its skilled employees at the Homestead plant but decided in 1892, during an economic depression, both to cut the employees' wages and to destroy the union. I won't go into the whole story today; we don't have time. Suffice it to say the union was crushed completely because of the actions of that steel company and then steel companies after it.

Move forward in history when demand for their products dried up in the Great Depression. Many businesses cut both wages and hours, further depressing workers' incomes and purchasing power.

In President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first year in office in 1933, he pushed through Congress the National Industrial Recovery Act. One of its main purposes was to encourage companies to recognize their unions and to bargain with them. FDR and Labor Secretary Frances Perkins were convinced that raising wages and thereby increasing consumer demand was essential to lift the economy and put people back to work.

Unfortunately, the entity the act created to encourage collective bargaining, the National Labor Board, as it was called at the time, had no power to compel compliance with the new law. Union membership soared, but the companies continued to resist collective bargaining or recognize the sham company unions they controlled, effectively bargaining with themselves rather than the real representatives of the workers. Instead of an orderly, efficient act, or system, I should say, the act produced chaos. The Supreme Court ruled that the act was beyond the powers of Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

What happened then was Senator Robert Wagner of New York started

over and drafted the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. It passed quickly and survived a constitutional challenge in the Supreme Court. The new law required companies to recognize unions as the exclusive representative of their employees when they could prove majority representation. It gave the new board the authority to conduct elections and to order companies to bargain in good faith over wages and working conditions. It outlawed sham company-dominated unions, and it protected employees from violations by employers of their right to join a union or to engage in strikes or other protected, concerted activities such as hand billing or picketing.

The Board itself was given the power to require employers to hire back fired workers, to pay lost wages with interest, and to agree not to break the law in the future.

For a time, the new law worked. As Wilma Liebman, on the National Labor Relations Board for 14 years, said recently:

> Over the next decades, millions of workers voted for union representation in NLRB-conducted elections. And millions achieved a middle class way of life through collective bargaining and agreements that provided fair wages and benefits in major industries of the economy.

At the peak of union power, 35 percent of workers were covered by union contracts. They won higher wages, job security, and other benefits. American family incomes grew by an average of 2.8 percent per year from 1947 to 1973. Let me say that again. There was almost a 3-percent increase in family incomes from 1947 to 1973, with every sector of the economy seeing its income roughly doubled.

Due to a number of factors, union membership as a share of private sector employment has declined from that 35 percent to less than 7 percent today. We know that our history tells us not only is the act important for union members and for their families, but it is also very important for the middle class.

No one thinks the National Labor Relations Board by itself will be able to restore balance to America's incomes or restore purchasing power to the middle class. The Board itself can help make a difference, especially if Congress repairs decades of damage to the rights of unions and employees to organize, bargain and, if necessary, to, in fact, strike. The Employee Free Choice Act would have been a good start in that campaign of repair and restoration.

Tens of millions of Americans today are working at poverty wages. By one estimate, 28 percent of workers are paid at a poverty-level wage or less. People who work hard for a living deserve a path to a decent economic future. Workers today are better off than the average workers surveyed in Pittsburgh 100 years ago, as I cited earlier, but their lives are getting harder every year. They are not sharing in our ever-growing national wealth.

I hope we can begin a process of reviving collective bargaining soon, but first we must end the disgrace of leaving the Nation's most important labor relations agency without leadership. It is shameful if we allow this to happen. The recent record of obstruction of nominations in the Senate is, in a word, unacceptable and should be unacceptable to every American. It is time to confirm the President's nominees to the National Labor Relations Board, to give certainty to workers and to businesses as we continue to recover and create jobs.

As I leave, I would go back to the few short words I will read from the opening Findings and Policies of the National Labor Relations Act:

> Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the free flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE IRS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday morning I called for the immediate resignation of Acting IRS Commissioner Steven Miller in light of the IRS's admission that it targeted conservative groups for inappropriate scrutiny. While I was willing to give Mr. Miller and other IRS officials the benefit of the doubt until the facts were in, the Treasury Inspector General report released on Tuesday has erased any doubts as to the severity of the misconduct and the blatant incompetence in dealing with the highest levels of the IRS.

I am pleased President Obama chose to heed the call that I made, and others as well, by dismissing Mr. Miller last night. This is a necessary step, but only a first step, toward restoring the credibility and the integrity of the IRS. This scandal is much larger than any one official within the IRS. Any government official who knew about the misconduct within the IRS and decided not to make this information public should be held accountable. No American taxpayer should ever have to worry that a group they belong to or a view they espouse would subject them to less favorable tax treatment by their government. Yet the IG report has, unfortunately, confirmed this political profiling is exactly what happened.

The misconduct by the IRS is troubling for a host of reasons, but there are two questions yet to be answered that I find particularly troubling. First, how was the improper targeting of IRS agents allowed to continue for more than 18 months before it was finally brought to an end?

Secondly, how did the internal IRS process involve so many high-level IRS officials yet remain hidden from the public and from Congress for more than 2 years?

Former Commissioner Miller was quoted yesterday as saying the IRS misconduct was a result of two ''rogue'' employees in Cincinnati who were ''overly aggressive.'' Yet we now know from the IG report the IRS's attempt to deal with the targeting of conservative groups went through numerous high-level IRS officials in Washington.

We know as early as March of 2010, IRS officials in Washington were involved in applying special scrutiny to tea party and other applications with conservative-sounding names. According to the IG report, the head of the IRS Exempt Organizations Division and the IRS Chief Counsel became aware of this targeting almost 2 years ago in the summer of 2011.

Let's be clear: The scandal isn't simply a few rogue employees. The real scandal is an entire bureaucratic structure within the IRS that allowed this targeting to go on for 18 months.

Behind me is the organizational chart from the IG report showing all the offices that were involved in dealing with the improper targeting of conservative groups. As you can see, of the 12 offices on this chart, only two of these offices are based in Cincinnati. The other 10 offices are in Washington, DC. This particular office was the office—until just last night—Acting Commissioner Steven Miller held. But as you can see, Mr. President, this is lifted directly from the IG's report. This is an organizational chart that suggests the two offices in Cincinnati were a small part of a much bigger web of offices and individuals who were involved.

This situation may have started with a few rogue employees in Cincinnati, but the idea that somehow it was confined to that one small part of the IRS structure is simply untrue. It is also misleading to suggest the IRS has been anything other than secretive and resistant to calls for greater transparency when it comes to the agency's handling of conservative groups.

We now know then-Deputy Commissioner Miller was made aware of inappropriate targeting of conservative groups as early as May of 2012. Yet for 1 year Mr. Miller did not bring this information to the attention of the public or Congress.

In June and August of 2012 I joined with fellow Republican Senators on the Finance Committee in sending letters to the IRS regarding reports the IRS was requiring conservative 501(c)(4)s to disclose their donors and expressing concerns the IRS may change regulations affecting these groups in response

to political pressures. The IRS responses to these letters did not acknowledge any special treatment of conservative groups.

In November Mr. Miller became the Acting IRS Commissioner, and in this capacity he testified before the Senate Finance Committee regarding the issue of tax fraud and ID theft. He did not take that opportunity to make remarks or to comment on the subject of targeting conservative groups. Time and time again high-level IRS officials deliberately avoided disclosing information regarding the targeting of conservative groups.

The American people deserve to know that action will be taken to ensure the IRS will never participate in this kind of partisanship again, and they deserve to know that leaders of such agencies will be held accountable for such breaches of trust. These actions undermine the confidence the American people have in the IRS to objectively and transparently administer our Nation's tax laws.

These actions by the IRS are a continuation of a troubling trend from the self-proclaimed most transparent administration in history. All of these incidents are beginning to add up to a growing credibility gap between this administration under President Obama and the high standard of public service the American people deserve.

Now, thanks to ObamaCare, the IRS will be administering parts of the health care law. The IRS's power will grow as they become responsible for determining whether Americans have satisfied the government mandate to have health insurance and whether the government will pay for part of that coverage through refundable tax credits.

As noted by the National Taxpayer Advocate Nina Olson, ObamaCare is ''the most extensive social benefit program the IRS has been asked to implement in recent history.''

As I previously mentioned, this isn't the only ObamaCare-related scandal that has come to light this week. Over the weekend the Washington Post reported that Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius has been soliciting donations from health care executives to fund left-leaning organizations that are trying to work hand-in-hand with HHS to enroll individuals in ObamaCare exchanges.

If these reports are accurate, the actions taken by the Secretary represent a very serious conflict of interest. Companies and organizations should never be pressured for money because it sends the message that contributions are necessary to secure favorable regulatory decisions, creating a pay-to-play environment.

Earlier this week David Axelrod, a former senior adviser to President Obama, said it isn't possible for the President to be aware of all these problems in government because government is simply too big. It is mind-blowing to consider how large the Federal Government is and how the one individual responsible for this $3.6 trillion entity can't even keep tabs on all the activity. Perhaps this is exactly why we should be focused on policies that shrink the size of government so it can be more transparent and more accountable to citizens of this country.

Chief Justice John Marshall, in the seminal opinion McCulloch v. Maryland, wrote: ''The power to tax is the power to destroy.'' Those words still ring true nearly 200 years later.

This administration is using one of its greatest powers—the power to tax—to destroy one of the people's strongest God-given rights, the right to free political speech. This isn't just an attack on certain conservative groups, it is an attack on all of our rights to assemble and to express free political speech without the fear of repercussion from our government. President Obama has a long way to go to restore public confidence and to stop the growing credibility gap that so far has plagued his second term.

I look forward to next Tuesday's oversight hearing in the Finance Committee where I hope we can begin the process of reining in a government agency that has run amuck.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRS RULES

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have been watching today as various speakers have come to the floor. I want to join in the outrage about what has happened at the IRS, the idea that the IRS would pick specific groups and target them. In this case, apparently they used the name ''patriot'' and they searched through incoming applications for 501(c)(4)s—and the term ''tea party''—and they were obviously focusing on one side of the political spectrum. They should not have done that.

There is no doubt that the people who are writing me, that people in America have watched this and feel a sense of outrage. They should be outraged. They are outraged, and I am outraged.

One of the things we have to understand as a result of this is that the IRS has tremendous power. It has the power to audit. It has the power to request information. It has the power to refer for criminal conduct. I think in many cases the IRS is probably more feared than the prosecutor's offices, which also have tremendous power. As many know, I have had some real experience there, having been a Federal prosecutor, having been a State attorney general. That is power that should be used in a very careful way. You do not pick one part of the political spectrum and target people when you are entering a phase of a prosecution or an audit, as the IRS was doing. I think our President, who is a lawyer, understands that. President Obama has called for the resignation of the top IRS official. That official has resigned. That is the right thing to do. Such action is inexcusable. No one disputes that. More disciplinary action is likely. The FBI is investigating, and I hope they do a full, thorough, and complete investigation. Of course, as I said before, the IRS should not be targeting specific sides of the political spectrum.

But in thinking about this, there is another failure, and we should talk about that at the same time. The IRS does not have clear rules for nonprofit groups and political activity. We need transparency about what is allowed and what is not allowed. Those rules should be applied to all groups across the board on all sides of the political spectrum. Front groups for huge amounts of campaign money are continually allowed to file false statements with the IRS and get away with it. Over and over again, they do this. This is wrong whether the group is liberal or conservative, Democratic or Republican. This is wrong across the board.

How does this happen? We know that lots of secretive groups want to funnel cash to influence elections, to get their candidates elected. But campaign finance rules are supposed to have transparency. How do these groups, left or right, keep their money secret? They hide behind an organization that is listed with the IRS called a 501(c)(4). They ask for permission under the IRS to be a 501(c)(4) status organization. That is a tax-exempt, nonprofit corporation regulated by the IRS.

These groups have one big hurdle to jump through. The 501(c)(4) has to be set up ''for the promotion of social welfare.'' In fact, the law says it must be exclusively—the law Congress wrote says it must be exclusively for social welfare. That is the law Congress wrote. It seems pretty clear, doesn't it? It seems as though Congress was saying what it intended. But the IRS muddied the water by deciding ''exclusively'' actually means ''primarily.'' ''Primarily engaged in social welfare activity'' means at least 51 percent of the time—not 100 percent of the time, 51 percent of the time. This is baffling, and it is completely misguided.

To make it more confusing, the IRS regulations state that ''the promotion of social welfare does not include direct or indirect participation, or intervention, in political campaigns on behalf or in opposition to any candidate for public office.'' To establish a 501(c)(4) corporation, the organizers must file a form with the IRS pledging that they do not plan to spend money

to influence elections. It appears that many of these groups have lied on their applications for nonprofit status. It also appears that they are allowed to get away with it. That is corrupt, and it is also a crime—and nothing appears to be done about it. That is a scandal right there. As the IRS stands by, these groups, whatever their political affiliation, mock Federal tax laws.

The Center for Responsive Politics noted that in the 2012 election, 501(c)(4) groups spent $254 million to support or oppose candidates. Why would someone donate to a 501(c)(4) instead of giving money to the parties or to the campaigns of candidates they support? Simple—to avoid disclosure. If someone gives $1,000 to a political campaign, that is required to be reported and the donor is known. It is out there. It is in the public. But if someone gives $1,000 to a 501(c)(4) that is improperly engaging in political activity, the public remains in the dark. So if someone gives $1,000 to a 501(c)(4), nobody knows about it, but it can go out under these rules and engage in political activity.

This secret money is a bipartisan outrage. They are seeking to influence elections, not promote social welfare. This has to change. I have long argued that it must change. Since 2010 many of us have come to this floor calling for vitally needed reforms, demanding that we change the way we do business. I believe that requires a constitutional amendment overturning the disastrous Buckley and Citizens United decisions by the Supreme Court, restoring to Congress and the States the authority to regulate elections.

We have also pushed for the DISCLOSE Act. That legislation would have taken the IRS out of the business of investigating these groups—a job it is failing to do anyway. It would have required open reporting with the Federal Election Commission. The DISCLOSE Act doesn't ban any group, but it does say the American people have a right to know who is trying to influence their vote, who is paying for all those ads on television.

There is a saying in Washington from the Watergate era: ''Follow the money.'' That is what I am trying to do. Where does the money come from and where is the money going? Not a single Republican voted for the DISCLOSE Act—not one. In fact, they filibustered it, blocked it from an up-or-down vote.

Partisan bias and abuse by the IRS cannot be tolerated. President Obama is not tolerating it. But Americans are also fed up with the deception by shadowy groups that continue to drown our elections in anonymous cash. The fact that these secret political money groups also serve as tax breaks for extremely wealthy people adds insult to injury.

We need clear rules from the IRS. Exclusive means exclusive, in my book. When the Congress says ''exclusive,'' it means exclusive, and we need to enforce those rules equally on all applicants for tax-exempt status, every single one. If you are a charity or true social welfare organization, you should not pay taxes. There is no need to publicize your donors. But if you are looking to influence Americans' votes and how Americans vote, the voters should know who you are. There must be disclosure at the very least.

We have to change the way we do business. The failure of IRS bureaucrats—billionaires writing political checks but hiding in the shadows and avoiding taxes—this has to change. The time has come to change this.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I am honored and privileged to stand here today and to say good words on behalf of Ernest Jay Moniz, also known as Dr. Moniz and Ernie Moniz. He is one of my favorite people from the world of academia. I have in my hand a bio of him that I will read out loud. It is not very long, and it is worth listening to.

Dr. Ernest J. Moniz is the Cecil and Ida Green professor of physics and engineering systems at MIT. His research at MIT, where he has served on the faculty since 1973, has focused on energy technology and policy.

Dr. Moniz also serves as the director of MIT's Energy Initiative and the MIT Laboratory for Energy and the Environment.

From 1997 until 2001, Dr. Moniz served as Under Secretary of the Department of Energy. Prior to that time, he served as Associate Director for Science in the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Executive Office of the President from 1995 until 1997.

In addition to his work at MIT and the Department of Energy, Dr. Moniz has served on any number of boards and commissions, including the President's Council of Advisers on Science and Technology from 2009 until today, the Department of Defense Threat Reduction Advisory Committee from 2010 until today, and on the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future from 2010 to 2012.

Dr. Moniz is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Humboldt Foundation, and the American Physical Society. In 1998 he received the Seymour Cray HPCC Recognition Award for vision and leadership in advancing scientific simulation.

Dr. Moniz received a bachelor of science degree summa cum laude in physics from Boston College and a doctorate in theoretical physics from Stanford University.

I have been privileged to know this man for a number of years. Our oldest son was an undergraduate in mechanical engineering at MIT and graduated a few years ago.

I remember holding a field hearing at MIT—gosh, about a half dozen or so years ago—and Dr. Moniz was one of our witnesses. Among the things I liked about him is that he was so approachable. We have all heard the term ''good guy.'' He is a really good guy.

Sometimes we think of somebody as a professor in an ivy tower and kind of out of touch, unable to communicate and connect with people. He could not be more different from that caricature. He is a real person, not to mention a very smart person. As a professor, he is able to explain complex concepts of nuclear energy and clean coal so that even I can understand what he is saying.

He has a wonderful sense of humor. If you happen to be a young person or an older person, Democratic or Republican, he just works so well with everybody. He is smart as a whip. He has a great way about him. He is approachable and has a very can-do attitude. I think the President made a great choice.

I say to Ernie and his family, I appreciate his willingness to serve in a lot of capacities and his willingness now to serve in this capacity. Hopefully, it will be good for him, his life, and his family. I think it certainly is going to be good for our country, so we appreciate that.

I say to my colleagues who have not had a chance to get to know him, I think everyone is going to like him a lot and enjoy working with him. I know I certainly have.

I also wish to discuss something I touched on earlier this week. I stood here just this week talking about the Swiss cheese we have in the executive branch of our Federal Government. There are too many positions that don't have someone confirmed for those positions.

In some cases, the administration has been derelict in terms of sending us nominations because they spend forever vetting nominations because they don't want to send someone to us who has a flaw or a blemish. As a result, I think they spend entirely too much time vetting nominees. In some cases, even when a nominee's name gets here, even if they are really good and well qualified, we delay those nominations further. Whether it is a Democratic or Republican President, we put the nominees through—not torture but something pretty close to it.

We need good people to be willing to serve. When they step up and are willing to serve, we need to process and vet those nominations. We need to scrub them hard, but at the end of the day we need to move them forward.

In the Environment and Public Works Committee, we took a small but important step with the President's nominee Regina McCarthy to be the Administrator for the Environment Protection Agency. She is enormously

well qualified. She has already been confirmed by the Senate for the air pollution side for the EPA and has done a very nice job.

Although she has been nominated by a Democratic President, in the past she served with five Republican Governors. She is smart, hard-working, she has great credentials, and she is approachable. She is somebody who is able to understand and explain things. She will do a great job.

We have had a hard time being able to move her nomination out of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Today we were joined by our Republican colleagues. Unfortunately, none of them voted to report her nomination out of committee. We have reported her out on a straight party-line vote.

My hope is that we will have an opportunity to do what we did a number of years ago—about 7 or 8 years ago. Mike Leavitt, the former Governor of Utah, was nominated to be the head of EPA. There was some delay in his nomination.

We actually had a big markup and business meeting scheduled to consider his nomination, and the Democrats boycotted that meeting. We waited a couple of weeks. At a followup meeting, the Democrats showed up, and we reported him out with Democratic support. Later, we voted for his nomination. It was a big bipartisan vote. I think there were 70 or 80 votes in favor of his nomination.

My hope is that is what we will do with Gina McCarthy. She deserves a vote, and from my perspective she deserves a positive, affirmative vote.

We have Ernie Moniz coming our way later this afternoon in about 40 minutes. I hope my colleagues will join me and give him a big vote so we can send him to work for our country one more time.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is about Dr. Ernie Moniz's appointment to be Secretary of Energy. I put a hold on Dr. Moniz. It has nothing to do with him. He is a wonderful fellow. He is an MIT professor. He has been amply associated with the Department of Energy, including the MOX Program. All of us in Georgia and South Carolina look forward to working with him.

What we are upset about is the Obama administration's decision to temporarily stop construction on the MOX facility. It is about 60 percent complete.

What is MOX? It is a program to take 34 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium in excess of our defense needs and dispose of it by turning it into commercial-grade fuel. It is enough weapons-grade plutonium to make 17,000 warheads.

In 2000 there was an agreement between the United States and Russia: They would dispose of 34 metric tons and we would dispose of 34 metric tons. And we have been studying how to do that.

In 2010 the Federal Government—and the Obama administration—in the agreement with the Russians to move forward, said we would MOX the 34 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium. We were to turn it into mixed oxide fuel to be used in commercial reactors, which was a technology deployed in France, and that was the way forward.

To the administration's credit, we are finally moving forward. Senator ISAKSON, Senator CHAMBLISS, and I went to the facility a couple of years ago and finally saw it moving forward. It is about 60 percent built. Now, in the budget proposal of the President, they stopped construction to study an alternative. There is no other alternative. If they try to turn it into vitrified glass material, that will take more money and more time than doing MOX, and it has not been proven to work the way it is set up today.

At the end of the day, the problems we should be focusing on are the cost overruns of the MOX Program. It is about $2 billion over cost. I would join with the administration to sit down with a contractor and try to recoup that $2 billion to find a way forward and make it affordable.

There are statutes in place that require a $100 million fine to be paid to the State of South Carolina if we don't meet our disposition goals. Last year we extended that statute by 2 years because we don't want the fine money, we want the MOX Program. It is good for the country, and it is good for the world.

Now that we have stopped the study, our fear is that we are stopping and studying an alternative that doesn't exist, and it cannot be cheaper than $2 billion. There is no other way to do it. We have been studying this for about 15 years, and we will be breaking the agreement with the Russians. Other than that, we don't have a problem with what they are doing.

What we want to do is sit down with the contractor and the administration and lower the costs of the program but keep it moving forward. This administration has talked consistently about reducing nuclear proliferation and making the world safer from the use of nuclear materials. This is a program that started in the Clinton administration—then Bush, and now Obama—that really would accomplish that.

Thirty-four metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium—enough to make 17,000 warheads—would be taken off the market forever. In this way, a sword becomes a plowshare by making commercial-grade fuel out of it. It is a good program, and we need to complete the program.

The reason we put a hold on the nominee for Secretary of Energy is to get everybody's attention. I have been talking with Dennis McDonough, and I have been talking with the administration. We hope we can resolve this, but we are here to speak for Georgia and South Carolina.

We have a deal with the Federal Government. We agreed to take this 34 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium years ago with the understanding that it would leave South Carolina and not affect the environment of South Carolina and Georgia in a permanent way.

We are very DOE-friendly in South Carolina and Georgia. The Savannah River site is right on the border. There are almost as many people from Georgia working at the site as there are from South Carolina. My colleagues from Georgia have been absolutely terrific.

At the end of the day we are going to be insistent that the Federal Government keep its commitment to the States of South Carolina and Georgia and to the Russians. We are going to make sure we dispose of this weapons-grade plutonium, and we are going to be more cost-conscious about it.

We are going to let Ernie Moniz become Secretary of Energy in 40 minutes. I will vote for him, but I will continue to slow down the process and make life incredibly miserable if we cannot find an accommodation that I think is fair. My State and the State of Georgia have been good partners with the Federal Government and the Department of Energy on energy issues.

Several years ago, when I first became a Senator—I think it was in 2002 or 2003—we agreed to leave some waste in the bottom of about 50 tanks that contained high-level waste material from the Cold War era from reactors at the Savannah River site used to make tritium to help fuel hydrogen bombs. By leaving a small amount in the bottom of the tank—the heel—and filling it with concrete, we were able to save $16 billion in cleanup costs. Instead of scrapping it all out and sending it to Yucca Mountain, which never came about, we were able to leave a small amount that would not hurt the environment of South Carolina and Georgia.

Now, in this budget they are reducing the tank closure by $106 million. We cannot do it that way. They cannot get us to help save money for the Federal Government and take on a reasonable risk—not much of a risk at all—and then short us. Whether it is a Republican or Democratic administration, people are going to stop dealing with the Federal Government when it comes to nuclear materials if this is the way we are going to do business.

The people in Georgia and South Carolina have been very accommodating. We appreciate the Savannah River site. It is a wonderful DOE facility. We are proud of it, and we are proud of the employees. But we are not going to be taken advantage of.

We are asking for the administration to sit down with us and others who care about this to find a way to lower the cost of the MOX construction but continue forward with the construction so we can get the MOX facility up and running. We need to honor our commitment to the Russians and get this weapons-grade plutonium off the market.

Count us in in terms of lowering costs; count us out when it comes to stopping the program in the middle and trying to find an alternative that doesn't exist.

As to the tanks, the Federal Government is going to honor its commitment to the people of South Carolina and Georgia to get these tanks closed up on time and on schedule. We have, again, saved $16 billion over the life of the close-up plan for the tanks just by being reasonable.

When it comes to MOX, there were three facilities planned to take the weapons-grade plutonium and turn it into a commercial-grade fuel. We were able to consolidate two of the facilities into one and save $2 billion. I am all for saving money, but I am also all for keeping one's word.

To our friends in the administration, we will work with you when we can, fight you when we must, but when it comes to this, I hope there will be a lot of bipartisanship for the delegations of South Carolina and Georgia to make sure we honor the commitment entered into between the Federal Government and the State of South Carolina that will affect our friends in Georgia and keep this program moving. We are not asking for too much. As a matter of fact, we are insisting on the Federal Government holding up its end of the bargain because we have held up our end of the bargain.

To our friends in the administration, let's see if we can solve this problem.

To my colleagues in this body, I hope I would have the good judgment and common sense to support the Members if anyone found themselves in this position of trying to do something good for the Nation and have it get off the rail. I hope I would be willing to help the other side when it comes to something such as this.

It is very difficult to deal with these high-level waste issues, particularly weapons-grade plutonium. When we find somebody who is willing to be reasonable and helpful, the last thing that should be done is to change the rules in the middle of the game.

With that, I will yield to Senator ISAKSON to just quickly ask him, from his point of view, does he see this as a fundamental breach of the agreement we have had for years, and what effect does he think it will have on our nonproliferation agenda and how does it affect South Carolina and Georgia?

Mr. ISAKSON. First of all, I wish to thank the Senator from South Carolina for his leadership on this important issue, and I am proud to join the senior Senator from Georgia SAXBY CHAMBLISS and, in effect, join Sam Nunn, who is a former Senator from Georgia who, with Dick Lugar, brought about the Nuclear Threat Initiative program which brought about the treaty of 2000 which calls for the reduction by 68 metric tons of nuclear materials.

I would answer the question of the Senator from South Carolina with another question: Where else in the United States of America are there two States willing to accept plutonium, reprocess it into fuel rod for commercial use, and do it safely and have dealt with nuclear materials for over 50 years? That is Georgia and South Carolina.

The idea that we can fund a study to look for an alternative is laughable. That is just merely a smokescreen for the current administration's position.

The Senator is exactly right. Senator CHAMBLISS and myself, along with Senator SCOTT and Senator GRAHAM, are happy to sit down with the administration, look at the cost overrun on the MOX facility, and find ways to find savings. But the dumbest economic decision in the world would be to stop the process when we are half finished because then we have wasted every dime that has already been spent, and we have to spend more money on an alternative that does not exist.

So I wish to add my support to the remarks of Senator GRAHAM and my State's support to reprocess this weapons-grade plutonium into reprocessed materials that fuel powerplants and commercial opportunities. That is a good use. It is a good way to get rid of this nuclear material, and it is also a good way to keep it out of the hands of the terrorists. If we don't destroy it and it lays around in Russia or anywhere else, it is always suspected of being stolen or used in a way that none of us would ever want.

I thank the Senator for his leadership.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can't thank Senator ISAKSON enough. Senator SCOTT has been with us at every step. But I want to let everybody in Georgia know that when it comes to the Savannah River site, we have worked as a team for years, and I just can't thank the Senator enough.

Senator CHAMBLISS is one of the leading national security experts in the Senate, and he has been intimately involved in the MOX program. My question for Senator CHAMBLISS is, we have an agreement with the Russians; they will dispose of their 34 metric tons of excess plutonium—enough to create 17,000 warheads in Russia—and we have agreed to do the same. If we are seen to stop and not honor our commitment, what reaction does the Senator from Georgia think the Russians would have, and is it smart to delay this program in the times in which we live?

I worry about the materials being compromised not so much in South Carolina and Georgia but very much in Russia. Could the Senator express his thoughts about that?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, as did my colleague from Georgia Senator ISAKSON, I wish to thank Senator GRAHAM for his leadership on this issue. He is right. We have been to the facility a number of times to examine what is going on there. There is great work being done by highly trained, highly educated individuals to deal with one of the most sensitive products we have in this country.

The Senator is exactly right that there are significant consequences from an international standpoint if the numbers in the President's budget are allowed to stand. That is why we have had conversations with a number of individuals currently at the Department of Energy and why we had a conversation with Dr. Moniz in preparation for his confirmation by this body. Those discussions have led to the fact that, as the Senator from Georgia says, we are willing—and we have their agreement that they are willing—to sit down with a contractor to talk about the money. That is the real issue because we are talking about a budget item and whether we can afford to do this. If we don't involve the contractor, then obviously we can't get that number down to a manageable number.

So, again, with the leadership of the Senator from South Carolina, we look forward to working with Dr. Moniz and others with respect to sitting down with the contractor and coming to some resolution of the ultimate budget number that is going to be needed.

With respect to Russia, the President met with President Medvedev in 2010, and the two of them, in a press conference, talked about the MOX facility and the agreement on MOX. Here we are 3 years later with this President submitting a budget number that, in fact, in effect starves this program and would have the obvious intended result of eliminating this program, thus breaking his word with President Medvedev in 2010 as well as breaking the U.S. agreement with Russia. That has the potential to have very serious consequences on the international stage.

Also, abandoning the project would have severe economic impact to both the State of Georgia and the State of South Carolina because of the individuals who have been working there for now, as Senator ISAKSON said, 50 years.

It is also going to strand up to 64 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium. Where else is it going to go? There is no place else for it to go. There is no State jumping up and down saying: Please bring your uranium and your plutonium to my State and we will deal with it. You can transport it to my State. In fact, the exact opposite is happening.

It was intended that we would process this plutonium and it would ultimately ship to Yucca Mountain, as Senator GRAHAM alluded to. Now the State of Nevada is saying no. They are throwing up their hands and saying: We don't want that processed material in

our State because it is hazardous waste.

Well, what we are saying is, we are happy doing what we are doing because we have those trained, sophisticated professionals who know how to deal with this hazardous material. They do an outstanding job of it. We have spent billions of dollars constructing the facilities to the point where they are 40 percent away from being completed now. If we just accept the President's budget, then we will have wasted all of that money and the construction phase of the buildings that are there. Also, we are not going to have anywhere to put this 64 metric tons of hazardous material and weapons-grade plutonium.

So this stands to have economic impacts to our part of the country. It stands to certainly create international issues with the Russians if we break our agreement with them. Also, just as significantly, it leaves 64 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium outstanding, with nowhere to go, nowhere to store it.

The MOX project was designed to deal with a very sophisticated issue years and years and years ago, and it just makes no sense whatsoever to stop in the middle of it now and say, well, we just don't have the money to take care of something that is as hazardous and potentially as life-threatening as what this weapons-grade plutonium is.

We do need to spend our money wisely. We have to be careful. But there are agreements we need to honor. There are certain aspects of governing that need to be done and need to be done in the right way, and this is simply one of those.

So with the continued leadership of Senator GRAHAM and Senator ISAKSON and Senator SCOTT, I look forward to us sitting down with Dr. Moniz once he is confirmed—and we are all going to vote to confirm him today—because he has so much knowledge about this.

One thing we failed to mention is the fact that he is the guy who negotiated the agreement. He is the guy the President is saying, well, we know you went through some very difficult times in negotiating this with the Russians, but the heck with your agreement, the heck with all the work you did. Thank goodness his attitude is that he wants to work with us.

We want to find a way forward. We look forward to his confirmation being completed, to sitting down with us and the contractor, and let's figure out a way we can make this project the continued success it has been thus far, as well as moving forward.

With that, I yield to Senator GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank Senator CHAMBLISS.

I believe Senator REED wishes to be recognized for a request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized in morning business after Senator GRAHAM has completed his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Just to conclude, I wish to thank both of my colleagues. They have been great partners on this issue and many others. We have tried to be good partners with the Federal Government. We are proud of the Savannah River site and all that has been accomplished over the last 50 years. Now we are moving into a new phase of trying to get rid of Cold War materials—34 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium here, and in Russia, 60 percent completion of the MOX program.

As to the $2 billion overrun, that is not lost upon me as being a lot of money. That is a lot of money. But what I am telling my fellow Members of the body, and the country as a whole, there is no way we can find an alternative to MOX cheaper than that $2 billion. It is just not possible. We have been studying this forever, and in the agreement itself with the Russians, it specifically says MOX, and it prohibits us as a nation from burying the plutonium.

So this is the way forward. I promise the Members of the body and the administration we will lower the cost overruns, I promise. This is a complicated scientific endeavor, but we will lower the cost overruns.

What we will not do is stop the program when it is 60 percent complete and study an alternative that has no possibility of coming about scientifically and could never lower costs and interrupt the disposition of this weapons-grade plutonium and breach the agreement with the Russians. We will not be a party to that. We will keep talking.

As to Mr. Moniz, he will be an outstanding Secretary of Energy. We look forward to working with him.

I appreciate my colleagues coming down and joining me in this colloquy and putting everything on the record about the Savannah River site and MOX.

With that, I yield the floor to Senator REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, Senator CHAMBLISS be recognized for up to 10 minutes to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, July 1 is less than 7 weeks away, and unless we act the interest rate on need-based student loans will rise from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

Student loan debt is second only to mortgage debt for American families. Now is not the time to add to student loan debt by allowing the interest rate on need-based student loans to double.

I have worked with Chairman HARKIN, Leader REID, and many of my colleagues to develop a fully offset, 2-year extension of the current student loan interest rate. Instead of charging low- and moderate-income students more for their student loans, the Student Loan Affordability Act will keep rates where they are while closing loopholes in the Federal Tax Code. We should take up this legislation and pass it without delay.

I know many of my colleagues, including myself, are working on longer term solutions that more effectively reflect market rates—but my concern is, frankly, that we will run up against this July 1 deadline and we will not have the long-term solution in place. We have to do something. That is why I urge us to pick up this legislation as quickly as possible.

Our first priority must be to reassure students and families that the interest rate will not double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent on July 1. We have to do that. Then we can work toward a longer term solution. We also owe it to them to commit to a full and thoughtful process for devising this longer term solution, to develop an approach that will set interest rates and terms and conditions on all student loans that will be more reflective of market rates, but also more beneficial to students and their families who are borrowing this money.

Senator DURBIN and I have put forward a long-term proposal that would set student loan interest rates based on the actual cost of operating the program so the Federal Government would not be offering student loans at a profit.

There are other long-term proposals on the table. Some of them, such as the one reported out of the Education and the Workforce Committee in the House today, could actually leave students worse off than they would be if the rates were to double. We need to take the time to fully consider comprehensive solutions to our student loan debt crisis—solutions that will make college more affordable, not less so. Rather than rushing to overhaul the Federal student loan program without fully considering the impact on students and college affordability, the Student Loan Affordability Act will secure low interest rates until Congress can act on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Without swift congressional action, more than 7 million students will have to pay an estimated additional $1,000 for each loan. These are the students who need the help the most.

Sixty percent of dependent subsidized loan borrowers come from families with incomes of less than $60,000, while 80 percent of independent subsidized loan borrowers come from families with incomes below $40,000.

Unlike Republican proposals that would balance the budget on the backs of students by charging them higher interest rates or make students vulnerable to exorbitant interest rates in the future, this legislation which we are

proposing will help ensure that college remains within reach for students who rely on Federal loans to pay for their education. This legislation is fully paid for.

Specifically, the pay-fors would be limiting the use of tax-deferred retirement accounts as a complicated estate planning tool, closing a corporate offshore tax loophole by restricting ''earnings stripping'' by expatriated entities, and closing an oil-and-gas industry tax loophole by treating oil from tar sands the same as other petroleum products.

We should not be collecting additional revenue from students when we can eliminate wasteful spending in the Tax Code, and we should not allow—not allow—the interest rate to double on July 1.

I hope all my colleagues will support, as the first step, the 2-year extension until we can truly come up with a thoughtful, comprehensive approach to long-term student lending in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

MILLER RESIGNATION

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the resignation of Acting IRS Commissioner Steven Miller.

The request by President Obama and Mr. Miller's resignation is too little too late. This is just another example of the President continuing to search for a scapegoat for his own administration's misdeeds.

The American people deserve trust, and this egregious abuse of power demonstrates the worst fears of the American people that they cannot trust their government.

It has been 2 years since these incidents were first reported, and while Members of Congress were led to believe no malfeasance occurred, the details of the IG report were more shocking than we could have realized, as many conservative groups were not only targeted for additional reviews but were harassed as well. Moreover, in some cases, information was purposefully leaked by the Internal Revenue Service.

These actions are unacceptable, and while President Obama's reactions seem to be sincere, he has not yet demonstrated to the American people that all of those responsible will be brought to justice. Above all, we have to make sure this never happens again.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to support President Obama's nomination of Dr. Ernest J. Moniz to be the next Secretary of Energy. Dr. Moniz has a solid and extensive background in the energy field and I believe will bring a balanced and practical perspective to our Nation's energy policy. Dr. Moniz has significant familiarity with the Department of Energy and its issues, having served as Under Secretary during the second Clinton administration. During the Obama administration, he has served in a number of advisory positions, including as a member of the President's Council of Advisers on Science and Technology, the Department of Defense Threat Reduction Advisory Committee, and the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.

The Committee on Armed Services, which I chair, has jurisdiction over both the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, NNSA, and Department's Environmental Management Program. The NNSA is responsible for the management and security of the Nation's nuclear weapons, nuclear nonproliferation, and naval reactor programs. The Environmental Management Program is responsible for cleanup of the environmental legacy from the Nation's nuclear weapons development and government-sponsored nuclear energy research. Combined, these programs represent more than $16.7 billion of the Department of Energy's $26.3 billion budget, or more than 63 percent.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with Dr. Moniz and to highlight several issues of importance to the State of Michigan and to the Nation. I look forward to working with Dr. Moniz on these issues.

Among these issues is the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams, FRIB, which will be the world's most powerful rare isotope accelerator and provide cutting-edge research capabilities to study questions about the fundamental nature of matter. Applications of research discoveries from FRIB will assist development of new technologies in the fields of biomedicine, environmental science, and national defense. Michigan State University, MSU, was selected in 2008 after an extensive competitive process, and the FRIB project plans and schedules have been through rigorous Federal review. As home of the National Science Foundation's National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory, MSU has solid and well-known expertise in the field of rare isotopes and nuclear physics, with the largest nuclear physics faculty in the Nation and a nuclear physics graduate program that ranks No. 1 in the United States. MSU already produces 10 percent of the Nation's Ph.D.s in nuclear physics. In addition to expanding our knowledge of physics and the life science, successful completion of FRIB also will enhance the education of nuclear scientists and engineers needed to maintain U.S. competitiveness.

Another important issue to the State of Michigan and the Nation is collaboration between Federal agencies, the private sector, and academia on the development and transition of advanced ground vehicle and energy technologies. Collaboration in these areas is critical to leverage and maximize the value of the work being done in the Federal Government, in the private sector, and at our academic institutions around the country. The Advanced Vehicle Power Technology Alliance, AVPTA, is a partnership between the Department of Energy and the Department of the Army which was created to provide a mechanism for this collaboration. A charter was signed between these two agencies in July 2011 establishing the mission of the AVPTA to ''leverage resources and research involving the commercial automotive and defense ground vehicle manufacturers to transition technologies into both the commercial and military marketplaces and increase precompetitive research and development.''

Dr. Moniz is familiar with and supportive of these programs, and I look forward to his Senate confirmation as Secretary of Energy. The Department of Energy has been effectively led by Dr. Steven Chu. Dr. Moniz will carry on that good work.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I believe we have run out of those in the Senate who wish to speak. I would just like to state again that this is a nominee who is supported by both Senator MURKOWSKI and myself. This is a nominee who got an overwhelming bipartisan vote in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

As I said earlier, I think he is an individual who is smart about energy policy, he is savvy about how the Department of Energy operates and he is a solution-oriented person and Democrats and Republicans in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee saw that in the confirmation process.

There are huge challenges ahead of him at the Department of Energy, but I think he is very qualified for this position. I would urge all Senators—Democrats and Republicans—to support the nominee.

I yield back all remaining time on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Ernest J. Moniz, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Energy?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Baucus	Harkin	Portman
Begich	Hatch	Pryor
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Sessions
Coats	King	Shaheen
Cochran	Kirk	Shelby
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Landrieu	Tester
Corker	Lautenberg	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Toomey
Cowan	Lee	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Merkley	Wyden
Flake	Mikulski	
Franken	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Coburn	Moran

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. CON. RES. 25

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I am here today on the floor again to ask that Senate Republicans stop blocking the next step in regular order and allow us to move to a bipartisan budget conference with the House of Representatives. We have waited long enough. In fact, we have now waited 54 days, and it is time to get to work on a bipartisan budget agreement.

The Senate Democrats see no reason for delay. We are very proud of our budget, which puts forward a strong, fair vision for getting Americans back to work, tackling our long-term debt and deficit challenges, and laying a strong foundation for the middle class in the future. It seems that some of our Republican colleagues in the Senate and House would rather wait now until the next crisis and see if they can extract political concessions with the clock ticking—or maybe they don't want to air the details of the unpopular House budget.

Either way, there is no excuse for putting the American people through another round of partisan brinkmanship. We have already seen that that hurts our economy, and it causes Americans to question whether their government is working for them.

Yesterday the House Republicans met to talk about what they are going to demand in exchange for not tanking our economy. Apparently they are considering a ''laundry list,'' including repealing ObamaCare—which the House will vote on, by the way, for the 37th time today—and restrictions on women's health choices.

House Republicans' practice of leveraging crises for their own gain died with the Boehner rule, and no amount of wishing is going to bring it back. House Republicans may think brinkmanship helps them win political fights, but it does not help the American families and communities we are here to serve.

I urge our Republican colleagues in the Senate to take a step toward a responsible bipartisan budget agreement and a step away from governing by crisis.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the request?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, we want to proceed with this as well. We want a budget. It has been 4 years and it has been far too long. What we want to avoid is a deal negotiated behind closed doors, a backroom deal to raise the debt limit.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify her request so that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, the Senator's request is asking to disregard what the Senate did on those days—54 days ago—to go through over 100 amendments and defeat those amendments time and time again; to go to conference—not behind closed doors, I would add. A conference committee is a committee that is out in the public.

What is happening right now is closed-door agreements. What we are asking for is an open process where we are allowed to take the Senate-passed budget and the House-passed budget, go to conference, and find out where we can agree so we can put this behind us.

I object to the Senator's request and ask again for our unanimous consent request to move to budget conference, as we do in regular order, which is what the Republicans have been demanding for a very long time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Does the Senator from Utah object?

Mr. LEE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we have gone 4 years without a budget, and the Democratic Senate did act this year and passed a budget. The House has also passed a budget, and it is a historic proposal. It balances in 10 years, it does not raise taxes, and it increases spending every year by as much as 3 percent. It is the right way to go for America, and it is the kind of budget we should be talking about.

Chairman MURRAY has indicated we should go through regular order. But under regular order, what we should do is have the House budget at the desk right now. It is a responsible budget. Under regular order, the House budget should be brought to the floor under section 305(b) of the Congressional Budget Act. Then we can have full debate on that budget with 50 hours and the ability to offer amendments. I think this is what we should be doing.

Instead, our Democratic colleagues and Senator REID have offered consent requests that short-circuit the regular order. Their request would automatically bring the House budget off the calendar, replace it entirely with the Senate's own budget and assume it passes without a single minute of debate or without a single vote being taken. That is not the regular order.

Madam President, first, I ask unanimous consent that after my remarks Senator INHOFE be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I object. I wish to respond to the Senator.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, what the

Senator is requesting us to do is to take up the House-passed budget. Remember, we have passed a Senate budget here. We had 50 hours of debate, over 100 amendments were offered. We voted on all of them way into the wee hours, 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning, as everyone here will rightly remember. He is asking us to disregard all that action in the Senate, take up the House bill and have 50 hours more of debate, unlimited amendments, sitting here for weeks at a time again to go through all the amendments.

Madam President, that is a waste of taxpayer money and it is a waste of our time. We have done that work. It is time to go to conference.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my understanding that a colloquy is in order between Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator LEE, but I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of that I be recognized and that following my remarks the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, I believe I was listed in the queue a bit earlier than that, but I only have a 3- or 4-minute statement. I do not mind trading off, but I, similar to others, was told the time was right after the vote that I would be recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to amend my unanimous consent request to include the 3-minute remarks of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator. But reserving the right to object, is that before or after the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. INHOFE. That would be before the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—S. RES. 133 and 134

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 133; that the Senate proceed to its consideration; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I wish to point out that the incident that led to this resolution—the Kermit Gosnell prosecution—indeed resulted in a successful prosecution. He was convicted of three counts of first-degree murder and one count of involuntary manslaughter. That case is closed. The criminal justice system has done its part, and the three life sentences without the possibility of parole means that the interests there—the very important public interests—will be served and he will never again harm women, infants or anyone else through his version of medical practice, that distorted and unfortunate betrayal of trust that he called a medical practice.

We need very much to focus on the kind of abuse of trust—unsanitary, abusive, unsafe medical practices—across this country, no matter what kind of procedure is involved, and that is the reason I think this resolution is too narrow in its focus on violations of the standard of medical care when they occur in medical practice, which most certainly was involved in the Gosnell case and involved, unfortunately, in thousands of cases across the country every year.

As Senators, we have a responsibility to focus on that betrayal of trust and care when it occurs. That is the reason I have offered a resolution—S. Res. 134—to express the sense of the Senate that all incidents of abusive, unsanitary, illegal, unhealthful medical practices should be condemned and prevented, and the perpetrators should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, as Gosnell was.

There are, unfortunately, many instances already publicly disclosed of these abuses of standards, and one of them, for example, I cited on the floor just very recently—last week. I remind my colleagues of the Oklahoma dentist who exposed as many as 7,000 patients to the HIV and hepatitis B and C viruses through unsanitary practices. So far, 60 of his patients have tested positive for these viruses. Those are 60 people who trusted a health care provider in a position of authority to provide safe, quality care. Those patients now face life-threatening diseases. In Nevada, practitioners at an endoscopy center exposed 40,000 patients to hepatitis C through their unsanitary practices, which went on for years. My resolution speaks to these kinds of abuses—unsafe, unsanitary practices—no matter what the medical procedure involved may be. So I urge my colleagues to support my resolution, and I do object to the proposed resolution of the Senator from Utah.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 134, and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that the resolution be agreed to, the Blumenthal amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from Utah.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Reserving the right to object, the kind of abuse, the kind of betrayal of trust described in the resolution proposed by my friend and my colleague from Connecticut is different in kind from that described in my resolution. The kind of abuse involved in my resolution involves the intentional taking, the first-degree premeditated murder of a human life. I think that deserves its own consideration, and on that basis I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. If I may respond to my friend's remarks—and I certainly not only sympathize with his motivation but also with the result—I just think it is too narrow a result—to investigate one form of medical practice, no matter how egregious the violation of standard of care may be. In this instance, it involved murder. We can say it now, no longer with the word ''alleged'' before murder, as we did last week. It is now proven. It is heinous and unacceptable. But so are the practices that involve exposing patients to very severe illnesses; and, likewise, the nursing home director in California who inappropriately administered an antipsychotic medicine to residents simply for convenience and which resulted in the death of one patient. Those kinds of practices may be equally egregious in the results and impact they cause, and my resolution would be broader and more inclusive and fairer not only to those victims' families—and I want to express my sympathy to the families of those victims who were so deeply and irreparably harmed by Gosnell—but also with the families and victims of other kinds of medical malpractice and to respect the States that have an independent responsibility to ensure adherence with those standards of care and ought to have the ability to enforce their laws, which might be impeded by the resolution that has been offered by my friend from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I rise to ask my colleagues once again to join me in expressing the sense of the Senate that governments at all levels have a compelling interest in preventing and punishing the practices of late-term abortions under unsafe, unsanitary, and illegal circumstances.

It seems as though every day we find new evidence that this problem is much bigger than we could have feared previously. Earlier this week, of course, Philadelphia abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell was convicted on three counts of first-degree murder for severing the spines of newborn infants, and one count of involuntary manslaughter for the death of a pregnant mother who came to see Dr. Gosnell for care.

The shocking details of the Gosnell case have, despite the best efforts of

the mainstream media to cover it up, become national news. The abortion industry has spun into action, trying to isolate and condemn Gosnell as an aberration. Planned Parenthood cited Gosnell's ''appalling crimes.'' NARAL called him a ''butcher.'' On this very floor last week, Gosnell's actions were decried by pro-choice Senators as ''reprehensible'' and ''an outrage . . . a violation of everything we hold dear.''

But Kermit Gosnell has only been sentenced to life in prison and condemned as a monster for doing things for which—had he done them just a few seconds earlier or a few centimeters in a different direction—those same voices might have hailed him as a hero and not as a monster.

Remember, President Obama himself, while serving in the State legislature of Illinois, voted against legislation that would have protected the civil and constitutional rights of infants—human beings—born alive.

At a recent hearing in the Florida State Legislature, a Planned Parenthood representative refused even to acknowledge that newborn babies have the right to life. In recent weeks, undercover videos have caught abortion clinics around the country casually offering to kill infants born alive. Just this week, evidence emerged about similar abuses at a clinic in Texas.

This has nothing to do with health care or even with medical negligence but with murder—a war on women and children waged under the guise of legitimate health care.

As much as we might want to agree that Kermit Gosnell is an aberration, recent revelations, indeed, suggest otherwise. A mounting body of evidence seems to suggest that at least among some late-term abortion providers and advocates, the immorality of infanticide may be an open question.

The abortion industry's defense of late-term abortion has always been based on a rejection of innate human dignity. How could it be otherwise? But as technology advances, their case for late-term abortion increasingly rejects medical science as well.

We now know as a scientific fact that unborn children, after about 20 weeks of development, can feel pain. We know Dr. Gosnell's victims squirmed and cried before he severed their spinal cords, and we know that every day medical technology progresses our abortion laws fall further behind the science.

It is a tragedy all on its own that even today our laws defining human life depend more on geography than biology. The unsettling question before us now is: Has an industry whose profits have always depended on dehumanizing unborn children gone even further and dehumanized children born alive too?

The case of Kermit Gosnell, the undercover videos, and recent clinic scandals around the country all hint at a terrifying answer. Yet right now we just don't know. My resolution would call on governments at all levels to find out—to find out what the late-term abortion industry is up to and to take any appropriate and necessary measures to prevent and punish abusive, unsanitary, and illegal practices.

Some might say this resolution is a symbolic gesture, and I and others have introduced more concrete legislation. Perhaps. But even so, symbols are themselves important. It is important that the strong stand for the weak; that we, in the world's greatest deliberative body, lend our voices to the voiceless; that we, representatives of the most powerful Nation on Earth, promise to protect the weakest, most innocent, and most vulnerable among us and punish those who would do our children harm.

Mr. CRUZ. Would the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. LEE. Yes, I would.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I wish to ask a question but will start by laying a predicate and ask the Senator's views on that predicate.

I rise to support the resolution offered by Senator LEE calling upon the Senate to investigate and hold hearings about the late-term abortion practices in this country.

This is especially important given the fact we are seeing allegations of similar conduct to that of Dr. Gosnell potentially being performed in other locations across the country. Indeed, there have been allegations of similar conduct in my hometown of Houston, TX, which I understand are being investigated by the local district attorney and other authorities and that need to be fully and thoroughly investigated.

The crimes committed by Dr. Gosnell are almost unspeakable. The harm inflicted to the mothers and to the babies who were born alive and had their lives willingly extinguished—unthinkable. The actions detailed in the grand jury report depict a house of horrors.

Knowing what we know now about what happened, everyone in this body should be supporting conducting an investigation to make sure there are not other Dr. Kermit Gosnells across this country. We need to make sure it is not happening to other unsuspecting mothers, that other newborn babies are not being murdered as they were in Dr. Gosnell's clinic.

Specifically this resolution states:

> Congress and States should gather information about and correct abusive, unsanitary and illegal abortion practices and the interstate referral of women and girls to facilities engaged in dangerous or illegal second- or third-trimester procedures.

This body should be concerned what referrals were made to Dr. Gosnell and who else might be performing these late-term abortions in such horrific conditions.

This resolution goes on to say:

> Congress has the responsibility to investigate and conduct hearings on abortions performed near, at, or after viability in the United States, public policies regarding such, and evaluate the extent to which such abortions involve violations of the natural right to life of infants who are born alive or are capable of being born alive and therefore are entitled to equal protection under the law.

In my judgment this is a resolution everyone should support. Everyone who proclaims himself or herself to be a champion for women and children should enthusiastically support this resolution.

Many of these late-term abortion clinics serve under-privileged populations. Anyone who proclaims himself a champion dedicated to helping the most vulnerable should be supporting this resolution. The Senate has an obligation to conduct oversight.

Planned Parenthood, the Nation's largest abortion provider in 2001 performed 333,964 abortions in the United States. From 2011 to 2012, Planned Parenthood received 45 percent of its revenue from taxpayer-funded sources. Almost half of its income comes from the taxpayer. This body has an obligation to make sure there are not other Gosnell houses of horror practicing today.

The conditions described in the grand jury report shock the conscience. They describe how doctors and nurses worked without proper licenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. CRUZ. My question to the Senator is, does he see how any Senator of good faith, given these facts, could oppose this resolution?

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent I be given 60 seconds to answer the question and then I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, in short, in response to the question from my colleague from Texas, I do find it difficult to understand why anyone would oppose this resolution. I also find it difficult to understand how this can be put on the same plate—as serious as other kinds of abuses are, as serious as other acts of medical malpractice may be, this one is different. This is about premeditated first degree murder of the most defenseless, most vulnerable people in our society, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Again, I renew my objection. Let me say, my two colleagues have made excellent closing arguments to the Gosnell jury. I would expect that to be the case since they are two well-trained, excellent lawyers. But the Gosnell case is over. It is done. He has been sentenced—or he will be shortly. These kinds of abuses ought to arouse outrage wherever and whenever they occur. Anytime, anywhere a doctor endangers a patient in violating standards of care, we ought to condemn them. So I urge my colleagues to join

me in the outrage I feel about the dentist in Oklahoma or the endoscopy center in Nevada or the nursing home director in California. In any case where prosecution is appropriate, an investigation should be done properly by State authorities who have jurisdiction, and they should condemn such practices. I ask them to join me in resolution S. 134.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oklahoma, recognizing that he has other accommodations he has to deal with. I ask unanimous consent I be granted up to 4 minutes to speak after the Senator from Oklahoma completes his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask the Chair if I am correct when I say after comments by the Senator from Virginia, the senior Senator from Texas will be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

IRAN SANCTIONS IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, I think we, all of us, late in the week, are on a timeline. I have a very significant piece of legislation, S. 965, called the Iran Sanctions Implementation Act. I spent a long time on the floor yesterday talking about this. It occurred to me it is a little bit complicated. The longer we talk about it the more complicated it gets. I have shortened it. Let me make a couple of brief comments about where we are today in relationship to Iran and some of the other countries in the Middle East, and a solution to which everyone can agree to the problem that is there.

First of all, 70 percent of Iran's revenues come from their export of oil. What we have done successfully is had some modest means of reducing that, so we have actually cut their amount of exports in half over the last 4 or 5 years from 2.5 million barrels of oil a day to 1.25 million barrels of oil a day. That amounts to 70 percent of the resources, the revenue that Iran has.

What do they do with their revenue? First of all, we recognize something that people do not like to talk about; that is, our own intelligence says, and has said since 2007, by 2015 Iran will have a weapon and the delivery system for that weapon.

Our concern, of course, is that one of the things that happened in Barack Obama's first budget 4 years ago was, in addition to other things regarding the military, they did away with the ground-based interceptor in Poland which was designed specifically to take care of a missile coming from the east and, of course, what we had there was the threat from Iran. That is a threat.

The second thing they have, besides their nuclear buildup, is they are helping all the terrorist operations throughout the Middle East. We know they are very significant in assisting Asad in his barbaric slaughter of over 70,000 of the Syrian people. They are able to do this because Iran earns $3 billion a month in oil revenue, 70 percent of their revenue. If Iran didn't have access to this money, its ability to influence the region would be either stopped or significantly curtailed. In other words, Iran cannot pose this threat without their oil revenues.

U.S. production is now 7 million barrels a day, which is 40 percent higher—put the chart up, please—40 percent higher than in 2008. When we look at the map, we can see back in the old days the oil belt was the western part of the United States. Look at it now. It has all changed. We have the Marcellus up there in Pennsylvania, which is now the second largest employer in Pennsylvania. It is scattered throughout.

The reason for this surge is because the use of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing has allowed us to reach reserves, reach production we otherwise could not do.

Here is the interesting thing: We have grown by 40 percent in our production, and all 100 percent of it is on State or private land. None of it is on Federal land. In fact, during this boom we are in the middle of right now that is so productive to the economy of most of the States, none of that came from the Federal Government. In fact, we had a reduction during this time in production from Federal lands.

The Institute for Energy Research recently issued a report stating that if we enacted policies that allowed aggressive development of all this off-limits land that is there right now, it would generate $14 trillion in economic activity, create 2.5 million jobs, and reduce the deficit by $2.7 billion. Most of all, we could become totally independent from having to import our energy from any other country.

This bill says if the President would, at his discretion—it would require the President to find some area where we can just increase our production from Federal lands 1.25 million barrels a day. That is just a small, minuscule part of all the production we could have. For example, in just this area, that would exceed 1.25 million barrels a day or this up here, in Alaska, or even offshore.

The Senator from Virginia is going to be speaking next. They have actually voted to go ahead and explore this off their shores. Any of these places would do that.

Why do we say 1.25 million barrels a day? That is what Iran exports. This is what would happen: If we were able to do that, that would be 1.25 million barrels a day that we in the United States would no longer have to import, which would open that up to those who are importing from Iran, and it would completely dry up 70 percent of their revenue. Of course, the rewards of that would be great for our country.

We are looking at one of these rare situations where everything is good, everything that would come from this is beneficial. We could dry up their revenues that they are using right now to enhance their nuclear capability and to perform all these atrocious acts in the Middle East. At the same time, we would be able to lessen our dependence and provide all of the benefits that come from the use of this.

Eventually, we would like to be at a situation where we can do not just 1.25 million barrels a day but maybe 10 times that and become totally independent. In the meantime, we are only talking about one very small amount that we would be telling the President of the United States he is going to have to allow us to explore so we can stop Iran from doing the things they are doing today.

I thank those who have allowed me to have a little bit of time today, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Virginia.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma and wish him good travels.

I rise briefly today to point out one more time some of the ramifications of the policy I have repeatedly called stupidity on steroids, which is our sequestration policy. Word came out earlier this week from the Department of Defense that the Secretary, to meet his sequestration numbers, is going to have to furlough teachers in Department of Defense schools for 5 days and education support personnel for 11 days.

Many of us on the floor of the Senate stand and praise our men and women who serve in the military, who defend our freedoms. I cannot think of anything that is more of an antithesis to those words we say, that we would praise their service, if we say: Yes, you go off and defend our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan; meanwhile, your families and your children cannot go to school.

What makes this particularly difficult to stomach at this point is just today, Blue Star Families—one of our Nation's best veterans organizations, veterans support group organizations—came out and said in a list of priorities for military families, No. 1, the impact of deployments, repeated deployments on military families and particularly children; and, No. 2, military children education.

In my State and many other States, military families, particularly on base, have a military DOD school. Those schools provide a valuable service to those military families oftentimes who have their parents deployed. In my mind, how can we stand on the floor of this Senate and commend those men and women who serve and at the same

time say we support that service: We want to support you at home, but not enough to not have your kids have to miss 5 days of school because their teachers are furloughed or providers of other support services for educational personnel are furloughed for 11 days.

I am going to write Secretary Hagel, and I ask that all of my colleagues join with me in this matter in urging that the furloughs of these educators who educate the children of our military families be exempted from the process of sequestration.

While it begs the large question that the Nation confronts a $16 trillion debt, I think most of us in this Chamber know that the only way we are going to get to a solution is if those of us on this side of the aisle find a way to make smart and sensible reforms to our entitlement programs. Our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle are going to have to work with us to find ways to generate additional revenues; otherwise, we are going to keep coming back to the kinds of cuts we have seen in sequestration and in domestic discretionary.

We are on a current path that would take domestic discretionary spending from 16 percent of our Federal spending down to 4 percent. As a business investor, I would never invest in a business that spent less than 5 percent of its resources on its workforce and infrastructure.

So today I rise on the issue of making sure we actually honor those military families of whom we speak so often and make sure their kids get to go to school next year and don't have to lose valuable educational time because their teachers are furloughed. I hope my colleagues will join me on the letter to Secretary Hagel.

With that, I yield the floor, and I thank the Senator from Texas for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

OBAMACARE

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we have been informed that the Secretary of Health and Human Services has become a private fundraiser to raise funds from the very industry she regulates in order to implement ObamaCare. This raises all sorts of troubling concerns. There is an appearance of impropriety and a conflict of interest. There is an appearance that there is basically a shakedown going on—extracting money from companies she regulates in order to implement the President's health care law. This is certainly unethical—representing a conflict of interest—and possibly illegal. However, it has provided us a useful reminder about ObamaCare: that it represents one of the worst examples of crony capitalism that exist today. Unfortunately, that is true of a number of the administration's policies, but let me just explain what I mean.

When the private enterprise and the government become so intertwined as to become mutually dependent, usually what that means is the people who can hire the most lobbyists, the best lawyers, and others, compete unfairly for government benefits.

The concern is that since Secretary Sebelius is going to be the one who doles out grants and other benefits under ObamaCare, there is the all-too-human temptation to favor those who have gotten you out of a crack and done you a favor.

Let's review how ObamaCare is supposed to work in the first place. The Federal Government is supposed to come up with its own definition of health insurance. What we own right now may not be good enough for the government and its standard for health insurance. It is demanding that private businesses offer their employees this Washington-approved insurance or they get penalized.

It is also demanding that some Americans—many Americans—pay for coverage they don't want, don't need, and may not be able to afford. The best example of that is young adults—sometimes called the young and invincible—who may not think they need comprehensive health care insurance. They may think, well, perhaps I need more of a catastrophic policy or something else that will take care of me if things really turn bad. As a result of ObamaCare, these young people will be forced to buy coverage they don't need. Many of them don't want it and can't afford it.

They will literally see their insurance premiums skyrocket because of a phenomenon known as age-banding. Age-banding is where older Americans cannot be charged more than three times what younger people can be charged. We all know that as we age, we utilize more health care services. Here again, younger Americans are being asked to subsidize their elders in ObamaCare.

One way to look at it is the Obama administration has decided that the purchase of an expensive government-approved product sold by certain private companies is a condition of American citizenship. For those who are American citizens and live here, they have to buy it. If they don't, they pay the penalty. That is one example of crony capitalism.

Private companies are turning into de facto public utilities, and Americans are forced to buy their products but only those products approved by the regulators here in Washington. It is the ultimate marriage of big business and big government, and it is bad for the American taxpayer.

Now Secretary Sebelius has gone a step further. She is using her leverage and power as a regulator over private companies to force them to fund ObamaCare. We all see what is going on. Secretary Sebelius is making the health care industry an offer they cannot refuse. After all, her agency regulates those companies and has enormous influence over their business operations.

Indeed, ObamaCare has expanded Health and Human Services' regulatory power so much, we could say it essentially amounts to a government takeover of one-sixth of the national economy. Anytime there is a dramatic increase in Federal regulation of bureaucratic authority, there will also be a dramatic increase in crony capitalism.

Health and Human Services granted a series of waivers from ObamaCare's annual limit requirements, which fostered the impression that certain companies, labor unions, and other institutions were getting preferential treatment. Why not treat all Americans the same rather than have the government pick winners and losers, with the temptation to pick their friends and political supporters and give them special favors?

We saw this also in the government-run bailout of the Chrysler Corporation when the company's secured bondholders received less for their loans than the United Auto Workers pension fund.

For that matter, we also saw it in the notorious Solyndra project. President Obama's entire green agenda energy policy is based on the idea that the Federal Government should be playing venture capitalist with taxpayer dollars. We all know that when Solyndra went bankrupt, the administration favored private lenders over taxpayers, which was a violation of the law.

But there are many other private companies that have received taxpayer funding for political or ideological reasons, and that is why we say that crony capitalism undermines public trust in government because not everybody is treated the same. The government—those in power—picks winners and losers, political favorites, friends, and family.

I have one final point. We learned about the Sebelius shakedown on the same day we learned that the IRS has been deliberately targeting and harassing some organizations based on their political views.

As we all know, the IRS has a very important and key role in administering some of the biggest parts of ObamaCare and thus will be collecting massive amounts of new information about individual Americans. That was always a bad idea, but now, after we have learned about the abuses at the IRS, it sounds even more dangerous than ever. After what we have learned so far, how can Americans feel confident that the IRS won't abuse these new powers after having abused its current powers? Why should the American people believe what they have been told when they have been lied to time and time again about the IRS's activities?

Back in March 2012, the former IRS Commissioner categorically denied that his agency was targeting certain political organizations. Now we know that he was not only wrong, we also know they intentionally lied. We also know that senior IRS officials—many

who still have their jobs—learned of these abuses 2 years ago and never corrected the record.

In short, if we ever needed another reason to get rid of ObamaCare and replace it with market-driven, patient-centered reform, the IRS has provided us with one.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I remember—and I am sure the Presiding Officer does too—an early morning in March when we completed our budget deliberations. That was a couple of months ago. I remember the outcry about the Senate not following regular order in passing a budget. On that March morning, we followed regular order. We passed a budget. We took up lots of amendments. We spent hours on debate. We voted on many amendments, and the Senate worked its will. Of course, the House has also worked its will. It passed a budget that is different from the Senate budget.

The next step in regular order is for the House and Senate to meet in what is called a conference to work out the differences between the House and the Senate so we can then have a budget for the country. That is how the regular process works.

I know for the last couple of years we have had budgets. We have had budgets because of grand bargains that have been agreed to on debt extensions and things such as that, but there is now a cry to follow regular order. That is what we should do: Follow regular order. So the next step is to go into a conference.

I must tell my colleagues, I don't quite understand why the Republican leader is objecting to going to conference. He is trying to say, We will go to conference if the Senate agrees with the House. No, we don't go to conference because we agree with one body; we go to conference to work out our differences. So I am extremely disappointed that those who are yelling the loudest about following regular order are now preventing us from using regular order.

We need to get to conference, and one of the reasons is so we can get rid of sequestration. Sequestration means across-the-board mindless cuts. It treats every priority in government the same. That is mindless. That is not what we should be doing. It is having a major impact on the mission of many agencies in this country. They can't do what the public wants them to do because they don't have the budget support to do it. For an agency that is affected by sequestration, it amounts to almost 10 percent of their budget, because they have to cram in savings over a short number of months. Also, it only affects some agencies, not all. Not all of the programs are affected by sequestration. But those discretionary programs that are affected are across the board, without any discretion.

If the Presiding Officer ran into a tough economic time or someone we represent does and they lose some income, they look at their family budget. They may have money put aside for rent or mortgage payments, maybe some money put aside for a food budget for their family, and maybe there is some money put aside to go to an Orioles-Red Sox game.

They are going to have to make some tough choices, but they are going to make choices based upon what is most important to their family. They certainly are going to pay their rent payment or their mortgage payment to keep the roof over their family home.

So that is what we should be doing. We have to make decisions, and we cannot do these across-the-board cuts. It is hurting agencies. These are cuts on top of cuts on top of cuts.

Let me mention one group that will be particularly affected by that, and that is our Federal workforce. These are the people who are at NIH, the talented scientists doing the research that is keeping us healthy. They are finding the answers to the dread diseases in our society. These are people who are standing guard on our border, keeping us safe. These are people who do food inspections to make sure we have a healthy food supply. These are people who help our seniors, to make sure they get the checks they need for their dignity in their older years. These are people who are working for the public.

What have we done to them? Three straight years of freezes, no increase in their salaries. We are now looking at what we are going to do with their benefit structure. On top of that, we have freezes on the number of employees; therefore, they are being asked to do more with less. And now we have furloughs, which is basically cuts—cuts in their salary.

It is not the Federal payroll that causes the deficits we have today. As the Presiding Officer and I know, it is the fact that we went to war in two countries, we cut taxes, we went through a recession. We have to answer the way of getting out of this problem in a balanced approach. We have already done the discretionary cuts to those agencies, and we are now affecting their ability to do their mission.

I want to mention some of the effects of sequestration on the citizens of Maryland, whom I have the opportunity to represent in the Senate.

Maryland will lose approximately $14.4 million in funding for primary and secondary education. Twelve thousand fewer students will be served and approximately 30 fewer schools will receive funding. In Maryland, we believe education is a top priority. That is how we compete. That is how we invest in our future. We invest in our children.

Maryland will lose approximately $10 million in funds for about 120 teachers, aides, and staff who help our children with disabilities.

Around 770 fewer low-income students in Maryland will receive aid to help them finance the cost of college, and around 440 fewer students will get work-study jobs that help them pay for college. These are programs that Democrats and Republicans have fought for over the years to make sure they are funded. Now, in Maryland, we are going to have to cut back.

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

The list goes on and on and on.

Maryland would lose about $3 million in environmental funding to ensure clean water and air quality, as well as prevent pollution from pesticides and hazardous waste. We have worked hard to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and provide a safe environment for our families. That is in jeopardy as a result of sequestration. In addition, Maryland could lose another $467,000 in grants for fish and wildlife protection.

In Maryland, there will be 46,000—tens of thousands—of civilians in the Department of Defense who will be furloughed, reducing gross payroll by around $353.7 million in total in our State.

Maryland will lose about $317,000 in justice assistance grants. These grants support law enforcement. We all talk about supporting law enforcement. These grants also support prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, and crime victim and witness initiatives.

Maryland will lose about $66,000 in funding for job search assistance, referral, and placement, meaning around 9,270 fewer people will get the help and skills they need to find employment.

Madam President, 2,050 fewer children in Maryland will receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and hepatitis B.

Maryland will lose approximately $551,000 in funds to help upgrade its ability to respond to public health threats, including infectious diseases, natural disasters, and biological, chemical, nuclear, and radiological events.

Maryland will lose about $1.6 million in grants to help prevent and treat substance abuse, resulting in around 2,500 fewer admissions to substance abuse programs.

Maryland health departments will lose about $595,000, resulting in around 14,900 fewer HIV tests.

Maryland could lose up to $124,000 in funds that provide services to victims of domestic violence.

My point is these are cuts that I do not think the public wants us to do. In Congress, each of us says: Oh, we did not mean that. Well, it is time for us to act. Democrats and Republicans, coming together in a bipartisan way, compromise. That is what our Founding Fathers envisioned we would do—working together—so we have a balanced approach.

Just look at compulsory spending, mandatory spending. We can organize our health care delivery system in a more cost-effective way. Dealing with individuals with high-cost interventions—we can save money there—reduce hospital readmission rates. There are ways we can bring down costs in a sensible way. Our troops are coming home from Afghanistan. We can reduce our military spending. We can certainly look at the $1.2 trillion we spend every year through the Tax Code—that is on a yearly basis—tax expenditures. We can certainly close some of those loopholes and get the badly needed revenues so we can deal with our budget in a balanced, responsible way.

Let's work together in a bipartisan fashion, Democrats and Republicans.

One more thing it will do: Solving problems gives predictability, and people will know what the rules are. They will know what our budget is, they will know what our Tax Code is, and that unleashes our economy and creates jobs, which helps the economy and helps balance our budget.

I urge my colleagues, let's take the next step. The next step is to go to conference on the budget. Let's work out the differences between the House and the Senate. Let's do what we are supposed to do in regular order.

I urge my Republican colleagues to remove their objections, and let's get to a conference on the budget as soon as possible.

With that, I see my distinguished friend from Utah who is on the floor. I always learn a lot when he speaks, so I am going to yield the floor for my colleague from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I thank my dear friend and colleague from Maryland. He is a wonderful person and a very good Senator. I enjoy him on the Senate Finance Committee. He is one of the brighter people on that committee, among a whole bunch of very bright people.

THE IRS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to speak on a matter that deserves the attention of everyone in this Chamber.

By now we all know about what is going on at the Internal Revenue Service. We have seen the report from the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, TIGTA, indicating that between 2010 and 2012 the IRS was targeting conservative groups applying for tax-exempt status for increased levels of scrutiny.

We have read the accounts of conservative groups that were asked improper questions about their donors while some of their applications were delayed for more than 3 years, even as applications for groups friendly to the President and liberal causes were promptly approved.

We have heard the apologies from senior IRS officials and the condemnations from the White House itself. While we know for a certainty that this unacceptable behavior was going on at the IRS, there is still much more we do not know.

For example, we still do not know why the targeting began or why only conservative groups were targeted by the IRS examiners.

We do not know the full extent to which senior officials at the IRS and Department of Treasury became aware of these practices, when they found out, and what they did or did not do to put a stop to these practices.

Perhaps most importantly, we do not know why, when Members of Congress asked questions about these issues last year, and after senior officials certainly knew of the problem—or problems—we were led to believe that no groups were being targeted.

Indeed, neither Congress nor the American people learned anything about these activities from the responsible officials until they were trapped and their hands were forced.

There are not words to describe what has gone on here. Some of us have tried. Words such as ''unconscionable,'' ''unbelievable,'' and ''Nixonian'' have been thrown around, rightfully, in my opinion.

But regardless of the words we use to describe it, this is easily the most shocking and outrageous turn of events we have seen in Washington in some time—and that is saying something.

One thing I am glad to see is that these actions have, for the most part, been condemned by Members of both parties. In the end, I hope both Republicans and Democrats will work together to address these issues.

I have said from the outset that it does not matter if a tax-exempt group is liberal, conservative, or moderate. It is an outrage that the IRS would single out any group based on its political beliefs. On that point there is bipartisan agreement in Congress and throughout the country.

On the Senate Finance Committee, Chairman BAUCUS and I are undertaking a bipartisan investigation into this matter to find out exactly what happened and make sure this type of thing never happens again.

I am happy to be working with Chairman BAUCUS on this effort, and I want to assure my colleagues that we are going to get to the bottom of this. We are going to find out just how far down the rabbit hole the IRS went in singling out groups based on their political beliefs. We are going to find out why the IRS ignored a bedrock rule of tax administration: Treat similarly situated taxpayers similarly—always. We are going to find out exactly who was responsible, and we are going to hold them accountable for their actions.

The IRS needs to come clean about what went on here. Chairman BAUCUS and I intend to make sure they do.

Sadly, while the targeting of conservative groups in the review process has gotten most of the attention thus far, there are other issues involving the IRS that are every bit as disconcerting.

There are news reports indicating that in 2012, the same IRS office improperly disclosed confidential information about certain conservative groups to media organizations.

Last November, the journalist group ProPublica requested 501(c)(4) applications for 67 different nonprofits. Less than 2 weeks later, the IRS produced application documents submitted by 31 of the organizations. Included in this group of documents were the applications from nine conservative organizations that were still under consideration by the IRS. ProPublica subsequently posted six of those applications in redacted form on the Internet and published articles analyzing the information they obtained.

This is disturbing for at least three reasons. First and foremost, under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, the IRS is prohibited from disclosing applications for tax-exempt status that are still under review. While the IRS is authorized, under section 6104, to release application materials of groups that have already been granted tax-exempt status, pending applications are required by law to remain confidential. This appears to be a pretty cut-and-dried violation of the Internal Revenue Code, meaning that civil and criminal penalties may apply.

Second, the IRS responded to ProPublica's request in just 13 days. That seems extraordinarily swift, and it raises the question of how long the IRS normally takes to respond to such document requests. I do not want to prejudge anything, but I suspect it usually takes longer than 13 days to hear back from the IRS. It certainly takes longer than that for the IRS to respond to requests from Congress.

Finally, this revelation comes not too long after other allegations that the IRS disclosed confidential information submitted by conservative nonprofits.

In the spring of 2012, activist groups and media outlets began posting confidential donor information regarding the National Organization for Marriage, a nonprofit 501(c)(4) organization, on the Internet. Such information is also required by law to be kept confidential.

Although the IRS is authorized to release yearly forms filed by tax-exempt organizations, the law prohibits donor information from being disclosed, and that is whether it is a conservative, moderate, or liberal organization. Yet National Organization for Marriage's documents that found their way online

in the middle of a Presidential election appeared to have come from the IRS. This was suspicious, to say the least.

That is why, in May of 2012, I sent a letter to the IRS Commissioner requesting an investigation into whether the IRS publicly disclosed confidential donor information about the National Organization for Marriage. To date, I have not received a substantive response.

So in addition to the revelations that the IRS was improperly targeting conservative groups for scrutiny of their 501(c)(4) applications, we have these unanswered questions about the possible illegal disclosure of confidential information to media outlets and other organizations. This is another matter that needs to be resolved in order to restore the credibility of the IRS as a government agency.

That is why I, along with all the Republican members of the Senate Finance Committee, have submitted a letter to the Treasury Inspector General asking that he look into these issues.

Among other things, our letter requests that TIGTA—that is the Inspector General's organization—investigate to determine which employees at the IRS were responsible for improperly disclosing confidential documents to ProPublica and whether any actions have been taken against them.

In addition, this letter asks for an investigation into whether the IRS followed its usual Freedom of Information Act procedures in its prompt response to ProPublica's document request.

Our letter asks TIGTA to determine whether the IRS ever undertook an investigation to determine if the agency was responsible for leaking the National Organization for Marriage's donor information.

The American people have a right to expect government agencies to perform their functions in a neutral, unbiased manner. When any agency breaks that trust, it undermines the credibility of the entire government.

These are not matters that can simply be wished away by public apologies and condemnations.

They cannot be covered up by a handful of resignations, and they are not covered up by an apology. I hope the administration knows this. The only way to fully address these issues and to fully restore the credibility of the IRS is to have full accounting of the facts. In one way or another, we are going to learn all we can about the facts and what went on there. I hope we can do so with the full and complete cooperation of the administration.

Look, the IRS is the most powerful agency in government. Our liberties depend upon an impartial IRS. We know many of the employees of the IRS are represented by one of the toughest unions in this country. We can presume from that most of them are not Republicans. Be that as it may, the Democrats I know whom I honor and respect are those who keep their word, live within constraints, follow the rules, do what is right, and fight hard for their principles.

But the IRS is not a place where we should be doing anything but fighting hard for the principles of fair treatment of all U.S. citizens. I would be decrying this if the IRS was doing this to liberal organizations. We do not expect it to ever do that, but I would surely be decrying it. All I can say is that the very essence of liberty is involved with what the IRS does or is doing. If we cannot rely on the most powerful agency in government to treat people fairly, then this country is in much greater trouble than many of us think it is. We know we are in trouble. We know we are living beyond our means. We know we are not doing what is right in this country. We know Congress could do a much better job than it is doing. That includes both Democrats and Republicans. It is inexcusable for an agency with the power the IRS has to be involved in these types of shenanigans. It is chilling, absolutely chilling to anybody who thinks about it, that this most powerful agency can basically come down on anybody for almost any reason if it is not honest.

We have to restore the trust and the honesty of the IRS. We have to be able to rely on the IRS being fair, impartial, and in doing what is right. I think I speak for my colleagues on the Democratic side. Many of them are as outraged as I am about what went on here. It is not right. I think the American people fully understand that.

I appreciate those who are honest. I appreciate those who do abide by their ethical constraints. I appreciate those who are not political at the IRS. There are many good people working there. I do not want them to be besmirched by the few. There might be a little bit more than a few people who do not honor the ethical constraints that the IRS simply has to live up to. Let's hope neither side will ever again use the IRS for political purposes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I wanted to come to the floor to follow up on the news that we have had on the IRS situation, which I know is concerning to all Americans, Democrats, Republicans, everyone. The power of government is real and the power of the IRS is very real. So anything involving an abuse of power in the IRS is going to concern Americans irrespective of their political leanings.

Before I do, I just wish to comment on something that happened a few moments ago at a press conference at the White House. I have tremendous respect for the Office of the Presidency and for anyone who would hold themselves out to hold the office. So I say this with the highest respect.

I think the President today in his press conference potentially made a mistake in an answer he gave. I would encourage the White House to clear it up as soon as possible. He was asked specifically if he or anyone in the White House knew about what was going on at the IRS before April 22 of this year.

The President's answer was that he did not know about the inspector general's report until he read about it in the press. So I would submit to you he did not answer that question. I am not implying he did know about it. I am just encouraging the White House and those there to clear this up as soon as possible.

It is kind of reminiscent of when Attorney General Holder would not answer Senator PAUL's question about whether American citizens could be targeted in the homeland with a drone. That led—we all remember what it led to. It is a very simple and straightforward question. I would encourage the White House and the President to echo what Jay Carney said just a couple days ago, which is no one in the White House knew anything about it. I think it is important for the President to answer that clearly; again, not because I am implying he did know, because I think if they leave that out there, it creates questions that should not be created. I hope they will do that. It is important.

I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate and the American people a compilation of stories that have emerged since the initial question emerged. They are very troubling. They extend, quite frankly, beyond the IRS, but I will begin with the IRS. Here is a report from the Washington Examiner. The headline reads: ''IRS denied tax-exempt status to pro-lifers on behalf of Planned Parenthood.''

Let me read what it says inside. It says: ''In one case, the IRS withheld approval of an application for tax exempt status for Coalition for Life of Iowa.''

In a phone call that this reporter reported he had with one of the leaders—I am sorry. One of the leaders claimed that in a phone call he had with the IRS on June 6 of 2009, ''the IRS agent 'Ms. Richards' told the group to send a letter to the IRS with the entire board's signatures stating that, under perjury of the law, they do not picket/protest or organize groups to picket or protest outside of Planned Parenthood.''

They said that ''once the IRS received this letter, this application would be approved.'' That is troubling if true. That is one report that is in the news.

Here is another one. This one comes from a very respected individual in the United States. His name is Franklin Graham. He is the son of the Reverend Billy Graham. He claims the Billy Graham Evangelical Association and the family's international humanitarian organization Samaritan's Purse, the

IRS notified them in September that it was conducting a ''review'' of their activities for tax year 2010.

He goes on to say, by the way, that this review happened after Mr. Graham's organization published newspaper ads in North Carolina backing a State constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage. That is in the news. That was from Politico. Again, I am just reporting what different outlets are reporting.

This is another report that has been out there. I think I alluded to this yesterday in my speech. This talks about how the same IRS office that deliberately targeted conservative groups applying for tax-exempt status in the runup to the 2012 election released nine pending confidential applications of conservative groups to ProPublica late last year. I think this is actually ProPublica admitting that is where they got the information.

This is in response to a request for the applications for 67 different nonprofits last November. So this is an admission, basically, from ProPublica, which is in this not-for-profit investigative reporting group. They are admitting the source of these leaked documents was the IRS office in Cincinnati, the leaked documents of nine conservative groups.

So now it is no longer audits, it is cooperating with investigative journalists by provided them with information which is illegal to provide them, confidential tax information. That is what this report says from the organization that got the leak.

This is FOX News Latino. It reports that the former President of San Antonio tea party said they received a questionnaire with over 50 questions, including inquiries into whom the group met with, where their meetings were held, who was in attendance, the subjects of internal e-mails, et cetera.

This is in line with some of the other stories we have been hearing around the country. This was actually posted online. These are letters going back and forth between the Richmond tea party and the IRS. These are the actual online letters we pulled, with some information redacted for privacy.

Some of the questions they were asked: Provide the following information for all events and programs you have conducted and participated in from October 22 to now.

They wanted copies of handouts provided to the audience. They wanted to know if there were any speeches or forums conducted in the event or program, provide detailed contents of the speeches or forums, the names of the speakers and panels, their credentials, the names of persons from your organization and the amount of time they spent on the event or the program. Indicate the percentage of time and resources you spent on all of the events and programs in relation to your activity.

It goes on and on. This is page after page of information being asked of a citizen group by the IRS. Anyone who has gotten a letter from the IRS understands it is never a pleasant circumstance, unless there is a refund check in that envelope. You go to the mailbox, open it, it says IRS, and no one likes that.

Just imagine this group of everyday citizens. These are not professional political activists. They do not have entire law firms at their disposal. These are just everyday Americans who are speaking out about the principles of limited government and free enterprise. By the way, if they were speaking out in favor of big government, they still have the same right not to be harassed by the IRS.

So I just want to bring the real face of this to bear, because this is not just a problem with an abuse of power in the IRS. Think about the impact this has had on the lives of everyday Americans who one day decided: I want to get involved in politics. I want to speak out. I want to say something. They get hit with a letter such as this, this kind of questionnaire, which quite frankly what happens with a lot of these people is they decide I am not going to do it. I am not going to get involved. I do not have the time for this. I do not need the hassle. Maybe that was the intent.

So we went over that for a moment. Here is something that is very troubling. This is from USA Today. The USA Today headline: ''IRS approved liberal groups while Tea Party in limbo.'' Some of those groups were approved in as little as 9 months. Bus for Progress in New Jersey, a not-for-profit that uses red, white, and blue buses to drive progressive change, Missourians Organizing for Reform and Empowerment, they got their tax-exempt status just 9 months after a pretty simple and straightforward process.

Progress Florida in my own home State, similar experience. Again, this is USA Today. I think this was their cover story yesterday, where it described the difference in how tea party groups are treated, in comparison, that had words in their title such as ''progress'' or ''progressive.''

Here is one more that actually shows this kind of behavior extends beyond the Internal Revenue Service. This is from the Competitive Enterprise Institute, May 14. It talks about how public records produced by EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, in response to a lawsuit filed by CEI under the Freedom of Information Act, show a pattern of making it far more difficult for limited government groups, in particular those that argue for more freedom and less EPA, how it makes it harder for them to get access to public records.

For example, green groups such as the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, the Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, Earth Justice, they had their fees waived in 75 out of 82 cases.

Meanwhile, the EPA effectively or expressly denied CEI's request for fee waivers in 14 of its 15 requests—14 of its 15 requests. So that is 93 percent of the time versus basically the alternative, which is what they did to these other groups. Again, all a chain in a pattern of behavior that I think is not anything any of us ever want to see. So far I have not seen it, and I do not think we are going to, quite frankly. I suspect we will not see a single Member of Congress come to the floor of either Chamber and say this is acceptable behavior.

I wish to tie in the loop, though, because this is not just about these agencies run amok. This is not just about a handful of people in the IRS's Cincinnati office or somewhere else doing something wrong. This is much deeper than that.

I talked about it yesterday, I will repeat it today; that is, the sense that this administration has pursued a real culture of intimidation in the political process, including the way it ran its campaign. But I wish to take it one step further. What this should remind us of is the danger of government power. Let me stop there and remind everyone. We need government. No one here—I do not know any anarchists who serve in the U.S. Government, for the most part. All of us believe government has an important role to play in our country and the national defense. By and large, we believe there needs to be a safety net to help those who cannot help themselves, not as a way of life but to help those who have fallen to stand and try again.

We think the government plays an important role in our laws. One of the things that attracts people to the United States—for example, to do business here—is that we have a legal system where property rights are going to be respected. So if one says they own a piece of property, it belongs to them. No one would necessarily dispute that. If they do, they have to go to court. There are countries in the world where the owner of the property is whoever has the bigger guns or whoever has the best connection to government. We take that for granted sometimes.

So there is a role for government to play. It is a very important role. But the problem is that our Framers, the Founders of this Nation, had a deep suspicion of government no matter who was running the government. They rejected this notion that if we get very good people in government, we will have very good government.

Government has a role to play. But when government's powers extend beyond its natural limits or its important limits, we start to have problems such as these emerge. I bring this to the floor because this is exactly what we have been debating in so many instances, is expanding the natural power of government beyond where it should be and allowing it to have jurisdiction and influence over areas of our life, where no matter who is in charge, Republican or Democrat, we may not like the way it turns out.

We talked about the IRS for a moment. The IRS is going to be on the frontlines of enforcing the health care law. This is the same agency of government that has for the most part over the last few years, now by admission of everyone involved, been abusing power—at least some of their employees have. I don't want to besmirch the entire agency. As Senator HATCH was saying a few minutes ago, there are very good people at work all throughout government who would never participate in this sort of behavior.

My point is that this is the agency that was targeting Americans because they were organizing themselves as conservatives. This is now the agency that is going to be empowered with new powers it has never had before—the power to force every American to either buy health insurance or pay a fine, buy health insurance or pay a tax.

In the weeks to come, I am going to be outlining examples of why giving government more power than it should have creates situations like this—the potential for situations like this to occur. There was enormous wisdom in limiting the power of the Federal Government that our Framers had, enormous wisdom in that. That is why they specifically said: If this Constitution doesn't give the Federal Government this power, it doesn't have it. We sometimes forget that lesson from two centuries later, but we shouldn't. That is an important limit.

I think we can have an honest debate about what role government should be playing in our lives and in our economy. There could be an honest debate about that because there is a role for government to play. There is an important role for government to play in our country. It can go too far, whether it is in the realm of civil liberties or economic liberties. That is what I think the debate should be focused on in the weeks to come, in addition to getting to the bottom of what has happened here, understanding clearly what has happened here.

I am involved in another endeavor: immigration reform. One of the biggest impediments to immigration reform that I am facing—that we are facing—is this distrust of the Federal Government. It is the belief that they are not going to enforce the law. No matter what we pass or what we put in place, they are not going to do it. We tried this 20 or 30 years ago, and they didn't do it. That is unfortunate. I hope we can overcome that. I believe we can because the truth is that the vast majority of Americans—the vast majority of Republicans, Democrats, Independents—are willing to deal with the fact that we have 11 million people living in this country illegally so long as we can ensure that this problem never happens again in the future. They are willing to deal with that. We have to win their confidence that, in fact, the measures we are going to take are going to prevent that from happening in the future. We are struggling because people have such a distrust of the government's willingness or ability to enforce the law. You see it, even in that issue, rear its head.

I think it is important to remind ourselves that even if government is run by the best people with the best of intentions, it has a tendency to do these sorts of things. You see that at every level but particularly at the Federal level where there are such enormous powers.

Anytime we come here and debate giving government a new power, a new agency, a new mandate, or a new jurisdiction, we should be cognizant of the history of government power. We should be cognizant of what it has meant throughout human history. We should remember why the Framers limited that power to begin with—because they understood that power could be abused.

In the weeks to come, I know that I, along with all my colleagues, want to get to the bottom of this. We want to understand from the IRS' perspective who was involved in doing this, why this happened, and, more importantly, what we can do now to make sure this never, ever happens again, what we can do now to ensure that not just in the IRS but across the government that a situation like this never happens again so that no matter what your political persuasion may be, no American ever feels afraid to speak out politically because they may wind up the target of governmental action.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INEQUALITY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the English translation of remarks made this morning by Pope Francis, who addressed the new nonresident ambassadors to the Holy See.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRANSLATION OF POPE FRANCIS' ADDRESS FOR THE NEW NON-RESIDENT AMBASSADORS TO THE HOLY SEE: KYRGYZSTAN, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, LUXEMBOURG AND BOTSWANA (16 MAY 2013)

Your Excellencies,

I am pleased to receive you for the presentation of the Letters accrediting you as Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Holy See on the part of your respective countries: Kytgyzstan, Antigua and Barbuda, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and Botswana. The gracious words which you have addressed to me, for which I thank you heartily, have testified that the Heads of State of your countries are concerned to develop relations of respect and cooperation with the Holy See. I would ask you kindly to convey to them my sentiments of gratitude and esteem, together with the assurance of my prayers for them and their fellow citizens.

Ladies and Gentlemen, our human family is presently experiencing something of a turning point in its own history, if we consider the advances made in various areas. We can only praise the positive achievements which contribute to the authentic welfare of mankind, in fields such as those of health, education and communications. At the same time, we must also acknowledge that the majority of the men and women of our time continue to live daily in situations of insecurity, with dire consequences. Certain pathologies are increasing, with their psychological consequences; fear and desperation grip the hearts of many people, even in the so-called rich countries; the joy of life is diminishing; indecency and violence are on the rise; poverty is becoming more and more evident. People have to struggle to live and, frequently, to live in an undignified way. One cause of this situation, in my opinion, is in our relationship with money, and our acceptance of its power over ourselves and our society. Consequently the financial crisis which we are experiencing makes us forget that its ultimate origin is to be found in a profound human crisis. In the denial of the primacy of human beings! We have created new idols. The worship of the golden calf of old (cf. Ex 32:15–34) has found a new and heartless image in the cult of money and the dictatorship of an economy which is faceless and lacking any truly humane goal.

The worldwide financial and economic crisis seems to highlight their distortions and above all the gravely deficient human perspective, which reduces man to one of his needs alone, namely, consumption. Worse yet, human beings themselves are nowadays considered as consumer goods which can be used and thrown away. We have begun a throw away culture. This tendency is seen on the level of individuals and whole societies; and it is being promoted! In circumstances like these, solidarity, which is the treasure of the poor, is often considered counterproductive, opposed to the logic of finance and the economy. While the income of a minority is increasing exponentially, that of the majority is crumbling. This imbalance results from ideologies which uphold the absolute autonomy of markets and financial speculation, and thus deny the right of control to States, which are themselves charged with providing for the common good. A new, invisible and at times virtual, tyranny is established, one which unilaterally and irremediably imposes its own laws and rules. Moreover, indebtedness and credit distance countries from their real economy and citizens from their real buying power. Added to this, as if it were needed, is widespread corruption and selfish fiscal evasion which have taken on worldwide dimensions. The will to power and of possession has become limitless.

Concealed behind this attitude is a rejection of ethics, a rejection of God. Ethics, like solidarity, is a nuisance! It is regarded as counterproductive: as something too human, because it relativizes money and power; as a threat, because it rejects manipulation and subjection of people: because ethics leads to God, who is situated outside the categories of the market. These financiers, economists and politicians consider God to be unmanageable, unmanageable even dangerous, because he calls man to his full realization and to independence from any kind of slavery. Ethics—naturally, not the ethics of ideology—makes it possible, in my view, to create a balanced social order that is more humane. In this sense, I encourage the financial experts and the political leaders of your countries to consider the words of Saint

John Chrysostom: ''Not to share one's goods with the poor is to rob them and to deprive them of life. It is not our goods that we possess, but theirs'' (Homily on Lazarus, 1:6–PG 48, 992D),

Dear Ambassadors, there is a need for financial reform along ethical lines that would produce in its turn an economic reform to benefit everyone. This would nevertheless require a courageous change of attitude on the part of political leaders. I urge them to face this challenge with determination and farsightedness, taking account, naturally, of their particular situations. Money has to serve, not to rule! The Pope loves everyone, rich and poor alike, but the Pope has the duty, in Christ's name, to remind the rich to help the poor, to respect them, to promote them. The Pope appeals for disinterested solidarity and for a return to person-centred ethics in the world of finance and economics.

For her part, the Church always works for the integral development of every person, In this sense, she reiterates that the common good should not be simply an extra, simply a conceptual scheme of inferior quality tacked onto political programmes. The Church encourages those in power to be truly at the service of the common good of their peoples. She urges financial leaders to take account of ethics and solidarity. And why should they not turn to God to draw inspiration from his designs? in this way, a new political and economic mindset would arise that would help to transform the absolute dichotomy between the economic and social spheres into a healthy symbiosis.

Finally, through you, I greet with affection the Pastors and the faithful of the Catholic communities present in your countries. I urge them to continue their courageous and joyful witness of faith and fraternal love in accordance with Christ's teaching. Let them not be afraid to offer their contribution to the development of their countries, through initiatives and attitudes inspired by the Sacred Scriptures! And as you inaugurate your mission, I extend to you, dear Ambassadors, my very best wishes, assuring you of the assistance of the Roman Curia for the fulfilment of you duties. To this end, upon you and your families, and also upon your Embassy staff, I willingly invoke abundant divine blessings.

Mr. SANDERS. I don't usually comment much on religious matters, but I was very impressed by what the Pope had to say today. In his remarks Pope Francis called for a revamping of the global financial system, a system which he pointed out benefits the few, values money over human dignity, and continues to widen the gap between the rich and everybody else.

While acknowledging the advances modern society has made in health care, education, technology, and other areas, the Pope expressed his concern for the least amongst us. The Pope said:

We must also acknowledge that the majority of the men and women of our time continue to live daily in situations of insecurity, with dire consequences . . . fear and desperation grip the hearts of many people, even in the so-called rich countries; the joy of life is diminishing; indecency and violence are on the rise; poverty is becoming more and more evident. People have to struggle to live and, frequently, to live in an undignified way.

The Pope went on to say this in his rather brief remarks:

One cause of this situation . . . is in our relationship with money, and our acceptance of its power over ourselves and our society . . . The worship of the golden calf of old has found a new and heartless image in the cult of money and the dictatorship of an economy which is faceless and lacking any truly humane goal.

The Pope continued:

The worldwide financial and economic crisis seems to highlight their distortions and above all the gravely deficient human perspective, which reduces man to one of his needs alone, namely, consumption. Worse yet, human beings themselves are nowadays considered as consumer goods which can be used and thrown away. We have begun a throw away culture.

He also said:

Solidarity, which is the treasure of the poor, is often considered counterproductive, opposed to the logic of finance and the economy.

Further quoting the Pope, and I hope everybody listens to this:

While the income of a minority is increasing exponentially, that of the majority is crumbling.

Let me repeat that. This is what the Pope said today:

While the income of a minority is increasing exponentially, that of the majority is crumbling. This imbalance results from ideologies which uphold the absolute autonomy of markets and financial speculation, and thus deny the right of control to States, which are themselves charged with providing for the common good. A new, invisible and at times virtual, tyranny is established, one which unilaterally and irremediably imposes its own laws and rules. Moreover, indebtedness and credit distance countries from their real economy and citizens from their real buying power. Added to this, as if it were needed, is widespread corruption and selfish fiscal evasion, which have taken on worldwide dimensions. The will to power and of possession has become limitless.

This is from a speech Pope Francis made today. I think it is important that we listen to the Pope on this issue. Frankly, I have strong disagreements with the Catholic Church on issues of women's rights, issues of gay rights, and a number of other issues. On this issue of what is happening economically around the world—the power of financial markets; the growing gap between the very rich and everyone else; the need for government and for states around the world to step in and protect the dispossessed; the need to understand that money unto itself means nothing unless it is being used in a way that improves the lives of all people—that is a message coming from the Pope. It is a message worth thinking about and discussing.

THE IRS

Mr. SANDERS. In the Senate, I hear a lot of criticism of government, some of which is certainly justified. All of us, I would hope, are deeply concerned, embarrassed, and disagree with what the IRS did in terms of picking out one political persuasion in terms of tax-exempt status. That is clearly wrong, unacceptable, and must be dealt with.

Many of my friends attack government day after day when government is trying to do the right thing in protecting middle-class and working families. There are some in the Congress, for example, who believe that government programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid should be significantly cut or that maybe government shouldn't even be involved in those areas. They believe these programs are unconstitutional.

If you were to eliminate Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, what would happen to tens of millions of people who rely on Social Security for their retirement, especially at a time when many private pensions have been cut severely? If you make cuts or eliminate Medicare for the old or you undo the Medicare system we know and turn it into the system our friends in the House would like to have, what will happen to elderly people when they get sick and need health care and don't have the money in their own pockets to pay for that? I will tell you what will happen.

This year alone, it is estimated that approximately 45,000 Americans will die because they never made it to a doctor on time when they should have made it. If you make major cuts in Medicare or do away with the basic guarantees Medicare now provides, clearly the number of people who will die will simply increase.

If you are 67 years of age and are diagnosed with cancer and Medicare is not there for you and you don't have a family who has money, what will happen to you? Some of my Republican friends will say: Well, go to charity. Charity is not going to be there to provide health care for millions of people.

In terms of health care, what we must point out over and over again because many Americans don't understand it is that our Nation is the only Nation in the industrialized world that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right of citizenship.

Today, although we hope that will change in the very near future, 50 million people have no health insurance. Many others have large deductibles or copayments, which keep them from going to the doctor when they should.

We have invited the Ambassador from Denmark to join us in a town meeting in Vermont on Saturday. He will explain to us how in Denmark, among many other countries throughout the world, they can provide health care to people that is virtually free from out-of-pocket expenses and yet per capita end up spending substantially less than we do. He will explain to us why the cost of their prescription drugs is substantially lower than it is in the United States.

In terms of education, this is at a time when in my State the average college graduate in Vermont leaves school some $28,000 in debt—roughly the national average. This is at a time when hundreds of thousands of young people cannot afford to go to college, and we lose all of their intellectual capabilities and the genius they might provide

for our society. In Denmark, college education is virtually free, including graduate school and medical school.

At a time when in our country millions of people are overworked and underpaid; at a time when we work some of the longest hours of any people in the industrialized world, when people in Vermont are working not 40 hours a week but 50 hours a week, 60 hours a week; at a time when people are not working one job but two jobs, three jobs, trying to cobble together an income; at a time when some employers are hiring people and providing zero vacation time or maybe, if one is lucky, a week off, how does it happen that in countries such as Denmark people not only get 5 weeks' guaranteed paid vacation, but they get another 11 vacation days?

In this country, we talk a lot about family values. However, if you are a working-class woman having a baby, you will get some maybe. If you are working for a large enough employer, family medical leave may have an impact and you may get some time off to have the baby, but you can't stay home very long to take care of your newborn because you will not have any money coming in. Millions of folks have a baby and go right back to work, putting the child back in childcare when they would prefer otherwise. How does it happen in countries such as Denmark that women get 4 weeks off, fully paid before they give birth, and then months off afterwards to stay home with the baby, not to mention three-quarters payment from the government for childcare, while we so poorly manage that?

I think it is time we have a serious discussion about values, and that discussion has to include whether we feel good about the fact that in this country so few have so much and so many have so little.

Do we feel comfortable with the growing imbalance in terms of income and wealth such that the top 1 percent owns 38 percent of the wealth and the bottom 60 percent owns only 2.3 percent, and the gap between the billionaire class and everybody else is growing wider?

As the Pope asked: Are we comfortable with a financial system where the goal is not to invest in the productive economy but to make money for itself, such that the top six financial institutions in this country have assets equivalent to some 70 percent of the GDP of the United States—some $9 trillion—and enormous political power?

This IRS business people are talking about on the floor of the Senate is related to the absurd campaign finance system we have where big companies can secretly put hundreds of millions of dollars into the political process. Are we comfortable with a political system where people can make contributions in secret that end up in the political process and then end up on a 30-second ad on our TV—money coming from billionaires who don't have to disclose their contributions?

So when we talk about values, it is important to assess who we are as Americans and what we believe in. I believe most Americans believe we have to do a lot better job at focusing on the needs of the declining and disappearing middle class; that we have to create millions of jobs so our young people do not have outrageously high levels of unemployment and older people who lose their jobs have nothing to go back to; that we have to address the issue of high childhood poverty; and we have to, in fact, make sure government works for all of the people and not just the people on top.

I would just conclude by recommending to the Members and to the American people they examine the remarks made this morning by Pope Francis, which I think raise some very important issues. I think there is a lot to be learned from those remarks.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORKER PROTECTION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, 50 years ago, in August 1963, Martin Luther King wrote, ''Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.''

When a factory full of human beings collapses in Bangladesh, it matters in Bucyrus and Boardman and Bellefontaine. When the concrete ceiling of a shoe factory crumbles in Cambodia, it matters in Celina and Canton.

Earlier this month we observed Workers Memorial Day. We paused and remembered those Americans who had lost their lives on the job. We honor their memories by passing laws to help ensure no other child waits by the door for a mother or a father who will never return home from work.

Out of the ashes of the Triangle Shirt Waste Factory fire 100 years ago in New York City, we fought and won workplace safety reforms that have helped save countless lives decade after decade after decade in our country. Yet even though we have passed the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, even though we have a National Labor Relations Board, we still have a moral responsibility to be vocal about violations to worker safety wherever it happens—whether it happens in Cleveland, in Honolulu, or in Bangladesh.

We are interconnected with this world. Our economy is linked to the women and children—to the people—whose names we don't know, the workers we don't know, who sew labels we all know in our shirts and in our sweaters. American and European retailers purchase some two-thirds of Bangladeshi garment production.

That is why, Mr. President, in the aftermath of the deadly Rana Plaza collapse in Bangladesh and the Wing Star Shoes collapse outside of Phnom Penh, we might have expected outraged American companies to take action. That is not exactly what happened. Which member of this multibillion-dollar industry will speak out for workers who face hazardous conditions for a minimum wage—in many cases of just $38 per month—making the clothes we wear in this country?

Today, Leader REID, Senator HARKIN of Iowa, DURBIN of Illinois, LEVIN of Michigan, LEAHY of Vermont, MURRAY of Washington State, ROCKEFELLER of West Virginia, and I sent a letter to some of our leading American retailers. We are urging retailers such as Walmart to sign onto a legally binding global accord to help ensure worker safety in Bangladesh. We are asking a number of the largest retailers in America to sign onto this legally binding global accord to help ensure worker safety in Bangladesh.

Remember, as Dr. King wrote some 50 years ago, injustice anywhere threatens our ability to create a more just world. Signing this accord from our retailers is one step our leading retailers can take to help us usher in a new era of justice in this new century.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COWAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am back again to remind this body and the American people for what I think is perhaps the 32nd speech on this subject that I have been giving weekly, that it is time, indeed it is well past time, for Congress to wake up to the disastrous effects of global climate change. The famous Mauna Loa Observatory has for the first time ever hit 400 parts per million of carbon in the atmosphere. That is an alarming benchmark to have hit.

What is happening? Over on the House side today they are repealing ObamaCare for the 37th time. That is the level of seriousness in Washington right now. In particular, our oceans—the Presiding Officer represents the Bay State, I represent the Ocean State—our oceans face an unprecedented set of challenges that come from climate change as well as from pollution and energy exploration and more.

We just have to look around to see it. We can look up to the far north and see that the Arctic ice is melting. Indeed, last summer sea ice extant in the Arctic Ocean hit a record low.

If we go south to the tropic seas, we will see that live coral coverage on Caribbean reefs is plummeting. It is down to less than 10 percent today. If we go to the top of the food chain, we will see marine mammals so laden with PCBs, flame retardants, mercury, and other bioaccumulative pollutants that many of them are swimming toxic waste—living, swimming toxic waste.

If we go to the very bottom of the food chain, we will see that the population of phytoplankton—some of our smallest ocean inhabitants and the basic building block for the oceanic food chain—has dropped 40 percent during the 20th century.

If we go far away from where we are, we will reach the great Pacific garbage patch, which is growing and swirling about the northern Pacific Ocean.

Close to my home—and near the Presiding Officer's home—is Narragansett Bay, which is 4 degrees warmer in the winter than it was a few decades ago.

Globally, the most threatening challenge, and the force behind many others, is ocean acidification. Our oceans have absorbed more than 550 billion tons of our carbon pollution. Try to wrap your head around a number that big. That is the carbon the ocean has absorbed from the excess we have pumped into the atmosphere.

The result is pretty clear, and it is a matter of basic chemistry. The oceans have become more acidic. Indeed, they have become 30 percent more acidic. By the way, that is a measurement, not a theory.

By the end of this century, the increase could be as much as 160 percent more acidic. That makes life a lot harder for species such as oysters, crabs, lobsters, corals, and even those plankton that comprise the base of the food web.

Ocean temperatures are changing dramatically—also driven by carbon pollution. Sea surface temperatures in 2012, from the Gulf of Maine to Cape Hatteras, were the highest ever recorded in 150 years. By the way, that is another measurement.

Fish stocks are shifting northward with some disappearing from U.S. waters as they move farther offshore. As we know, when the temperature rises, water expands in volume. On top of that, fresh water pours out of Arctic snowpacks and ice sheets that are melting, and as a result sea levels are rising.

Tide gauges in Newport, RI, show an increase in average sea level of 10 inches since 1930. That is a big deal when we in Rhode Island think of how devastating the great hurricane of 1938 was to our shores and what more would now befall us with 10 more inches of sea for such a storm to throw at our shores.

At these tide gauges, measurements show not only the sea level rising but the rate of sea level rise is increasing. This matches reports that since 1990, the sea level has been rising faster than the rate predicted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

I have said before: We will continue to take advantage of the ocean's bounty, as we should. We will trade, we will fish, and we will sail. We will extract fuel and harness the wind. We will work our oceans. Navies and cruise ships, sailboats and supertankers will plow their surface. We cannot undo this part of our relationship with the sea. What we can change is what we do in return. For the first time we can become not just takers but caretakers of our oceans.

We are beginning to take some baby steps. Last week, the Senate voted 67 to 32 to authorize a national endowment for the oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes, which is a funding stream for research, restoration, and protection of our marine and coastal resources. I hope that before long we can find a way to fund it by working with all of my colleagues. The famous ocean explorer Bob Ballard has described as ''a major problem . . . the disconnect between the importance of oceans and the meager funds we as a nation invest to not only understand their complexity, but become responsible stewards of the bounty they represent.''

This endowment—if we can get it over the remaining legislative hurdles and get it funded—will help us become more responsible stewards of that bounty. It will help us better respond to oilspills, it will help coastal States protect or relocate coastal infrastructure, and it will help our fisheries and marine industries take part in economically important conservation efforts.

I sincerely appreciate the support shown for this amendment by colleagues from every region of the country and both sides of the aisle. Protecting the oceans upon which our communities and our economy depend is neither a Democratic nor a Republican objective, and there ought to be a great deal of agreement on the need to meet these challenges.

We also see that agreement in the bipartisan Senate Oceans Caucus, which works to increase awareness of and find common ground on issues facing the oceans and coasts.

My fellow cochair Senator MURKOWSKI, honorary cochair Senator MARK BEGICH, Senator Mark Wicker, and all of our partners are working to stop illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing. We are working to clean up marine debris and collect baseline scientific data so we can make policy-informed decisions. This is important work. It demonstrates the good both parties can accomplish when we come together. I look forward to getting it done, but it is not enough. Until we address what is causing our oceans to change so drastically, until we protect our planet from carbon pollution unprecedented in human history, we are doing little more than putting Band-Aids on a gaping and growing wound.

I want to push back on the idea that so many of us seem to have accepted, that we cannot do anything serious on carbon pollution. In fact, we can. The tools to do it lie right around us, if only we would pick them up and go to work.

Very simply, here is my case: Pricing carbon is necessary. Make big carbon polluters pay a fee to the American people to cover the cost of dumping their waste into our atmosphere and oceans—a cost they now push off on to the rest of us—and return that fee to the American people.

At present, however, political conditions in Congress do not allow us to price carbon. It is necessary. Political conditions do not allow us to do it, so we must change those political conditions.

Changing the political conditions will require three actions: No. 1, there has to be a regulatory threat to the polluters. No. 2, there must be a political threat to the deniers here in the Senate and in Congress. No. 3, those of us who wish to limit carbon pollution must gather the armies that are on our side.

Let me go through those steps. First, as long as the polluters and their allies control Congress, legislative action is unlikely. That means we have to rely on the executive branch for regulatory action—very strong regulatory action that will change the equation for the polluters. That is the test. Will it change the equation for the polluters?

The status quo is a win for the polluters. They pollute for free. Change that balance, and it will not take them long to come to Congress. Why? Because regulatory action puts costs directly on the polluters but creates no revenues for them. A carbon pollution fee, now that creates revenues. A portion of that could offset their costs of transitioning to a green economy.

If that is the choice they have—regulation with no revenues or a fee they can get revenues from—it becomes in their interest to strike a deal in Congress. This regulatory step in the executive branch will, however, require an awakening at the White House.

Second, to create a meaningful political threat, the advocates out there for our climate and our oceans will need to employ all of the sophisticated political tools the polluters use—all the political artillery of the post-Citizens United world.

There is an expression that you should not bring a knife to a gunfight. Right now climate advocates bring not even a knife but a feather to this gunfight. It is no wonder we lose. When deniers in Congress see real artillery coming on the political field against them, some will rethink.

Third, and last, is gathering the armies. There is astonishingly wide support for action on climate. Obviously environmental groups support this, as

well as the green energy and investment industry, our national security officials, property casualty insurers and reinsurers, young people—such as the growing college movement for coal divestment—faith groups, many utilities, celebrities, hunting, fishing, outdoor, conservation groups, retailers, such as Apple, Coca-Cola and Nike, labor groups, mayors, local officials, and the public. The public is with us, and the polls show that.

The problem: Most of this support is latent and unorganized. None of these groups feel they can carry this battle on their own; yet if they choose to unite, create an allied command, assemble these various divisions and join in on a strategy that deploys them all effectively into action, that latent strength becomes potent strength, and that is a game changer.

When the polluting industry is looking down the barrel of a regulatory gun, when their political allies are fearful of a strongly backed political operation—backed also by the American people—when mobilized and motivated forces from a wide swath of the economy and multiple sectors are all active, the political landscape then shifts dramatically and a price on carbon is achievable.

I propose to the American people, to those who believe it is time to wake up and take action, to fend off devastating changes to our oceans and our climate: Let us be not faint of heart. Let us have the strength of our convictions and get to work and get this done. We can do it. The tools to do it already lie all around us. This can all take place quite rapidly. Let's get it done.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNIZING THE WHAYNE SUPPLY COMPANY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the Whayne Supply Company, a leader in Kentucky businesses and one of the Nation's oldest and largest Caterpillar dealerships, for reaching the milestone of 100 years in operation. That is a full century of serving the needs of Kentucky's construction, mining, agriculture, and industrial markets; a full century of employing Kentuckians; and a full century of expanding opportunity across the Commonwealth.

Whayne Supply Company was founded in 1913 by Mr. Roy C. Whayne, Sr. At the time of the firm's founding, he was its sole employee, and the business consisted of selling light engines, pumps, wheelbarrows, and bicycles. In 1925, the company began its long and continued association with Caterpillar, one of the world's largest manufacturers of construction and mining equipment. Today Whayne is also the dealer for Thomas Built Buses, Challenger, Lexion, Trail King, Mirenco, Sullair, Allmand, and other lines of construction, industrial, mining, paving, and agricultural equipment.

Today Whayne is consistently ranked as one of the country's top Caterpillar dealerships. It also provides customers with an extensive parts inventory and broad service capabilities. Whayne Supply Company is currently owned by Monty Boyd, who became president of Whayne Supply in 2005 after working for the company in various roles for 25 years. Under Mr. Boyd's leadership, Whayne has grown to employ over 1,300 people and operate 15 facilities across Kentucky and southern Indiana.

Whayne's home office is in Louisville, and it operates other branches in Ashland, Bowling Green, Corbin, Dry Ridge, Elizabethtown, Hazard, Hopkinsville, Lexington, Owensboro, Paducah, Pikeville, and Somerset, as well as in Evansville, Indiana, and Jeffersonville, IN.

The Whayne Supply Company intends to mark its 100th anniversary throughout 2013 by recognizing its employees and customers and holding a series of community service projects. With the company's ties to all regions of the State, I am sure many Kentuckians will have occasion to note this anniversary and reflect on Whayne Supply's century of service.

Mr. President, I know my colleagues in the Senate join me in commending the Whayne Supply Company for 100 years of operations and saluting them for their commitment to the people of Kentucky.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISIT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to recognize a very important event that will be occurring this Sunday and Monday: 85 World War II veterans from Montana will take part in the fourth Big Sky Honor Flight and come to Washington, DC, to visit their monument—the WWII Memorial.

Their trip is hosted by the Big Sky Honor Flight Program. The mission is to recognize American veterans for their sacrifices and achievements by flying them to Washington, DC, to see their memorials at no cost. The program, which has already flown more than 250 Montana veterans to visit the memorials, is generously funded by businesses, student groups, and folks all across Montana.

These veterans come from all parts of our great State, and while they are in Washington, they will see the WWII Memorial and other monuments and enjoy a banquet honoring their service to the country.

This is a special 2 days for this group of heroes, but it is also a time to give thanks for courage and sacrifice of all our veterans and service members. It is a time to reflect on the sacrifices made by those who fought on the frontlines in Europe and the Pacific, on the battlefields of Korea, in the jungles of Vietnam, the deserts of Iraq, and those who are currently fighting in the mountains of Afghanistan. We must not forget their sacrifices.

I am so pleased I will be able to meet with these courageous Montanans. I ask the Senate to join me in welcoming these heroes to our Nation's Capital this weekend. I ask unanimous consent that the following names be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Douglas M Alexander, Woodrow W Archer, Ralph W Arnold, Tim M Babcock, Peter E Bakken, Norman F Balko, Burl E Baty, Henry F Beckman, Harold M Brown, Charles L Bullis, Lester E Crouse, Stuart Ellison, Frederick L Ernst, Thomas E Francis, Merle M Green, Francis W Grove.

Harry P Hayden, Bernard J Heetderks, Paul L Hickman, Joseph Hucke, Maurice C Knutson, John C Kindelman, Leonard E Kuffel, Donald M Lilienthal, Harry M Merlak, John L Mulford, Antone F O'Dea, Lewis A Paschke, Billy M Paul, Oscar S Peterson, Charles F Petranek, Hardy J Pugliano, Charles F Romee, Raymond R Rumfelt, Paul T Ringling.

Dorothy K Roeder, Lester T Rutledge, Frank J Schledorn, William K Schultz, Maurice W Shoemaker, Duane Steinke, Robert L Stewart, Ralph W Stodden, John W Todd, Lawrence F Thomas, Kenneth Torgrimson, John D Walsh, Roman T Wuertz, George J Wright, Mike N Steiner, Harry H Knodel, Audrey Manuel.

Stanley R Kniepkamp, Leo F Staat, Frank P Scotten, Dean H Elliott, Joseph H Cook, Donald F David, Robert L Tillery, Bishop S Everingham, Oliver R Germann, Paul Hafner, Robert Barnhart, Leonard E Gissler, Thomas W Huff, Leo H Drain, Rolland Karlin, Doris A Adolph, Alfred J Adolph, Vernon L Phillips.

Colin F Glasgow, Leroy Bourque, John P Dillon, Bryon N Manley, Sebastian Messer, Raymond A Grossman, Ben J Raisland, Robert J O'Connell, Alfred J Falcon, Vernon E Locke, George Schuyler, Robert Kovash, Donald R Anderson, Robert G Orlando, Earl K Warne.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, as a proud co-sponsor of S. Res. 140, I was delighted by the Senate's unanimous passage this week of legislation commemorating the dedication and sacrifice made by Federal, State and local law enforcement officers who have been killed or injured in the line of duty.

As our Nation celebrates National Police Week, I wish to honor five heroes who gave their lives in service to the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 2012. Like 120 other law enforcement officers across the U.S., they died in the line of duty, joining the ranks of the 21,465 officers who have similarly given their lives since 1791.

This week we honor Trooper First Class Blake T. Coble, Police Officer Bradley Michael Fox, Police Officer Moses Walker Jr., Police Officer Brian J. Lorenzo and Patrolman Avery Freeman. Additionally we honor their families who must bear the profound absence of their loved ones.

On behalf of all Pennsylvanians I extend my condolences to the families and friends of these heroes. We mourn the loss of these remarkable men and women who represented the best of their communities and whose memory will serve as an inspiration for future generations.

RECOGNIZING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, in Arkansas, our law enforcement history runs deep. Take my hometown of Fort Smith, for example, where the U.S. Marshals Service played an integral part in shaping the city's unique role in our country's westward expansion. Many people in the area today find their family roots trace back to a U.S. Marshal.

From an early age we were taught about Judge Isaac Parker's efforts to bring order to Indian Territory, and great lawmen such as Deputy U.S. Marshal Bass Reeves helped lay the foundation that highlighted Fort Smith's chapter in the history of the U.S. Marshals Service. We have a lot to be thankful for as we honor these brave men and women as part of National Police Week.

May 15 marks Peace Officers Memorial Day. Each May during National Police Week we honor the men and women who died in the line of duty by adding their names to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

This year 321 names will be added to the memorial including Arkansas Department of Correction SGT Barbara Ester, who died in January 2012, and former Johnson County Sheriff John Hall Powers who was shot and killed while trying to stop a bank robbery in 1902.

The tradition of courageous public service is carried on today by the men and women who keep communities across the country safe 24 hours a day. They truly are on the front lines, walking some of the toughest beats in America, and keeping our streets safe.

More brave men and women opt to follow their lead in a career in law enforcement every day. I recently had the honor of handing out diplomas to graduates of the Black River Technical College Law Enforcement Training Academy in Pocahontas, AR. Graduates of this program follow different tracks in police work such as crime scene investigation, criminal training and police training with hands-on instruction and the currently available resources to allow for the best work possible. The program produced a great group of graduates who are excited to use the skills they learned in the field.

We recognize, not only during this week, but all year long, the devotion of the 900,000 law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line every day to make our communities safer.

Law enforcement faces unique challenges today and we are working to provide the best tools and training to prepare these men and women for unpredictable situations. As our world changes, so do the threats we face. The key to being equipped for these unexpected events is to prepare for these emerging threats. That is why a lot of law enforcement training today focuses on domestic terrorism. Look no further than the Boston Police Department that became the first line of defense against terrorism during the Boston Marathon bombing.

In order to keep our communities safe, we are challenged to develop the newest training techniques and prepare for a wide range of incidents. We have great resources in Arkansas that provide our officers with advanced training.

I thank the law enforcement officers in Arkansas and across the country who dedicate their lives to protecting our children and communities and seek to bring criminals to justice. These heroes come to our rescue when we need help and I am committed to providing them with the tools and the resources they need to fulfill their responsibilities.

EDENTON, NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, today I wish to pay homage to the beautiful Town of Edenton, NC. I join its citizens, its friends, and city and State leaders in celebrating their historic 300th anniversary. Originally known as the Town on Queen Anne's Creek, Edenton was renamed after the death of the first man appointed by the Crown as ''full'' Governor of North Carolina, Charles Eden, in 1722.

The first Colonial Capital until 1743, Edenton citizens were widely known for their steadfast values and dedication to a free society. Edenton's Penelope Barker was the first woman to organize a political event in the colonies when she gathered women from the region to a petition to King George opposing taxation. The son of Edenton's James Iredell, Sr., was nominated by President George Washington to serve on the first U.S. Supreme Court, and was confirmed the very next day at only 38-years-old. Edentonian Hugh Williamson signed the U.S. Constitution and effectively argued for the inclusion of the Bill of Rights. Edentonians have long been a proud community committed to our Nation's founding principles.

The Chowan County Courthouse in Edenton is not only North Carolina's oldest courthouse, but also the State's oldest government building. It is still in use today. The impressive building, of southern Georgian architecture, was built in 1767 on a plot of land first surveyed in 1712. Today, it is recognized as a National Historic Landmark. One of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, Joseph Hewes, a long-time Edenton resident, was instrumental in making the courthouse a reality.

Thanks to the Town of Edenton, Chowan County, the Edenton Historical Commission, Chowan County Tourism Development Authority and many citizen leaders, the town's treasured historic sites remain healthy and preserved. These treasures not only serve to teach us about our Nation's rich heritage, but they also boost our economy and attract people interested in our Nation's history from around the world. These include the 1767 Courthouse, the Barker House, the Roanoke River Lighthouse, Edenton Cotton Mill, the Cupola House, and the second oldest church building in North Carolina, Saint Paul's Episcopal Church.

Because of the community's tireless efforts to preserve its heritage and promote the arts and culture, I doubt anyone visiting Edenton today would be surprised to learn that it received the distinguished Forbes.com award as one of America's Prettiest Towns.

I am proud to join the entire Edenton community in congratulating them on this historic occasion.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL MICHAEL BARBERO

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the service of LTG Michael D. Barbero, the director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, JIEDDO, who will retire from service on May 17, 2013.

Lieutenant General Barbero has honorably served his country for more than three decades. Since graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1976 as an infantry officer, LTG Barbero has commanded troops at every level. He is a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom, having served 4 years in Iraq over three separate tours. From 2003–2004, he served as the assistant division commander of the 4th Infantry Division. He next served in Iraq as the deputy chief of staff, Strategic Operations at Multi-National Force-Iraq during ''the surge'' in 2007 and 2008. Immediately prior to his time as director of JIEDDO, he was deployed in Iraq for a final time from 2009–2011. During this deployment, Lieutenant General Barbero was responsible for the training, equipping, and development of all Iraqi security forces and building the ministerial capabilities of both the Ministries of Interior and Defense, while serving simultaneously as the commander of Multi-National Security and Transition Command-Iraq and the commander of the NATO Training Mission-Iraq. Among his many decorations, Lieutenant General Barbero has been awarded the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Bronze Star Medal.

As chairman of the Near Eastern and South Central Asian Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have worked closely with LTG Barbero in an effort to stem the flow of IED precursor materials from Pakistan into Afghanistan. These homemade explosive, HME, materials pose the biggest threat to our service men and women and are responsible for far too many casualties. Under General Barbero's leadership, JIEDDO has made significant strides in working with various departments, the interagency, the intelligence community, and the Government of Pakistan, to

create a whole-of-government approach to combat these dangers by not only reducing the flow of HME, but also by helping to eliminate the enemy networks that seek to use these materials for the nefarious purposes of harming our troops, attacking civilian populations, and furthering instability.

General Barbero has approached his work with a high degree of transparency, integrity, and focus. Few missions are as important as JIEDDO's in working to defeat the IED as a weapon of strategic influence. Lieutenant General Barbero carried out that mission superbly. No one has done more or worked harder to find ways to counter the threat posed by IEDs. I have especially appreciated his efforts to encourage others across government to do all they can in order to maintain a level of preparedness to deal with this asymmetric threat. Under his leadership, JIEDDO further improved its processes and control measures to make for a more effective and efficient organization that will be a model for other leaders to emulate.

I have gotten to know LTG General Michael Barbero well during his tenure at JIEDDO. He is an inspiring leader, a fine example for his fellow servicemembers, and a fellow Pennsylvanian. I am proud to share in the celebration of Lieutenant General Barbero, his extraordinary leadership of JIEDDO, and his distinguished military service.●

RECOGNIZING KELOLAND TV

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize KELOLAND TV's 60th anniversary. Opening their doors on May 19, 1953, KELOLAND became South Dakota's first television station. Over the past 60 years, KELOLAND has been a source for critical information and programming to countless South Dakotans.

Providing timely news, weather, and sports across the rural and vast South Dakota plains is no simple task, but through hard work and dedication, KELOLAND has served South Dakota with continuous and critical coverage of all the news of the day. Through challenging times in South Dakota, KELOLAND has been a mainstay for viewers in the region to turn to for up-to-date coverage of the events and happenings in their local communities. In October of 1954, KELOLAND offered its first live programming, which led shortly after to KELOLAND offering the first live sporting event in February of 1957. On March 11, 1955, ''Captain 11'' signed on for the first time. Little did they know that ''Captain 11'' would become the longest continuous running children's program in the world. ''Captain 11'' ran for 42 years before signing off for the last time on December 28, 1996.

In September of 1968, KELOLAND added live color cameras. The year 1997 was very busy for KELOLAND due to the September introduction of the Live Doppler Network, which brought live weather radar pictures to South Dakota homes, and the December launch of Keloland.com, which gave South Dakotans the ability for the first time to check their local news online. In 2011, KELOLAND made two more cutting-edge technology advancements by creating their first mobile phone app, in February, followed by offering full high definition broadcasting in October.

KELOLAND has provided critical information for the State of South Dakota for 60 years; however, its impact on the region and the community it serves does not stop there. In the spring of 1998, a violent tornado tore through the town of Spencer, and in an effort to help rebuild the Spencer community, KELOLAND organized a telethon to assist the victims of the tragedy. The telethon was a success and raised more than $1 million.

KELOLAND's commitment to excellence and to its service to the region has not only been recognized by South Dakotans but also on a national stage. Along with winning 10 regional Emmy Awards, KELOLAND, in August of 2000, was awarded an Emmy for its outstanding public service.

KELOLAND's commitment to service to the State of South Dakota makes it an honor to congratulate them on their 60th anniversary of broadcasts and wish them another 60 years of success.●

REMEMBERING AL NEUHARTH

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish today to honor the life and accomplishments of Al Neuharth.

Al Neuharth was born in Eureka, SD, on March 22, 1924, where he spent his childhood years. Al's passion for journalism was evident at a very young age when at 11 he began his first job working as a newspaper carrier in his hometown. In high school, Al began writing for his school newspaper and later became editor.

Soon after his graduation, Neuharth enlisted in the Army. Al honorably served his country during World War II in the 86th Infantry Division, under General Patton's 3rd Army. During his time in the service, Neuharth was awarded the Bronze Star and the Combat Infantryman's Badge for his bravery.

After the war, Neuharth moved back to South Dakota, where he enrolled at the University of South Dakota. In 1950, he graduated with a degree in Journalism and upon graduation began working at the Associated Press in Sioux Falls, launching a historic career.

In 1953, Neuharth moved to Florida to work for the Miami Herald. After spending several years at the Herald, in 1960 Neuharth left to work at the Detroit Free Press. In 1966, Neuharth launched a new paper called ''Today,'' which would later become ''Florida Today'' and eventually grow into the USA TODAY which was published for the first time on September 15, 1982. The USA TODAY would grow rapidly throughout the country and in 2001 was the most widely read paper in the country.

Neuharth's career also included becoming the chairman and CEO of Gannett Co., Inc., where he oversaw a drastic expansion of the company's holdings. In 1991, Neuharth founded Freedom Forum, a nonpartisan international foundation dedicated to free press, free speech, and free spirit to all people. Freedom Forum funds and operates the Newseum, a museum dedicated to the history and impact of journalism. In 1999, Neuharth was honored for his lifetime achievements by the National Press Foundation with the Distinguished Contributions to Journalism Award.

Al Neuharth passed away on April 19, 2013, at Cocoa Beach, FL, at the age of 89. He will be forever remembered for his impact on journalism and will always be one of South Dakota's favorite sons.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:39 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 356. An act 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''.

H.R. 384. An act to transfer the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Office of the Secretary, and for other purposes.

H.R. 573. An act to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

H.R. 701. An act to amend a provision of the Securities Act of 1933 directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to add a particular class of securities to those exempted under such Act to provide a deadline for such action.

H.R. 767. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 356. An act 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''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 384. An act to transfer the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Office of the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 573. An act to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 701. An act to amend a provision of the Securities Act of 1933 directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to add a particular class of securities to those exempted under such Act to provide a deadline for such action; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 767. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1527. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Animal Feed and Pet Food; Electron Beam and X–Ray Sources for Irradiation of Poultry Feed and Poultry Feed Ingredients'' (Docket No. FDA–2012–F–0178) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1528. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Admiral James G. Stavridis, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1529. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; System for Award Management Name Changes, Phase 1 Implementation'' ((RIN0750–AH87) (DFARS Case 2012–D053)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1530. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to recruitment incentives; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1531. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012, with respect to Yemen; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1532. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Executive Compensation'' (RIN2590–AA12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1533. A communication from the Senior Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2012 Management Report and statement of the system of internal control; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1534. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2012 Management Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1535. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–1536. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Probabilistic Fracture Mechanics Evaluation for the Boiling Water Reactor Nozzle-to-Vessel Shell Welds and Nozzle Blend Radii'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1537. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Canton-Massillon 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets'' (FRL No. 9812–2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1538. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Sulfur Dioxide and Nitrogen Dioxide Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9811–6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1539. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Flint Hills Resources Pine Bend'' (FRL No. 9811–7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1540. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana, 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan and 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Maintenance Plan Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets'' (FRL No. 9812–4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1541. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; State Implementation Plan Miscellaneous Revisions'' (FRL No. 9813–5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1542. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of TSCA Section 4 Testing Requirements for One High Production Volume Chemical Substance'' (FRL No. 9369–1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1543. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates'' (Notice 2013–23) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1544. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Proportional Method for OID on Pools of Credit Card Receivables'' (Rev. Proc. 2013–26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1545. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program'' (RIN1840–AD13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1546. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Performance Report for fiscal year 2012 for the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1547. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled ''The 2012 National Healthcare Quality Report'' and ''The 2012 National Healthcare Disparities Report''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1548. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S. Department of Education Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Performance Plan''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 607, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy

of electronic communications (Rept. No. 113–34).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Regina McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Srikanth Srinivasan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

Jennifer A. Dorsey, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BEGICH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHANNS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 967. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify various authorities relating to procedures for courts-martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. KING):

S. 968. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 969. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 970. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under the Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 971. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 972. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services replacing ICD–9 with ICD–10 in implementing the HIPAA code set standards; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 973. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 974. A bill to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 975. A bill to provide for the inclusion of court-appointed guardianship improvement and oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

S. 976. A bill to provide for education of potential military recruits on healthy body weight and to facilitate and encourage exercise in potential military recruits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 977. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide that a downward adjustment of the volume of cellulosic biofuel results in a pro rata reduction of the volume of renewable fuel and advanced biofuels required under the Renewable Fuel Standard; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 978. A bill to provide for an accounting of total United States contributions to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 979. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, to condition the receipt of certain highway funding by States on the enactment and enforcement by States of certain laws to prevent repeat intoxicated driving; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 980. A bill to provide for enhanced embassy security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 981. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 982. A bill to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from taking certain actions to establish a restricted area prohibiting public access to waters downstream of a dam, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 983. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 984. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for United States participation in joint military exercises with Egypt if the Government of Egypt abrogates, terminates, or withdraws from the 1979 Egypt-Israel peace treaty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 985. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act and revive the separation between commercial banking and the securities business, in the manner provided in the Banking Act of 1933, the so-called ''Glass-Steagall Act'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 986. A bill to prohibit performance awards in the Senior Executive Service during sequestration periods; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 987. 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.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 143. A resolution recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority in the efforts of the United States Government to promote democracy and good governance on the occasion of World Press Freedom Day on May 3, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 144. A resolution concerning the ongoing conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the need for international efforts supporting long-term peace, stability, and observance of human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 145. A resolution promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2013 to bring attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations such as American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians, Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics or Latinos, and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 146. A resolution designating the week of May 12 through May 18, 2013, as ''National Police Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South

Dakota, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 147. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 148. A resolution designating May 18, 2013, as ''National Kids to Parks Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Con. Res. 16. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of a statue of Frederick Douglass; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 309, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, 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.

S. 360

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the ''Doolittle Tokyo Raiders'', for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 466

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 466, a bill to assist low-income individuals in obtaining recommended dental care.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 541, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 545

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 545, a bill to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

S. 557

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 557, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to establish a fund to make payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran, and to members of their families, who are identified as members of the proposed class in case number 1:08-CV–00487 (EGS) of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 603

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 603, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 650

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 650, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers.

S. 669

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 669, a bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program.

S. 695

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc., and for other purposes.

S. 701

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 701, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 731

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 731, a bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct an empirical impact study on proposed rules relating to the International Basel III agreement on general risk-based capital requirements, as they apply to community banks.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 789, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

S. 813

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 813, a bill to require that Peace Corps volunteers be subject to the same limitations regarding coverage of abortion services as employees of the Peace Corps with respect to coverage of such services, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 815, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

S. 850

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 850, a bill to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from taking any action that requires a quorum of the members of the Board until such time as Board constituting a quorum shall have been confirmed by the Senate, the Supreme Court issues a decision on the constitutionality of the appointments to the Board made in January 2012, or the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 113th Congress.

S. 854

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 854, a bill to improve student academic achievement in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics subjects.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 871

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 871, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance assistance for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to impose sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 897, 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.

S. 931

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to raise awareness of, and to educate breast cancer patients anticipating surgery, especially patients who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, regarding the availability and coverage of breast reconstruction, prostheses, and other options.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, 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.

S. 945

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 945, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 953

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 953, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, to limit earnings stripping by expatriated entities, to provide for modifications related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 955

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 955, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act.

S. 959

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 959, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to compounding drugs.

S. 962

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 962, a bill to prohibit amounts made available by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 from being transferred to the Internal Revenue Service for implementation of such Acts.

S. CON. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 15, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Chained Consumer Price Index should not be used to calculate cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security or veterans benefits, or to increase the tax burden on low- and middle-income taxpayers.

S. RES. 133

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 133, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress and the States should investigate and correct abusive, unsanitary, and illegal abortion practices.

S. RES. 139

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 139, a resolution celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 969. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today, in honor of the 20th anniversary of International Migratory Bird Day on May 11, I am introducing the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act. More than half of the bird species found in the U.S. migrate across our borders

and many of these spend our winter in Central and South America. This bill promotes international cooperation for long-term conservation, education, research, monitoring, and habitat protection for more than 350 species of neotropical migratory birds. Through its successful competitive, matching grant program, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service supports public-private partnerships in countries mostly in Latin America and the Caribbean. Up to one quarter of the funds may be awarded for domestic projects.

This legislation aims to sustain healthy populations of migratory birds that are not only beautiful to look at but help our farmers by consuming billions of harmful insect and rodent pests each year, providing pollination services, and dispersing seeds. Migratory birds face threats from pesticide pollution, deforestation, sprawl, and invasive species that degrade their habitats in addition to the natural risks of their extended flights. Birds are excellent indicators of the health of an ecosystem. As such, it is troubling that, according to the National Audubon Society, half of all coastally migrating shorebirds, like the Common Tern and Piping Plover, are experiencing dramatic population declines.

The Baltimore Oriole, the State bird of Maryland and one whose song brightens all of the Northeastern U.S., has steadily declined in population despite being protected by Federal law under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the state of Maryland's Nongame and Endangered Species Conservation Act. Likewise, the iconic Red Knot bird, whose legendary 9,000 mile migration centers on a stopover in the Mid-Atlantic states, is decreasing in population quickly. Threats to these beloved Maryland birds are mainly due to habitat destruction and deforestation, particularly in the Central and South American countries where the birds winter. In addition, international use of toxic pesticides ingested by insects, which are then eaten by the birds, has significantly contributed to this decline. Conservation efforts in our country are essential, but investment in programs throughout the migratory route of these and countless other migratory birds is critical. This legislation accomplishes this goal.

The Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act has a proven track record of reversing habitat loss and advancing conservation strategies for the broad range of neotropical birds that populate the United States and the rest of the Western hemisphere. To date, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has administered these grants to support 422 projects in more than 35 countries. The $46.5 million that this program has provided in grants has leveraged $178.5 million from partners, almost four additional dollars for every one spent. More than 3.25 million acres of quality bird habitat have benefitted. In addition, birding is among the wildlife watching activities that generate jobs and income, approximately $2.7 billion annually, for the U.S. economy.

This legislation is cost-effective, budget-friendly, and has been a highly successful federal program. This simple reauthorization bill will make sure that this good work continues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 969

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

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT.

Section 10 of the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 6109) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts made available under subsection (a) for each fiscal year, not less than 75 percent shall be expended for projects carried out at a location outside of the United States.''.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 970. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under the Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Water Resources Research Amendments Act. First authorized in 1964, the Water Resources Research Act established 54 Water Resources Research Institutes at top land grant universities in each of the 50 States and the U.S. territories. These institutes created a grant program and provided opportunities for applied water supply research. The bill I introduce today would reauthorize the grant program for the next 5 years and would add a program focused on research and development of green infrastructure.

Water and the availability thereof is a defining characteristic of U.S. landscape, culture, wealth, and security. Clean water is a relatively rare and invaluable resource. Last year's funded projects included research into the impacts of climate change on water supply lakes, the development of better detection methods for pathogens in drinking water, and the impacts of drought on farm supply chains. In my own State, some of the tools we use for restoration of the Chesapeake Bay were products of these same grants in previous years. WRRA Researchers across the Mid-Atlantic States have developed ways to keep the Chesapeake waters cleaner through urban stormwater treatment, improved roadway design, and eco-friendly poultry farming practices. WRRA-funded projects develop innovative and cost-effective solutions for similar water resources issues across the country. Undoubtedly, funding WRRA is an intelligent and necessary investment in the future of our water resources.

WRRA authorizes two types of annual grants. First, it supplies grants to each Water Resources Research Institute for research that fosters improvements in water supply reliability, explores new ways to address water problems, encourages dissemination of research to water managers and the public, and encourages the entry of new scientists, engineers and technicians into the water resources field. Second, WRRA authorizes a national competitive grant program to address regional water issues. All WRRA grants leverage non-federal dollars at a minimum ratio of 2 to 1, but often far beyond that level, as high as 5 to 1.

The Water Resources Research Act was most recently reauthorized in 2006, in PL 109–471. In that period, the program was authorized at $12,000,000 per year, providing $6,000,000 each to state and competitive project grants. Authorization for these grants expired in fiscal year 2011. Today's bill would reauthorize both grant programs for an additional 5 years by providing $7,500,000 for institutional grants and $1,500,000 for national competitive grants. This lower authorization level reflects our efforts to adjust for present fiscal limitations. The proposed authorization maximizes the economic efficiency of the program without compromising its efficacy. An independent review panel has judged that the Water Resources Research Institutes command significant funding leverage for the modest amount of appropriations required to support it. Thus, we can be sure that we are supporting top-notch science while maximizing cost-effectiveness. Moreover, by funding this network of institutes we are investing in our future. The Water Resources Research Institutes are the country's single largest training program for water scientists, technicians, and engineers.

Today, floods, droughts, and water degradation issues pervade the nation. Simultaneously, water resources are increasingly critical for production of resources, economic stability, and the health and well-being of the citizenry. WRRA grants provide us with improved understanding of water-related issues and better technology to address them. Nearly half a century after the Water Resources Research grant program was first put in place, this program is relevant, critical, and deserving of our support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 970

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 ''Water Resources Research Amendments Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—Section 102 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10301) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) additional research is required into increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of new and existing treatment works through alternative approaches, including—

''(A) nonstructural alternatives;

''(B) decentralized approaches;

''(C) water use efficiency; and

''(D) actions to reduce energy consumption or extract energy from wastewater;''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Section 104(b)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''water-related phenomena'' and inserting ''water resources''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''.

(c) COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 104(c) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''From the'' and inserting ''(1) IN GENERAL.—From the''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 31 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a report regarding the compliance of each funding recipient with this subsection for the immediately preceding fiscal year.''.

(d) EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 104 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303) is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a careful and detailed evaluation of each institute at least once every 3 years to determine—

''(A) the quality and relevance of the water resources research of the institute;

''(B) the effectiveness of the institute at producing measured results and applied water supply research; and

''(C) whether the effectiveness of the institute as an institution for planning, conducting, and arranging for research warrants continued support under this section.

''(2) PROHIBITION ON FURTHER SUPPORT.—If, as a result of an evaluation under paragraph (1), the Secretary determines that an institute does not qualify for further support under this section, no further grants to the institute may be provided until the qualifications of the institute are reestablished to the satisfaction of the Secretary.''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 104(f)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018''.

(f) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS WHERE RESEARCH FOCUSED ON WATER PROBLEMS OF INTERSTATE NATURE.—Section 104(g)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018''.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 971. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to reintroduce the Silviculture Regulatory Consistency Act with my colleague Senator CRAPO. This legislation would end the legal uncertainty facing the timber industry by enacting legislation to preserve the Environmental Protection Agency's 37-year old policy treating forest roads as nonpoint sources under the Clean Water Act.

For 37 years, the EPA has maintained that forest roads are non-point sources. Furthermore, in March of this year, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' ruling on forest roads, upholding EPA's authority to regulate forest roads as nonpoint sources under the Clean Water Act. Various studies show that if the EPA were to change their decades-long position and require Federal, State, county, tribal and private forest road owners to obtain a point source permit, the cost could reach billions of dollars and cost thousands of jobs. The Pacific Northwest needs more jobs in the woods. The way to do that is to get the timber cut up and to stop litigating questions that have already been answered.

In the 112th Congress, Senator CRAPO and I introduced similar legislation on forest roads. The legislation we introduce today is different in only two respects. First, the bill includes new language to prevent forest roads from being otherwise regulated by the EPA. This language is needed because in its March 2013 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the EPA's authority to regulate forest roads as non-point sources, and therefore not require mandatory point source permits; however, it did not address the Ninth Circuit's previous ruling that forest roads are point sources. As a result, the EPA must respond to the Court's ruling that the EPA use its discretionary authority to determine whether or not to regulate forest roads as point sources. This will inevitably result in further litigation over permits for forest roads.

Second, the bill we introduce today includes the language adopted last year by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to clarify the list of forest activities the EPA will not regulate as point sources. The Committee favorable reported the bill with this addition.

Let me be clear. This legislation upholds an existing EPA regulation. Furthermore, this legislation does not weaken the Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act remains in the same force as it has since it was enacted in 1972.

The introduction of this bill begins the legislative process. There will be an opportunity for hearings, testimony provided by witnesses and Federal agencies, and public dialogue on this bill. It is my hope that this legislation will provide the certainty that the timber industry needs to increase jobs in the woods, get the timber cut up, and put an end to litigating the question of whether or not EPA has the authority to regulate forest roads as non-point sources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 971

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 ''Silviculture Regulatory Consistency Act''.

SEC. 2. SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 402(l) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) NPDES PERMIT REQUIREMENTS FOR SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall not require a permit or otherwise promulgate regulations under this section or directly or indirectly require any State to require a permit under this section for a discharge of stormwater runoff resulting from the conduct of the following silvicultural activities: nursery operations, site preparation, reforestation and subsequent cultural treatment, thinning, prescribed burning, pest and fire control, harvesting operations, surface drainage, and road use, construction, and maintenance.

''(B) PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.—Nothing in this paragraph exempts a silvicultural activity resulting in the discharge of dredged or fill material from any permitting requirement under section 404.''.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 974. A bill to provide for certain land conveyances in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 974

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Las Vegas Valley Public Land and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.
Sec. 3. Addition of land to Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area.
Sec. 4. Conveyance of Bureau of Land Management land to North Las Vegas.
Sec. 5. Conveyance of Bureau of Land Management land to Las Vegas.
Sec. 6. Expansion of conveyance to Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department.
Sec. 7. Spring Mountains National Recreation Area withdrawal.
Sec. 8. Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 amendments.
Sec. 9. Conveyance of land to the Nevada System of Higher Education.
Sec. 10. Land conveyance for Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport.
Sec. 11. Sunrise Mountain Instant Study Area release.
Sec. 12. Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area.
Sec. 13. Conveyance of land for Nellis Air Force Base.
Sec. 14. Military overflights.

SEC. 2. TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) since 1933, the Upper Las Vegas Wash has been valued by scientists because of the significant paleontological resources demonstrative of the Pleistocene Epoch that are located in the area;

(2) in 2004, during the preparation of the Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Bureau of Land Management identified sensitive biological, cultural, and paleontological resources determined to be worthy of more evaluation with respect to the protective status of the resources;

(3) the Upper Las Vegas Wash contains thousands of paleontological resources from the Pleistocene Epoch that are preserved in a unique geological context that are of national importance, including Columbian mammoth, ground sloth, American lion, camels, and horse fossils;

(4) in addition to Joshua trees and several species of cacti, the Las Vegas buckwheat, Merriam's bearpoppy, and the Las Vegas bearpoppy are 3 unique and imperiled plants that are supported in the harsh desert environment of Tule Springs;

(5) the area provides important habitat for threatened desert tortoise, endemic poppy bees, kit foxes, burrowing owls, LeConte's thrasher, phainopepla, and a variety of reptiles;

(6) in studies of the area conducted during the last decade, the Bureau of Land Management and National Park Service determined that the area likely contains the longest continuous section of Pleistocene strata in the desert southwest, which span multiple important global climate cooling and warming episodes;

(7) the Upper Las Vegas Wash is significant to the culture and history of the native and indigenous people of the area, including the Southern Paiute Tribe;

(8) despite the findings of the studies and recommendations for further assessment of the resources for appropriate methods of protection—

(A) the area remains inadequately protected; and

(B) many irreplaceable fossil specimens in the area have been lost to vandalism or theft; and

(9) designation of the Upper Las Vegas Wash site as a National Monument would protect the unique fossil resources of the area and the geological context of those resources for present and future generations while allowing for public education and continued scientific research opportunities.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Advisory Council established by subsection (g)(1).

(2) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Clark County, Nevada.

(3) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ''local government'' means the City of Las Vegas, City of North Las Vegas, or the County.

(4) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''management plan'' means the management plan for the Monument developed under subsection (d)(5).

(5) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated April 30, 2013.

(6) MONUMENT.—The term ''Monument'' means the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument established by subsection (c)(1).

(7) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' has the meaning given the term ''public lands'' in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(8) PUBLIC WATER AGENCY.—The term ''public water agency'' means a regional wholesale water provider that is engaged in the acquisition of water on behalf of, or the delivery of water to, water purveyors who are member agencies of the public water agency.

(9) QUALIFIED ELECTRIC UTILITY.—The term ''qualified electric utility'' means any public or private utility determined by the Secretary to be technically and financially capable of developing the transmission line.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(11) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to conserve, protect, interpret, and enhance for the benefit of present and future generations the unique and nationally important paleontological, scientific, educational, and recreational resources and values of the land described in this subsection, there is established in the State, subject to valid existing rights, the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.

(2) BOUNDARIES.—The Monument shall consist of approximately 22,650 acres of public land in the County within the boundaries generally depicted on the Map.

(3) MAP; LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare an official map and legal description of the boundaries of the Monument.

(B) LEGAL EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the legal description or the map.

(C) AVAILABILITY OF MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service.

(4) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may acquire land or interests in land within or adjacent to the boundaries of the Monument by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from another Federal agency.

(B) LIMITATION.—Land or interests in land that are owned by the State or a political subdivision of the State may be acquired under subparagraph (A) only by donation or exchange.

(5) WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid existing rights and subsections (e) and (f), any land within the Monument or any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States for inclusion in the Monument after the date of enactment of this Act is withdrawn from—

(A) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing laws, geothermal leasing laws, and minerals materials laws.

(6) RELATIONSHIP TO CLARK COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN.—

(A) AMENDMENT TO PLAN.—The Secretary shall credit, on an acre-for-acre basis, approximately 22,650 acres of the land conserved for the Monument under this Act toward the development of additional non-Federal land within the County through an amendment to the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

(B) EFFECT ON PLAN.—Nothing in this Act otherwise limits, alters, modifies, or amends the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 22,650 acres of public land depicted on the Map as ''Tule Springs Fossil Bed National Monument'' is transferred from the Bureau of Land Management to the National Park Service.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall—

(A) allow only such uses of the Monument that—

(i) are consistent with this section;

(ii) the Secretary determines would further the purposes of the Monument; and

(iii) are consistent with existing rights of previously authorized water facility and high voltage transmission facility rights-of-way and any rights-of-way issued under this Act, including the operation, maintenance, replacement, and repair and repair of the facility; and

(B) manage the Monument—

(i) in a manner that conserves, protects, interprets, and enhances the resources and values of the Monument; and

(ii) in accordance with—

(I) this section;

(II) the provisions of laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System (including the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.)); and

(III) any other applicable laws.

(3) BUFFER ZONES.—The establishment of the Monument shall not—

(A) lead to the creation of express or implied protective perimeters or buffer zones around or over the Monument;

(B) preclude disposal or development of public land adjacent to the boundaries of the Monument, if the disposal or development is consistent with other applicable law;

(C) preclude an activity on, or use of, private land adjacent to the boundaries of the Monument, if the activity or use is consistent with other applicable law; or

(D) directly or indirectly subject an activity on, or use of, private land, to additional regulation, if the activity or use is consistent with other applicable law.

(4) AIR AND WATER QUALITY.—Nothing in this Act alters the standards governing air or water quality outside the boundary of the Monument.

(5) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan

that provides for the long-term protection and management of the Monument.

(B) COMPONENTS.—The management plan—

(i) shall, consistent with this section and the purposes of the Monument—

(I) describe the resources at the Monument that are to be protected;

(II) describe the appropriate uses and management of the Monument;

(III) allow for continued scientific research at the Monument; and

(IV) include a travel management plan that may include existing public transit; and

(ii) may—

(I) incorporate any appropriate decisions contained in an existing management or activity plan for the land designated as the Monument under subsection (c)(1); and

(II) use information developed in any study of land within, or adjacent to, the boundary of the Monument that was conducted before the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) PUBLIC PROCESS.—In preparing the management plan, the Secretary shall—

(i) consult with, and take into account the comments and recommendations of, the Council;

(ii) provide an opportunity for public involvement in the preparation and review of the management plan, including holding public meetings;

(iii) consider public comments received as part of the public review and comment process of the management plan; and

(iv) consult with governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders involved in establishing and improving the regional trail system to incorporate, where appropriate, trails in the Monument that link to the regional trail system.

(6) INTERPRETATION, EDUCATION, AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for public interpretation of, and education and scientific research on, the paleontological resources of the Monument, with priority given to exhibiting and curating the resources.

(B) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and appropriate public and private entities to carry out subparagraph (A).

(e) RENEWABLE ENERGY TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of a complete application from a qualified electric utility, the Secretary, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), shall issue to the qualified electric utility a 400-foot right-of-way for the construction and maintenance of high-voltage transmission facilities depicted on the Map as ''Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor'' if the high-voltage transmission facilities do not conflict with other previously authorized rights-of-way within the corridor.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The high-voltage transmission facilities shall—

(i) be used—

(I) primarily, to the maximum extent practicable, for renewable energy resources; and

(II) to meet reliability standards set by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the Western Electricity Coordinating Council, or the public utilities regulator of the State; and

(ii) employ best management practices identified as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to limit impacts on the Monument, including impacts to the viewshed.

(B) CAPACITY.—The Secretary shall consult with the qualified electric utility that is issued the right-of-way under paragraph (1) and the public utilities regulator of the State to seek to maximize the capacity of the high-voltage transmission facilities.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The issuance of a notice to proceed on the construction of the high-voltage transmission facilities within the right-of-way under paragraph (1) shall be subject to terms and conditions that the Secretary (in consultation with the qualified electric utility), as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), determines appropriate to protect and conserve the resources for which the Monument is managed.

(4) EXPIRATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY.—The right-of-way issued under paragraph (1) shall expire on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act if construction of the high-voltage transmission facilities described in paragraph (1) has not been initiated by that date, unless the Secretary determines that it is in the public interest to continue the right-of-way.

(f) WATER CONVEYANCE FACILITIES.—

(1) WATER CONVEYANCE FACILITIES CORRIDOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of 1 or more complete applications from a public water agency and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), shall issue to the public water agency a 100-foot right-of-way for the construction, maintenance, repair, and replacement of a buried water conveyance pipeline and associated facilities within the ''Water Conveyance Facilities Corridor'' and the ''Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor'' depicted on the Map.

(B) LIMITATION.—A public water agency right-of-way shall not be granted under subparagraph (A) within the portion of the Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor that is located along the Moccasin Drive alignment, which is generally between T. 18 S. and T. 19 S., Mount Diablo Baseline and Meridian.

(2) BURIED WATER CONVEYANCE PIPELINE.—On receipt of 1 or more complete applications from a unit of local government or public water agency, the Secretary, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), shall issue to the unit of local government or public water agency a 100-foot right-of-way for the construction, operation, maintenance, repair, and replacement of a buried water conveyance pipeline to access the existing buried water pipeline turnout facility and surge tank located in the NE ¼ sec. 16 of T. 19 S. and R. 61 E.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.—The water conveyance facilities shall employ best management practices identified as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to limit the impacts of the water conveyance facilities on the Monument.

(B) CONSULTATIONS.—The water conveyance facilities within the ''Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor'' shall be sited in consultation with the qualified electric utility to limit the impacts of the water conveyance facilities on the high-voltage transmission facilities.

(4) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The issuance of a notice to proceed on the construction of the water conveyance facilities within the right-of-way under paragraph (1) shall be subject to any terms and conditions that the Secretary, in consultation with the public water agency, as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), determines appropriate to protect and conserve the resources for which the Monument is managed.

(g) TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—To provide guidance for the management of the Monument, there is established the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Advisory Council.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall consist of 13 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(i) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the County Commission;

(ii) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the city council of Las Vegas, Nevada;

(iii) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the city council of North Las Vegas, Nevada;

(iv) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the tribal council of the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe;

(v) 1 member shall be a representative of the conservation community in southern Nevada;

(vi) 1 member shall be a representative of, or be nominated by, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management;

(vii) 1 member shall be a representative of, or be nominated by, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

(viii) 1 member shall be a representative of, or be nominated by, the Director of the National Park Service;

(ix) 1 member shall be a representative of Nellis Air Force Base;

(x) 1 member shall be nominated by the State;

(xi) 1 member shall reside in the County and have a background that reflects the purposes for which the Monument was established; and

(xii) 2 members shall reside in the County or adjacent counties, both of whom shall have experience in the field of paleontology, obtained through higher education, experience, or both.

(B) INITIAL APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the initial members of the Council in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(3) DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.—The Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to—

(A) the preparation and implementation of the management plan; and

(B) other issues related to the management of the Monument (including budgetary matters).

(4) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for serving on the Council.

(5) CHAIRPERSON.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Council shall elect a Chairperson from among the members of the Council.

(B) LIMITATION.—The Chairperson shall not be a member of a Federal or State agency.

(C) TERM.—The term of the Chairperson shall be 3 years.

(6) TERM OF MEMBERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term of a member of the Council shall be 3 years.

(B) SUCCESSORS.—Notwithstanding the expiration of a 3-year term of a member of the Council, a member may continue to serve on the Council until—

(i) the member is reappointed by the Secretary; or

(ii) a successor is appointed.

(7) VACANCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A vacancy on the Council shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(B) APPOINTMENT FOR REMAINDER OF TERM.—A member appointed to fill a vacancy on the Council—

(i) shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor was appointed; and

(ii) may be nominated for a subsequent term.

(8) TERMINATION.—Unless an extension is jointly recommended by the Director of the National Park Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, the Council shall terminate on the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 3. ADDITION OF LAND TO RED ROCK CANYON NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSERVATION AREA.—The term ''Conservation Area'' means the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area established by the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area Establishment Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 460ccc et seq.).

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated April 30, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) ADDITION OF LAND TO CONSERVATION AREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Conservation Area is expanded to include the land depicted on the map as ''Additions to Red Rock NCA''.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the land is acquired, the Secretary shall update the management plan for the Conservation Area to reflect the management requirements of the acquired land.

(3) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(B) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(i) the map; or

(ii) the legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 4. CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND TO NORTH LAS VEGAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated April 30, 2013.

(2) NORTH LAS VEGAS.—The term ''North Las Vegas'' means the city of North Las Vegas, Nevada.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) CONVEYANCE.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall convey to North Las Vegas, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (b) consists of the land managed by the Bureau of Land Management described on the map as the ''North Las Vegas Job Creation Zone'' (including the interests in the land).

(d) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(e) USE OF LAND FOR NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—North Las Vegas may sell, lease, or otherwise convey any portion of the land described in subsection (c) for nonresidential development.

(2) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale, lease, or conveyance of land under paragraph (1) shall be carried out—

(A) through a competitive bidding process; and

(B) for not less than fair market value.

(3) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the land under paragraph (2)(B) based on an appraisal that is performed in accordance with—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practices; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(4) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—The gross proceeds from the sale, lease, or conveyance of land under paragraph (1) shall be distributed in accordance with section 4(e) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2345; 116 Stat. 2007; 117 Stat. 1317; 118 Stat. 2414; 120 Stat. 3045).

(f) USE OF LAND FOR RECREATION OR OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—North Las Vegas may retain a portion of the land described in subsection (c) for public recreation or other public purposes consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.) by providing written notice of the election to the Secretary.

(2) REVOCATION.—If North Las Vegas retains land for public recreation or other public purposes under paragraph (1), North Las Vegas may—

(A) revoke that election; and

(B) sell, lease, or convey the land in accordance with subsection (e).

(g) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—North Las Vegas shall pay all appraisal costs, survey costs, and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (c).

(h) REVERSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any parcel of land described in subsection (c) is not conveyed for nonresidential development under this section or reserved for recreation or other public purposes under subparagraph (f) by the date that is 30 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the parcel of land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(2) INCONSISTENT USE.—If North Las Vegas uses any parcel of land described in subsection (c) in a manner that is inconsistent with this section—

(A) at the discretion of the Secretary, the parcel shall revert to the United States; or

(B) if the Secretary does not make an election under subparagraph (A), North Las Vegas shall sell the parcel of land in accordance with this section.

SEC. 5. CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND TO LAS VEGAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LAS VEGAS.—The term ''Las Vegas'' means the city of Las Vegas, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated April 30, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights, and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to Las Vegas, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (b) consists of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management described on the map as ''Las Vegas Job Creation Zone'' (including interests in the land).

(d) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(e) USE OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Las Vegas may sell, lease, or otherwise convey any portion of the land described in subsection (c) for nonresidential development.

(2) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale, lease, or conveyance of land under paragraph (1) shall be carried out, after consultation with the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe—

(A) through a competitive bidding process; and

(B) for not less than fair market value.

(3) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the land under paragraph (2)(B) based on an appraisal that is performed in accordance with—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practices; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(4) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—The gross proceeds from the sale, lease, or conveyance of land under paragraph (1) shall be distributed in accordance with section 4(e) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2345; 116 Stat. 2007; 117 Stat. 1317; 118 Stat. 2414; 120 Stat. 3045).

(f) USE OF LAND FOR RECREATION OR OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Las Vegas may retain a portion of the land described in subsection (c) for public recreation or other public purposes consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.) by providing written notice of the election to the Secretary.

(2) REVOCATION.—If Las Vegas retains land for public recreation or other public purposes under paragraph (1), Las Vegas may—

(A) revoke that election; and

(B) sell, lease, or convey the land in accordance with subsection (e).

(g) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Las Vegas shall pay all appraisal costs, survey costs, and other administrative costs necessary for

the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (c).

(h) REVERSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any parcel of land described in subsection (c) is not conveyed for nonresidential development under this section or reserved for recreation or other public purposes under subsection (f) by the date that is 30 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the parcel of land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(2) INCONSISTENT USE.—If Las Vegas uses any parcel of land described in subsection (c) in a manner that is inconsistent with this section—

(A) at the discretion of the Secretary, the parcel shall revert to the United States; or

(B) if the Secretary does not make an election under subparagraph (A), Las Vegas shall sell the parcel of land in accordance with this section.

SEC. 6. EXPANSION OF CONVEYANCE TO LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Section 703 of the Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–282; 116 Stat. 2013) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and the parcel of land identified as 'Conveyance to Las Vegas for Police Shooting Range Access' on the map entitled 'North Las Vegas Valley Overview', and dated April 30, 2013''.

SEC. 7. SPRING MOUNTAINS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA WITHDRAWAL.

Section 8 of the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area Act (16 U.S.C. 460hhh–6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''for lands described'' and inserting ''as provided''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), W½ E ½ and W ½, sec. 27, T. 23 S., R. 58 E., Mt. Diablo Meridian is not subject to withdrawal under that subsection.

''(2) EFFECT OF ENTRY UNDER PUBLIC LAND LAWS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the following are not subject to withdrawal under that paragraph:

''(A) Any Federal land in the Recreation Area that qualifies for conveyance under Public Law 97–465 (commonly known as the ''Small Tracts Act'') (16 U.S.C. 521c et seq.), which, notwithstanding section 7 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 521i), may be conveyed under that Act.

''(B) Any Federal land in the Recreation Area that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for conveyance by exchange for non-Federal land within the Recreation Area under authorities generally providing for the exchange of National Forest System land.''.

SEC. 8. SOUTHERN NEVADA PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1998 AMENDMENTS.

Section 4 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–263; 112 Stat. 2344; 116 Stat. 2007) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking ''dated October 1, 2002'' and inserting ''dated April 30, 2013''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) Notwithstanding paragraph (4), subject to paragraphs (1) through (3), Clark County may convey to a unit of local government or regional governmental entity, without consideration, land located within the Airport Environs Overlay District (as of the date of enactment of this paragraph) if the land is used for a water or wastewater treatment facility or any other public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the 'Recreation and Public Purposes Act') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.), provided that if the conveyed land is used for a purpose other than a public purpose, paragraph (4) would apply to the conveyance.''.

SEC. 9. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD OF REGENTS.—The term ''Board of Regents'' means the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

(2) CAMPUSES.—The term ''Campuses'' means the Great Basin College, College of Southern Nevada, and University of Las Vegas, Nevada, campuses.

(3) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means each of the 3 parcels of Bureau of Land Management land identified on the maps as ''Parcel to be Conveyed'', of which—

(A) approximately 40 acres is to be conveyed for the College of Southern Nevada;

(B) approximately 2,085 acres is to be conveyed for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas; and

(C) approximately 285 acres is to be conveyed for the Great Basin College.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(6) SYSTEM.—The term ''System'' means the Nevada System of Higher Education.

(b) CONVEYANCES OF FEDERAL LAND TO THE SYSTEM.—

(1) CONVEYANCES.—Notwithstanding section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) and section 1(c) of the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869(c)) and subject to all valid existing rights, the Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, convey to the System, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to—

(i) the Federal land identified on the map entitled ''Great Basin College Land Conveyance'' and dated June 26, 2012, for the Great Basin College; and

(ii) the Federal land identified on the map entitled ''College of Southern Nevada Land Conveyance'' and dated June 26, 2012, for the College of Southern Nevada, subject to the requirement that, as a precondition of the conveyance, the Board of Regents shall, by mutual assent, enter into a binding development agreement with the City of Las Vegas that—

(I) provides for the orderly development of the Federal land to be conveyed under this subclause; and

(II) complies with State law; and

(B) convey to the System, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated April 30, 2013 for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, if the area identified as ''Potential Utility Schedule'' on the map is reserved for use for a potential 400-foot utility corridor of certain rights-of-way for transportation and public utilities.

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of the conveyance under paragraph (1), the Board of Regents shall agree in writing—

(i) to pay any administrative costs associated with the conveyance, including the costs of any environmental, wildlife, cultural, or historical resources studies;

(ii) to use the Federal land conveyed for educational and recreational purposes;

(iii) to release and indemnify the United States from any claims or liabilities that may arise from uses carried out on the Federal land on or before the date of enactment of this Act by the United States or any person; and

(iv) to assist the Bureau of Land Management in providing information to the students of the System and the citizens of the State on—

(I) public land (including the management of public land) in the Nation; and

(II) the role of the Bureau of Land Management in managing, preserving, and protecting the public land in the State.

(B) AGREEMENT WITH NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Federal land conveyed to the System under paragraph (1)(B) shall be used in accordance with the agreement entitled the ''Cooperative Interlocal Agreement between the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education, on Behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and the 99th Air Base Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada'' and dated June 19, 2009.

(ii) MODIFICATIONS.—Any modifications to the agreement described in clause (i) or any related master plan shall require the mutual assent of the parties to the agreement.

(iii) LIMITATION.—In no case shall the use of the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1)(B) compromise the national security mission or avigation rights of Nellis Air Force Base.

(3) USE OF FEDERAL LAND.—The System may use the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1) for any public purposes consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.)).

(4) REVERSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Federal land or any portion of the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1) ceases to be used for the System, the Federal land, or any portion of the Federal land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS.—If the System fails to complete the first building or show progression toward development of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus on the applicable parcels of Federal land by the date that is 50 years after the date of receipt of certification of acceptable remediation of environmental conditions, the parcels of the Federal land described in subsection (a)(3)(B) shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(C) COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA.—If the System fails to complete the first building or show progression toward development of the College of Southern Nevada campus on the applicable parcels of Federal land by the date that is 12 years after the date of conveyance of the applicable parcels of Federal land to the College of Southern Nevada, the parcels of the Federal land described in subsection (a)(3)(A) shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 10. LAND CONVEYANCE FOR SOUTHERN NEVADA SUPPLEMENTAL AIRPORT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Clark County, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map entitled ''Land Conveyance for Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport'' and dated June 26, 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) LAND CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date described in paragraph (2), subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (3), and notwithstanding the land use

planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the County, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (c).

(2) DATE ON WHICH CONVEYANCE MAY BE MADE.—The Secretary shall not make the conveyance described in paragraph (1) until the later of the date on which the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration has—

(A) approved an airport layout plan for an airport to be located in the Ivanpah Valley; and

(B) with respect to the construction and operation of an airport on the site conveyed to the County pursuant to section 2(a) of the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act (Public Law 106–362; 114 Stat. 1404), issued a record of decision after the preparation of an environmental impact statement or similar analysis required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(3) RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS.—In conveying the public land under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall reserve the mineral estate, except for purposes related to flood mitigation (including removal from aggregate flood events).

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the public land to be conveyed under paragraph (1) is withdrawn from—

(A) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(B) operation of the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws.

(5) USE.—The public land conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be used for the development of flood mitigation infrastructure for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport.

(6) REVERSION AND REENTRY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the land conveyed to the County under the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act (Public Law 106-362; 114 Stat. 1404) reverts to the United States, the land conveyed to the County under this section shall revert, at the option of the Secretary, to the United States.

(B) USE OF LAND.—If the Secretary determines that the County is not using the land conveyed under this section for a purpose described in paragraph (4), all right, title, and interest of the County in and to the land shall revert, at the option of the Secretary, to the United States.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (b) consists of the approximately 2,320 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and described on the map as the ''Conveyance Area''.

(d) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare an official legal description and map of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 11. SUNRISE MOUNTAIN INSTANT STUDY AREA RELEASE.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that for the purposes of section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782), the public land in Clark County, Nevada, administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the Sunrise Mountain Instant Study Area has been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) RELEASE.—Any public land described in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness—

(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S. C. 1782(c)); and

(2) shall be managed in accordance with land management plans adopted under section 202 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1712).

(c) POST RELEASE LAND USE APPROVALS.—Recognizing that the area released under subsection (b) presents unique opportunities for the granting of additional rights-of-way, including for high voltage transmission facilities, the Secretary of the Interior may accommodate multiple applicants within a particular right-of-way.

SEC. 12. NELLIS DUNES OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE RECREATION AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of North Las Vegas, Nevada.

(2) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Clark County, Nevada.

(3) ECONOMIC SUPPORT AREA.—The term ''Economic Support Area'' means the land identified on the map as the ''Economic Support Area''.

(4) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 1,211 acres of Federal land in the County, as depicted on the map.

(5) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area'' and dated April 30, 2013.

(6) NELLIS DUNES RECREATION AREA.—The term ''Nellis Dunes Recreation Area'' means the Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area identified on the map as ''Nellis Dunes OHV Recreation Area''.

(7) NET PROCEEDS.—The term ''net proceeds'' means the amount that is equal to the difference between—

(A) the amount of gross revenues received by the County from any activities at the Economic Support Area; and

(B) the total amount expended by the County (or a designee of the County) for capital improvements to each of the Economic Support Area and the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area, provided that the capital improvements shall not exceed 80 percent of the total gross proceeds.

(8) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the County, subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (2), without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcels of Federal land.

(2) RESERVATION OF MINERAL ESTATE.—In conveying the parcels of Federal land under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall reserve the mineral estate, except for purposes related to flood mitigation (including removal from aggregate flood events).

(3) USE OF FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The parcels of Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1)—

(i) shall be used by the County—

(I) to provide a suitable location for the establishment of a centralized off-road vehicle recreation park in the County;

(II) to provide the public with opportunities for off-road vehicle recreation, including a location for races, competitive events, training and other commercial services that directly support a centralized off-road vehicle recreation area and County park; and

(III) to provide a designated area and facilities that would discourage unauthorized use of off-highway vehicles in areas that have been identified by the Federal Government, State government, or County government as containing environmentally sensitive land; and

(ii) shall not be disposed of by the County.

(B) REVERSION.—If the County ceases to use any parcel of the Federal land for the purposes described in subparagraph (A)(i) or subparagraph (D)—

(i) title to the parcel shall revert to the United States, at the option of the United States; and

(ii) the County shall be responsible for any reclamation necessary to revert the parcel to the United States.

(C) RENEWABLE AND SOLAR ENERGY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), the parcels of Federal land conveyed to the County under paragraph (1) and the land conveyed to the County under section 1(c) of Public Law 107–350 (116 Stat. 2975), may be used for the incidental purpose of generating renewable energy and solar energy for use by the Clark County Off Highway Vehicle Recreation Park, the shooting park authorized under that Act, and the County.

(ii) LIMITATION.—Any project authorized under clause (i) shall not interfere with the national security mission of Nellis Air Force Base or any other military operation.

(iii) REQUIRED CONSULTATION.—Before the construction of any proposed project under clause (i), the project proponent shall consult with the Secretary of Defense or a designee of the Secretary of Defense.

(D) FUTURE CONVEYANCES.—Any future conveyance of Federal land for addition to the Clark County Off Highway Vehicle Park or the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area shall be subject to—

(i) the binding interlocal agreement under paragraph (4)(B); and

(ii) the aviation easement requirements under paragraph (7).

(E) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary of the Air Force and the County, may develop a special management plan for the Federal land—

(i) to enhance public safety and safe off-highway vehicle recreation use in the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area;

(ii) to ensure compatible development with the mission requirements of the Nellis Air Force Base; and

(iii) to avoid and mitigate known public health risks associated with off-highway vehicle use in the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area.

(4) ECONOMIC SUPPORT AREA.—

(A) DESIGNATION.—There is designated the Economic Support Area.

(B) INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Before the Economic Support Area may be developed, the City and County shall enter into an interlocal agreement regarding the development of the Economic Support Area.

(ii) LIMITATION OF AGREEMENT.—In no case shall the interlocal agreement under this subparagraph compromise or interfere with the aviation rights provided under paragraph (7) and subsection (c)(3).

(C) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Of the net proceeds from the development of the Economic Support Area, the County shall—

(i) annually deposit 50 percent in a special account in the Treasury, to be used by the Secretary for the development, maintenance, operations, and environmental restoration and mitigation of the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area; and

(ii) retain 50 percent, to be used by the County—

(I) to pay for capital improvements [that are not covered by subsection (a)(7)(B)]; and

(II) to maintain and operate the park established under paragraph (3)(A)(i)(I).

(5) AGREEMENT WITH NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the Federal land may be conveyed to the County under paragraph (1), the Clark County Board of Commissioners and Nellis Air Force Base shall enter into an interlocal agreement for the Federal land and the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area—

(i) to enhance safe off-highway recreation use; and

(ii) to ensure that development of the Federal land is consistent with the long-term mission requirements of Nellis Air Force Base.

(B) LIMITATION.—The use of the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (1) shall not compromise the national security mission or aviation rights of Nellis Air Force Base.

(6) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—With respect to the conveyance of Federal land under paragraph (1), the Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(7) AVIATION EASEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each deed entered into for the conveyance of the Federal land shall contain a perpetual aviation easement reserving to the United States all rights necessary to preserve free and unobstructed overflight in and through the airspace above, over, and across the surface of the Federal land conveyed under subsection (b)(1) for the passage of aircraft owned or operated by any Federal agency or other Federal entity.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Each easement described in subparagraph (A) shall include such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Air Force determines to be necessary to comply with subparagraph (A).

(c) DESIGNATION OF THE NELLIS DUNES NATIONAL OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE RECREATION AREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The approximately 10,000 acres of land identified as ''Nellis Dunes'' in the Bureau of Land Management Resource Management Plan shall be known and designated as the ''Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area''.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Director of the Bureau of Land Management may develop a special management plan for the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area to enhance the safe use of off-highway vehicles for recreational purposes.

(3) AVIATION RIGHTS.—The aviation rights described in subsection (b)(7) shall apply to the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area.

(d) WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LAND FOR NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.—

(1) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as otherwise provided in this subsection—

(A) the Federal land and interests in the Federal land identified on the map as ''Land to be withdrawn for Nellis Air Force Base'' are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the general land laws, including the mining, mineral leasing, and geothermal leasing laws; and

(B) jurisdiction over the land and interest in land withdrawn and reserved by this subsection is transferred to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(2) RESERVATION.—The land withdrawn under paragraph (1) is reserved for use by the Secretary of the Air Force for—

(A) the enlargement and protection of Nellis Air Force Base; or

(B) other defense-related purposes consistent with the purposes of this subsection.

(3) CHANGES IN USE.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall consult with the Secretary before using the land withdrawn and reserved by this subsection for any purpose other than the purposes described in subsection (b)(3)(A)(i).

(4) EASEMENT.—The United States reserves—

(A) a right of flight for the passage of aircraft in the airspace above the surface of the Federal land conveyed to the County; and

(B) the right to cause in the airspace any noise, vibration, smoke, or other effects that may be inherent in the operation of aircraft landing at, or taking off from, Nellis Air Force Base.

SEC. 13. CONVEYANCE OF LAND FOR NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the parcel of Federal land described in subsection (b) is transferred from the Bureau of Land Management to the Air Force for inclusion in Nellis Air Force Base.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcel of Federal land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 410 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and identified as ''Addition to Nellis Air Force Base'' on the map entitled ''North Las Vegas Valley Overview'' and dated April 30, 2013.

SEC. 14. MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) military aircraft testing and training activities in the State of Nevada—

(A) are an important part of the national defense system of the United States; and

(B) are essential in order to secure an enduring and viable national defense system for the current and future generations of people of the United States;

(2) the units of the National Park System and the additions to the Conservation Area established under this Act are located within a region critical to providing training, research, and development for the Armed Forces of the United States and allies of the Armed Forces;

(3) there is a lack of alternative sites available for the military training, testing, and research activities being conducted in the State of Nevada;

(4) continued use of the airspace in the State of Nevada is essential for military purposes; and

(5) continuation of the military activities in the State of Nevada, under appropriate terms and conditions, is not incompatible with the protection and proper management of the natural, environmental, cultural, and other resources and values of Federal land in the State of Nevada.

(b) OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act or any other land management law applicable to a new unit of the National Park System or an addition to the Conservation Area designated by this Act shall restrict or preclude overflights, including—

(1) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the Federal land; and

(2) military overflights that can be seen or heard within the unit or Conservation Area.

(c) SPECIAL AIRSPACE.—Nothing in this Act or any other land management law applicable to a new unit of the National Park or an addition to the Conservation Area designated by this Act shall restrict or preclude the designation of new units of special airspace or the use or establishment of military flight training routes over the unit or Conservation Area.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 980. A bill to provide for enhanced embassy security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise at this moment, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, outraged at the implication that we in the Senate have not done enough to investigate what has happened in Benghazi; that we have not investigated it thoroughly; that we have not looked at the details, have not analyzed the information—classified and unclassified—that has come before us.

The committee has held four hearings—four—on the attack on Special Mission Benghazi. The very first hearing I chaired in January was on this topic with Secretary Clinton. In fact, we postponed the nomination hearing of Senator Kerry so that Secretary Clinton could come before us and explain what happened and why, despite her medical condition at the time.

Let's make that very clear. One of the very first things we did, despite a pending nomination of a new Secretary, and the sitting Secretary's medical concerns, was to hold a hearing on this topic and air the facts. Prior to that, Chairman Kerry held a hearing of the committee on December 20 on the events that transpired in Benghazi with Deputy Secretaries Burns and Nides. There were also two classified briefings in December specifically on the circumstances surrounding the attack. The December 13 briefing included a video of the attack with high level officials from State, the Joint Staff, Defense Department, the FBI, and the intelligence community. They included Patrick Kennedy, Under Secretary of State for Management at State; Matthew Olsen, Director of the National Counterterrorism Center; Maj. Gen. Darryl Roberson, Vice Director of Operations at the Joint Staff; Gary Reid, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict; Jenny Ley, Deputy Assistant Director at the FBI.

On December 19, there was a high-level classified briefing with the Accountability Review Board with Ambassador Pickering and Admiral Mullen.

At his nomination hearing in January, Secretary Kerry also fully addressed this issue and then again at the committee's annual budget hearing this past April. Last week, the nominee to be our new Ambassador to Libya, Deborah Kay Jones, testified before the full committee—another opportunity for my friends on the other side to ask questions, to get the truth, not create their own truth for political purposes. That hearing was yet another opportunity to ask questions about the security situation on the ground. Yet Republican participation was limited to just a handful of Members.

We have fully vetted this issue. We have held hearing after hearing. We have, on both sides, had the opportunity to have our questions answered. In fact, in total, between the House and the Senate, there have been 11 hearings on Benghazi, 25,000 pages of documents released, and now a full e-mail history of the interagency process.

Our focus now should not be on the work product of the CIA or State on draft talking points we have seen in hundreds of e-mails released by the White House yesterday; it should not be to score political points at the expense of the families of the four victims. It should be on doing all we can to protect our personnel serving overseas and providing the necessary oversight and legislative authority to carry out the Administrative Review Board's recommendations.

I would remind my friends and the American people that nothing has changed. The facts remain the facts. They are the same today as they were in September, in October, in November, in December, and in January. It is the rhetoric and the political calculus that has changed. In fact, the e-mails released by the White House further demonstrate that point.

The original CIA-produced talking points, notably produced as the result of a request by the House Intelligence Committee for media interviews, clearly show that in the days immediately after the attack, the intelligence community was not sure what exactly happened or who was responsible. The points produced by the CIA said the agency's belief the events in Benghazi were spontaneously inspired by the protests at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo and evolved into a direct assault against the U.S. diplomatic post in Benghazi and subsequently its annex. That point stays in the talking points from beginning to end of the interagency process, with no debate, and is conveyed to the House Intelligence Committee.

Throughout the e-mail discussions, the agency makes clear their information is limited and that there is a lot they simply don't know. In fact, the National Counterterrorism Center says in one e-mail:

> At this point we are not aware of any actionable intelligence that this attack was planned or imminent. The intelligence community is combing through reporting from before and after the attack to determine the full extent of who was involved.

It became clear over time that this was, in fact, a calculated terrorist attack, but there was no political calculation involved in the initial assessment.

So let's be honest about what is happening here. It is not about doing all we can to find the truth and making sure it never happens again; it is about political gamesmanship and finding someone to blame.

I remind my friends, and the American people, again, nothing has changed. Some wish to make this a political issue to drive a purely political agenda. I believe our real focus, our honest focus, and what the American people truly care about is the security of our missions and the safety of our personnel. That has been, and will remain, the clear focus of the Foreign Relations Committee going forward, and I hope we will have the support of our Republican colleagues.

In my view the Monday morning quarterbacking on this issue is politically driven—a perspective shared by former Republican Defense Secretary Gates, who said on Sunday: ''Frankly, I think my decisions would have been just as theirs were'' with regard to sending in Special Forces teams or overflights by fighter aircraft based in Italy.

Former Secretary Gates said:

> Without knowing what the environment is, without knowing what the threat is, without having any intelligence in terms of what is actually going on, on the ground, would have been very dangerous.

So I think we have common interests. I have been working hard to ensure full implementation of all 29 recommendations made by the Administrative Review Board—recommendations to ensure that going forward we are providing adequate personnel and resources to meet local conditions at more than 280 facilities in over 180 countries around the world, specifically where host nations are unable to provide adequate protection to our diplomats. I call on our Republican colleagues to join us in that effort.

Today, I am introducing legislation. I hope we will be able to count on the support of all of our colleagues to enact this crucial, time-sensitive legislation without delay, without obstruction, and without political grandstanding.

The bill will provide authority to fund the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program to permit us to move forward with construction at high-risk, high-threat posts. This account was created following the U.S. Embassy bombings in Kenya and in Tanzania, and at that time it would have allowed us to construct 8 to 10 facilities per year. However, the way the Congress is funding it, it presently is funding for construction of just two to three facilities per year, despite the fact that there are at least two dozen posts that fall into that high-risk, high-threat category. At that rate it will take us over 8 years to get around to construction at just the posts with the highest risk of attack.

The bill authorizes funding for Arabic language training and for a Foreign Affairs Security Training Center to train diplomatic security personnel. It provides contract authority to the State Department to allow it to award contracts on a best value basis rather than to the lowest bidder where conditions require enhanced levels of security. At the administration's request, the bill will authorize disciplinary action in cases of unsatisfactory leadership by senior officials related to a security incident, which does not presently exist. This will allow appropriate disciplinary action to be taken against any future officials in a circumstance such as Benghazi.

The bill requires planning to incorporate additional marine security guards at overseas facilities, and it requires extensive reporting on State's implementation of the Accountability Review Board's recommendations on the designation of high-risk, high-threat posts.

I hope we can work together to do what has to be done to protect those who serve this Nation abroad. If we want to address the problem, we have an opportunity to do it. If we want to score political points, fine, but do not do it at the risk of American lives. Let's work together to fix the problem, not use it for political advantage.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 983. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 983

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 ''Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On May 10, 2013, the Internal Revenue Service admitted that it singled out advocacy groups, based on ideology, seeking tax-exempt status.

(2) This action raises pertinent questions about the agency's ability to implement and oversee the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152).

(3) This action could be an indication of future Internal Revenue Service abuses in relation to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, given that it is their responsibility to enforce a key provision, the individual mandate.

(4) Americans accept the principle that patients, families, and doctors should be making medical decisions, not the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING ENFORCEMENT OF PPACA AND HCERA.

The Secretary of the Treasury, or any delegate of the Secretary, shall not implement or enforce any provisions of or amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 143—RECOGNIZING THE THREATS TO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND EXPRESSION AROUND THE WORLD AND REAFFIRMING FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AS A PRIORITY IN THE EFFORTS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE ON THE OCCASION OF WORLD PRESS FREEDOM DAY ON MAY 3, 2013

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 143

Whereas Article 19 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted at Paris December 10, 1948, states that ''everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers'';

Whereas, in 1993, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed May 3 of each year as World Press Freedom Day to celebrate the fundamental principles of freedom of the press, to evaluate freedom of the press around the world, to defend the media from attacks on its independence, and to pay tribute to journalists who have lost their lives in the exercise of their profession;

Whereas 2013 is the 20th anniversary of World Press Freedom Day, which focuses on the theme ''Safe to Speak: Securing Freedom of Expression in All Media'';

Whereas the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note; Public Law 111–166), which was passed by unanimous consent in the Senate and signed into law by President Barack Obama in 2010, expanded the examination of freedom of the press around the world in the annual human rights report of the Department of State;

Whereas, according to Freedom House, the percentage of people in the world who live in countries with a free media environment fell to 14 percent in 2012, the lowest percentage in more than a decade;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, 88 journalists and 47 citizen journalists were killed in 2012 in connection with their collection and dissemination of news and information, an increase of 33 percent and 840 percent, respectively, compared to 2011;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, the five deadliest countries for journalists in 2012 were Syria, Somalia, Pakistan, Mexico, and Brazil;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, 593 journalists have been murdered since 1992 without the perpetrators of those crimes facing punishment;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, the five countries with the highest number of unsolved journalist murders since 2003 as a percentage of the population of that country are Iraq, Somalia, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Colombia;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, 879 journalists and 144 citizen journalists were arrested in 2012;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, there were a record 232 journalists in prison worldwide on December 1, 2012;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, the five countries in which the most journalists are imprisoned are Turkey, China, Eritrea, Iran, and Syria;

Whereas the abuse of anti-terrorism and cybercrime laws to incarcerate journalists and suppress freedom of the press occurred on numerous occasions abroad in 2012;

Whereas freedom of the press is a key component of democratic governance, the activism of civil society, and socio-economic development;

Whereas, in the ongoing political transition of Burma, notable progress was made in advancing freedom of the press in 2012, although certain problems remain; and

Whereas freedom of the press enhances public accountability, transparency, and participation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses concern about the threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world on the occasion of World Press Freedom Day on May 3, 2013;

(2) commends journalists around the world for the essential role they play in promoting government accountability, defending democratic activity, and strengthening civil society, despite threats to their safety;

(3) pays tribute to the journalists who have lost their lives carrying out their work and calls on governments abroad to thoroughly investigate and seek to resolve all cases while ensuring the protection of witnesses;

(4) condemns all actions around the world that suppress freedom of the press;

(5) reaffirms the centrality of freedom of the press to efforts by the United States Government to support democracy, mitigate conflict, and promote good governance domestically and around the world; and

(6) calls on the President and the Secretary of State—

(A) to improve the means by which the United States Government rapidly identifies, publicizes, and responds to threats against freedom of the press around the world; and

(B) to highlight the issue of threats against freedom of the press year-round.

SENATE RESOLUTION 144—CONCERNING THE ONGOING CONFLICT IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO AND THE NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS SUPPORTING LONG-TERM PEACE, STABILITY, AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 144

Whereas, since the 1990s, an estimated 5,000,000 people have died due to repeated cycles of conflict, lack of governance, and atrocities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, particularly those in North and South Kivu provinces, and, since the beginning of 2012, more than 2,000,000 people have been displaced;

Whereas the United Nations and humanitarian groups have reported staggering rates of sexual violence indicating tens of thousands of cases perpetrated by security forces of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and non-state armed groups, which continue to operate with nearly total impunity;

Whereas human rights defenders in the Democratic Republic of the Congo have been subject to intimidation and attack;

Whereas the Democratic Republic of the Congo's wealth of natural resources, including minerals, have been a key driver of instability and violence;

Whereas the deeply flawed November 2011 presidential election in the Democratic Republic of the Congo presented significant political, economic, and social challenges, and provincial and local elections still have not been conducted despite plans to hold such elections in 2012;

Whereas the Democratic Republic of the Congo remains subject to recurring conflict despite one of the world's longest-running, largest, and most expensive international peacekeeping operations and extensive bilateral and multilateral efforts to address longstanding humanitarian crises, forge lasting peace, and pursue security sector reform and accountability;

Whereas members of civil society and political parties from both the majority and the opposition in the Democratic Republic of the Congo created the National Preparatory Committee (Comité National Préparatoire or CNP) to lay the groundwork for convening a national forum and dialogue with the goal of putting an end to the multifaceted crisis that afflicts the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Whereas, on November 15, 2012, the United Nations Group of Experts provided compelling evidence that the crisis in eastern Congo had been fueled and exacerbated by regional actors, including through provision of significant military and logistical assistance and of operational and political support to the armed group known as the M23;

Whereas the United Nations and United States Government have imposed sanctions on the M23 and its leaders for human rights atrocities including rape, massacres, and the recruitment and physical and psychological torture of child soldiers;

Whereas, on March 18, 2013, International Criminal Court (ICC) indictee and leader of a faction of the M23 rebel group, Bosco Ntaganda, turned himself in to the United States Embassy in Kigali, asking to be transferred to the ICC in The Hague, where he voluntary surrendered on March 22, 2013;

Whereas the Lord's Resistance Army continues to perpetrate attacks against civilian populations in affected areas of northeastern Congo, creating widespread insecurity and displacement;

Whereas the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, and 9 other countries on February 24, 2013, signed the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework that provides for a comprehensive approach to the ongoing conflict;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 2098 on March 28, 2013, extending the mandate of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission (MONUSCO) and authorizing the creation of an intervention brigade tasked with neutralizing armed groups; and

Whereas, on March 18, 2013, United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon appointed former President of Ireland and High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson, to serve as Special Envoy for the Great Lakes region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon's commitment and leadership to resolving the crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and his appointment of Mary Robinson as United Nations Special Envoy to the Great Lakes;

(2) supports the commitments agreed to by the signatories of the Peace, Security and Cooperation (in this resolution, the ''Framework''), and encourages them to work closely with the United Nations, the African Union, the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region, the Southern African Development Community, as guarantors of

the Framework, and the United Nations Special Envoy, MONUSCO, and relevant international bodies and governments to develop, implement, and enforce a comprehensive peace process for the region;

(3) notes that the adoption of the Framework, the appointment of Mary Robinson as United Nations Special Envoy to the Great Lakes, and the expanded MONUSCO mandate provide an opportunity to make meaningful and sustained progress toward ending the recurrent cycles of violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, especially in eastern Congo;

(4) urges the signatories of the Framework and the international community to engage and consult with representatives of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and civil society representatives engaged in the ongoing effort to convene an inclusive national forum and dialogue;

(5) urges the President to appoint a Special Envoy to the Great Lakes in the near-term in order to represent the United States in international and regional efforts to end the conflict and secure sustainable peace, stability, and safety for the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo by—

(A) working with United Nations Special Envoy Mary Robinson and the broader international community to promote a transparent and inclusive process to implement the regional and national commitments under the Framework, including the development of clear benchmarks for progress and appropriate follow-on measures;

(B) strengthening international efforts to mobilize and support justice for victims and accountability for perpetrators of sexual and gender based violence and other human rights abuses in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

(C) expanding efforts to develop conflict-free and responsible mining and supply chains for the region's vast mineral resources, in coordination with other government, private industry, and international and local organizations;

(D) coordinating with international and regional partners to expand unhindered access to life-saving humanitarian assistance to populations in need, particularly displaced persons and conflict-affected communities;

(E) pressing for fulfillment of the commitment of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as well as other regional actors, to ending the threat posed by the M23, the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR), and other armed groups in the Great Lakes region, and to facilitate enhanced coordination of regional efforts to counter these groups; and

(F) mobilizing and facilitating United States and international support for electoral reforms in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with the goal of encouraging free, fair, and credible provincial and local elections in the near-term, and presidential elections in 2016;

(6) calls on the President to support the creation of a World Bank Fund for the Great Lakes Region, as part of a coordinated international investment and development strategy aimed at deepening regional economic integration and stability and leveraging reform;

(7) calls on the President, in close coordination with international and regional partners, to work with the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to develop and implement recommendations to improve accountability for serious violations of international humanitarian law and human rights abuses in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including by considering imposition of sanctions authorized under section 1284 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note);

(8) calls on governments of the Great Lakes region of Africa to immediately halt and prevent any and all forms of support to non-state armed groups, including support provided by individuals independent of government policy;

(9) calls on all relevant nations, including destination and transit countries, to increase cooperation on ending the illicit trade in conflict minerals, wildlife, and wildlife parts, which continues to fuel and fund violence and to deprive citizens of economic opportunity in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the broader region;

(10) calls on the signatories of the Framework to cooperate in the arrest and prosecution of those responsible for violating international humanitarian law and for serious human rights violations, including gender-based violence;

(11) calls on the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to engage in meaningful and inclusive electoral reforms, prepare and hold impartially administered local and provincial elections as soon as technically possible, continue to participate in ongoing efforts to provide a platform for inclusive dialogue within the Democratic Republic of the Congo to address critical internal political issues, and strengthen processes of state institution building;

(12) calls on the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in coordination with the international community, to undertake significant security sector reform, which is a necessary component for lasting stability, and renewed disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) efforts that ensure that any rebel troops, especially commanders, responsible for human rights violations are held accountable and not reintegrated into the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (FARDC); and

(13) urges the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to improve efforts to protect civilians from armed groups, in cooperation with MONUSCO and the African Union's Regional Cooperation Initiative on the LRA.

SENATE RESOLUTION 145—PROMOTING MINORITY HEALTH AWARENESS AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL MINORITY HEALTH MONTH IN APRIL 2013 TO BRING ATTENTION TO THE HEALTH DISPARITIES FACED BY MINORITY POPULATIONS SUCH AS AMERICAN INDIANS AND ALASKA NATIVES, ASIANS, BLACKS OR AFRICAN AMERICANS, HISPANICS OR LATINOS, AND NATIVE HAWAIIANS AND OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDERS

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 145

Whereas in 2011, the Department of Health and Human Services released the ''National Stakeholder Strategy for Achieving Health Equity'' and the ''Disparities action Plan'' to reduce health care disparities in the United States;

Whereas a recent analysis estimates that the economy of the United States loses an estimated $309,000,000,000 a year due to the direct and indirect costs of health disparities;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has identified 6 main categories in which racial and ethnic minorities experience the most disparate access to health care and health outcomes, including infant mortality, cancer screening and management, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, HIV and AIDS infection, and immunizations;

Whereas African-American women are more than twice as likely to die of cervical cancer than White women and are more likely to die of breast cancer than women of any other racial or ethnic group;

Whereas the rate of death from coronary heart disease is 30 percent higher among African Americans than among Whites;

Whereas the death rate from stroke is 50 percent higher among African Americans than among Whites;

Whereas in 2012, as compared to non-Hispanic Whites living in Hawaii, Native Hawaiians had more than twice the rate of medically-diagnosed diabetes and were 5.7 times more likely to die of diabetes;

Whereas compared to non-Hispanic White men, African American men are 9.5 times more likely to die of AIDS and Hispanic men are 2.5 times more likely to die of AIDS;

Whereas in 2010, 84 percent of children born with HIV infection belonged to minority groups;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has identified diseases of the heart, malignant neoplasm, unintentional injuries, diabetes, and cerebrovascular disease as some of the leading causes of death among American Indians and Alaska Natives;

Whereas American Indians and Alaska Natives die at higher rates than other people in the United States from tuberculosis, diabetes, unintentional injuries, and suicide; and

Whereas American Indians and Alaska Natives have a life expectancy that is 5.2 years shorter than the life expectancy of the overall population of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2013 to bring attention to the severe health disparities faced by minority populations such as American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians, Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics or Latinos, and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders.

SENATE RESOLUTION 146—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 12 THROUGH MAY 18, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL POLICE WEEK''

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 146

Whereas, in 1962, John Fitzgerald Kennedy proclaimed May 15 to be ''Peace Officers Memorial Day'', and designated the calendar week in which May 15 falls as ''National Police Week'';

Whereas law enforcement officers are charged with pursuing justice and protecting communities in the United States;

Whereas State and local police officers, sheriffs, and other law enforcement officers across the United States serve with dignity and integrity;

Whereas law enforcement officers serve as first responders to natural disasters such as Hurricane Isaac and Hurricane Sandy;

Whereas law enforcement officers serve as first responders to terrorist attacks such as

the bombings at the Boston Marathon in Boston, Massachusetts, and to accidents such as the fertilizer plant explosion in West, Texas;

Whereas law enforcement officers selflessly risk their personal safety in the interest of public safety;

Whereas Peace Officers Memorial Day honors law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty;

Whereas Peace Officers Memorial Day this year honors 143 law enforcement officers recently killed in the line of duty, including Randall L. Benoit, Brandon Joseph Nielson, Jeremy Michael Triche, Ricky Ray Issac, Jr., Howard Evans Jr., Raymundo Dominguez, Steven C. D. Green Sr., David W. Ridlesperger, Scott J. Ward, William H. Coleman, James D. Lister, David W. Wargo Jr., Barbara A. Ester, Robert L. Paris Jr., Kenyon M. Youngstrom, Jeremy S. Bitner, James J. Davies, Leide W. DeFusco, Celena C. Hollis, Mary K. Ricard, Matthew R. Tyner, William H. Dyer III, Michael K. Erickson, Barbara A. Pill, Christopher A. Schaub, Bruce E. St. Laurent, Ruben H. Thomas III, David A. White, Sean L. Callahan, Robert W. Crapse Sr., Elgin L. Daniel, Richard J. Halford, Shawn A. Smiley, Larry L. Stell, Gail D. Thomas, Garret C. Davis, Eric C. Fontes, Chad M. Morimoto, Nikkii Bostic-Jones, Kyle W. Deatherage, Lamont C. Reid, Timothy A. Betts, Britney R. Meux, Robert L. Atherly, Davis S. Gogian, Herbert D. Proffitt, Carl A. Rakes, Mark A. Taulbee, Charles B. Licato, Adrian A. Morris, William D. Talbert, Forrest E. Taylor, Teresa L. Testerman, Kevin E. Ambrose, Peter J. Kneeland, Jose Torres, Ryan Tvelia, Joseph T. Candie, Patrick J. O'Rourke, Thomas E. Decker, Michael J. Walter, William M. Mudd, Christopher R. Parsons, George F. Ross Sr., Tracy A. Hardin, Denny Lawrence, Michael P. Maloney, James G. Hoopes III, Christopher W. Reeves, Robert A. Potter, Amanda D. Anna, Fermin S. Archer Jr., Michael J. Chiapperini, Arthur Lopez, Joseph P. Olivieri Jr., Christopher M. Pupo, Bobby G. DeMuth Jr., Jeremiah M. Goodson Jr., Dewayne C. Hester, William R. Mast Jr., Edward A. Pounds, Randall S. Thomas, William L. Wright, Jason E. Gresko, Frank D. Mancini, William C. Coen, Brian E. Hayden, Jeffrey M. McCoy, Blake T. Coble, Bradley M. Fox, Avery E. Freeman, Brian J. Lorenzo, Moses Walker Jr., Maxwell R. Dorley, Sandra E. Rogers, David C. Gann, Martoiya V. Lang, Justin D. Maples, Javier Arana Jr., Brian D. Bachmann, Angel Garcia, Paul Hernandez, Joshua S. Mitchell, Jonathan K. Molina, Edrees Mukhtar, Jimmie D. Norman, Jamie D. Padron, Michael R. Smith, Joshua S. Williams, Aaron R. Beesley, Jard D. Francom, Morton M. Ford III, Andrew D. Fox, Michael C. Walzier, Chris Yung, Tony V. Radulescu, Marshall L. Bailey, Michael T. May, Eric M. Workman, Sergio Aleman, Jennifer L. Sebena, Margaret A. Anderson, Merrill A. Bruguier, Leopoldo Cavazos Jr., David R. Delaney, James R. Dominiguez, Terrell Horne III, Nicholas J. Ivie, Julio D. La Rosa, Preston B. Parnell, Jeffrey Ramirez, Abimael Castro-Berrocales, Pedro R. Cora-Rivera, Noel D. Cordero-Guzman, Francis A. Crespo-Mandry, Carlos R. Lozada Vergara, Isaac J. Pizarro-Piazarro, Wilfredo Ramos-Nieves, Ivan G. Romas-Matos, Victor M. Soto-Velez, and Colvin T. Georges; and

Whereas more than 35 law enforcement officers across the United States have made the ultimate sacrifice during the first 4 months of 2013, including Officer Sean Collier of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Police Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 12 through May 18, 2013 as ''National Police Week'';

(2) expresses strong support for law enforcement officers across the United States for their efforts to build safer and more secure communities;

(3) recognizes the need to ensure that law enforcement officers have the equipment, training, and resources necessary to protect their health and safety while they are protecting the public;

(4) recognizes the members of the law enforcement community for their selfless acts of bravery;

(5) acknowledges that police officers and other law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice should be remembered and honored; and

(6) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Police Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the vital role of law enforcement officers in building safer and more secure communities across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 147—RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT THE CHALLENGES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM, AND ENCOURAGING CONGRESS TO IMPLEMENT POLICY TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 147

Whereas National Foster Care Month was established more than 20 years ago to—

(1) bring foster care issues to the forefront of public consciousness;

(2) highlight the importance of permanency for every child; and

(3) recognize the essential role that foster parents, social workers, and advocates have in the lives of children in foster care throughout the United States;

Whereas all children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent home;

Whereas the primary goal of the foster care system is to ensure the safety and well-being of children while working to provide a safe, loving, and permanent home for each child;

Whereas approximately 400,000 children are living in foster care;

Whereas approximately 252,000 youth entered the foster care system in 2011, while more than 104,000 youth were eligible for and awaiting adoption at the end of 2011;

Whereas children of minority races and ethnicities are more likely to stay in the foster care system for longer periods of time and are less likely to be reunited with their biological families;

Whereas foster parents—

(1) are the front-line caregivers for children who cannot safely remain with their biological parents;

(2) provide physical care, emotional support, and education advocacy to the children in their care; and

(3) are the largest single source of families providing permanent homes for children transitioning from foster care to adoption;

Whereas children in foster care who are placed with relatives, compared to children placed with nonrelatives, have more stability, including fewer changes in placements, have more positive perceptions of their placements, are more likely to be placed with their siblings, and demonstrate fewer behavioral problems;

Whereas some relative caregivers receive less financial assistance and support services than foster caregivers;

Whereas recent studies show foster children enrolled in Medicaid were prescribed antipsychotic medications at nearly 9 times the rate of other children receiving Medicaid;

Whereas youth in foster care are much more likely to face educational instability, with 65 percent of former foster children experiencing at least 7 school changes while in foster care;

Whereas an increased emphasis on prevention and reunification services is necessary to reduce the number of children who are forced to remain in the foster care system;

Whereas more than 26,200 youth ''age out'' of foster care annually without a legal permanent connection to an adult or family;

Whereas the number of youth who age out of foster care has increased during the past decade;

Whereas foster care is intended to be a temporary placement, but children remain in the foster care system for an average of 2 years;

Whereas children in foster care experience an average of 3 different placements, which often leads to disruption of routines and the need to change schools and move away from siblings, extended families, and familiar surroundings;

Whereas children entering foster care often confront the widespread misperception that children in foster care are disruptive, unruly, and dangerous, even though placement in foster care is based on the actions of a parent or guardian, not the child;

Whereas children who age out of foster care lack the security and support of a biological or adoptive family and frequently struggle to secure affordable housing, obtain health insurance, pursue higher education, and acquire adequate employment;

Whereas States, localities, and communities should be encouraged to invest resources in preventative and reunification services and postpermanency programs to ensure that more children in foster care are provided with safe, loving, and permanent placements;

Whereas Federal legislation during the past 3 decades, including the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–272), the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89), the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–351), and the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (Public Law 112–34) provided new investments and services to improve the outcomes of children in the foster care system;

Whereas May 2013 is an appropriate month to designate as ''National Foster Care Month'' to provide an opportunity to acknowledge the accomplishments of the child-welfare workforce, foster parents, the advocacy community, and mentors for their dedication, accomplishments, and positive impact on the lives of children; and

Whereas much remains to be done to ensure that all children have a safe, loving, nurturing, and permanent family, regardless of age or special needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2013 as ''National Foster Care Month'';

(2) recognizes National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about

the challenges that children face in the foster care system;

(3) encourages Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of children in the foster care system;

(4) acknowledges the special needs of children in the foster care system;

(5) recognizes youth in foster care throughout the United States for their ongoing tenacity, courage, and resilience while facing life challenges;

(6) acknowledges the exceptional alumni of the foster care system who serve as advocates and role models for youth who remain in care;

(7) honors the commitment and dedication of the individuals who work tirelessly to provide assistance and services to children in the foster care system; and

(8) reaffirms the need to continue working to improve the outcomes of all children in the foster care system through parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and other programs designed to—

(A) support vulnerable families;

(B) invest in prevention and reunification services;

(C) promote adoption in cases where reunification is not in the best interests of the child;

(D) adequately serve children brought into the foster care system; and

(E) facilitate the successful transition into adulthood for children who ''age out'' of the foster care system.

SENATE RESOLUTION 148—DESIGNATING MAY 18, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL KIDS TO PARKS DAY''

Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 148

Whereas the third annual National Kids to Parks Day will be celebrated on May 18, 2013;

Whereas the goal of National Kids to Parks Day is to empower young people and encourage families to get outdoors and visit the parks of the United States;

Whereas, on National Kids to Parks Day, individuals from rural and urban areas of the United States can be reintroduced to the splendid National Parks and State and neighborhood parks that are located in their communities;

Whereas communities across the United States offer a variety of natural resources and public land, often with free access, to individuals seeking outdoor recreation;

Whereas the people of the United States should encourage young people to lead a more active lifestyle, as too many young people in the United States are overweight or obese;

Whereas National Kids to Parks Day is an opportunity for families to take a break from their busy lives and come together for a day of wholesome fun; and

Whereas National Kids to Parks Day aims to broaden the appreciation of young people for nature and the outdoors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 18, 2013, as ''National Kids to Parks Day'';

(2) recognizes the importance of outdoor recreation and the preservation of open spaces to the health of the young people of the United States; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR THE UNVEILING OF A STATUE OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 16

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

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR THE UNVEILING OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS STATUE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 19, 2013, to unveil a statue of Frederick Douglass.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a meeting of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has been scheduled to discuss natural gas issues. The meeting will be held on Thursday, May 23, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide a forum to explore what the next applications are for natural gas and how this new demand will be met. The environmental impacts of shale gas development and best practices will be specific points of interest.

Because of the limited time available for the forum, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to lauren_goldschmidt@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Todd Wooten at (202) 224–4971 or Lauren Goldschmidt at (202) 224–5488.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 16, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 16, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 16, 2013, at 12 p.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 16, 2013, at 9:30 a.m., in SD–G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to continue its executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 16, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. in room 428A Russel Senate Office building to conduct a roundtable entitled ''The Impact of Mandatory E-Verify on America's Small Businesses.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 16, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND SPACE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Science and Space of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 16, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM TO FISH ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 982, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 982) to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from taking certain actions to establish a restricted area prohibiting public access to waters downstream of a dam, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 982) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 982

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 ''Freedom to Fish Act''.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTED AREAS AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS DAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) RESTRICTED AREA.—The term ''restricted area'' means a restricted area for hazardous waters at dams and other civil works structures in the Cumberland River basin established in accordance with chapter 10 of the regulation entitled ''Project Operations: Navigation and Dredging Operations and Maintenance Policies'', published by the Corps of Engineers on November 29, 1996, and any related regulations or guidance.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers.

(b) EXISTING RESTRICTED AREA.—If the Secretary has established a restricted area or modified an existing restricted area during the period beginning on August 1, 2012, and ending on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) cease implementing and enforcing the restricted area until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) remove any permanent physical barriers constructed in connection with the restricted area.

(c) ESTABLISHING NEW RESTRICTED AREA.—If, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary establishes any restricted area, the Secretary shall—

(1) ensure that any restrictions are based on operational conditions that create hazardous waters;

(2) publish a draft describing the restricted area and seek and consider public comment on that draft prior to establishing the restricted area;

(3) not implement or enforce the restricted area until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(4) not take any action to establish a permanent physical barrier in connection with the restricted area.

(d) EXCLUSIONS.—For purposes of this section, the installation and maintenance of measures for alerting the public of hazardous water conditions and restricted areas, including sirens, strobe lights, and signage, shall not be considered to be a permanent physical barrier.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Enforcement of a restricted area shall be the sole responsibility of the State in which the restricted area is located.

(2) EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary shall not assess any penalty for entrance into a restricted area under section 4 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes'', approved December 22, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 460d).

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. COWAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 20, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 45 and 46; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote, with no intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; further, that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 11 and 12; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote, with no intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; further, that following the votes on Calendar No. 12 and Calendar No. 46, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appoints the following Senator as a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 113th Congress: The Honorable SAXBY CHAMBLISS of Georgia.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 145, S. Res. 146, S. Res. 147, and S. Res. 148.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 16, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of a statue of Frederick Douglass.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 20, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, May 20, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 73, S. 954, the farm bill; and, finally, that at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, then on Monday there will be two rollcall votes on the confirmation of Chappell and McShane at 5:30 p.m. We will, as indicated, move to the farm bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 20, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask

unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 20, 2013, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

CAROLYN B. MCHUGH, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT, VICE MICHAEL R. MURPHY, RETIRED.

DEBRA M. BROWN, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI, VICE W. ALLEN PEPPER, JR., DECEASED.

PAMELA L. REEVES, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE THOMAS W. PHILLIPS, RETIRING.

ELIZABETH A. WOLFORD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE CHARLES J. SIRAGUSA, RETIRED.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

RICHARD T. METSGER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2017, VICE GIGI HYLAND, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DANIEL R. RUSSEL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS), VICE KURT M. CAMPBELL, RESIGNED.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

ROBERT JAMES GREY, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2014. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ROBERT L. THOMAS, JR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

BRADLY A. CARLSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

MICHAEL LUCAS AHMANN
DARRIN KENT ANDERSON
ROBERT AVON ATOR II
VANCE CHRISTIAN BATEMAN
KIMBERLY A. BAUMANN
CHRISTOPHER JOHN BELLI
THOMAS ALAN BIEDIGER
BARRY A. BLANCHARD
MICHAEL A. BORKOWSKI
ROBERT DARIN BOWIE
DENISE W. BOYER
ROBERT MICHAEL BRAWLEY
BRIAN S. BUHLER
MICHAEL O. CADLE
LAWRENCE L. CHRISTENSEN
JAMES DAVID CLEET
JENNIFER ANN CONWELL
MICHAEL D. CROGHAN
BRYAN A. DAVIS
HAROLD D. DAVIS II
BRYAN SCOTT DELAGE
STEVEN JOHN DEMILLIANO
KEVIN CHRISTOPHER DERICKSON
MONIQUE J. DESPAIN
MATTHEW D. DINMORE
JAMES NORRIS DIXON
BARBARA G. DONCASTER
DENISE M. DONNELL
BOBBI J. DOORENBOS
SCOTT ALAN DUMFORD
DAVID M. DZIOBKOWSKI
STEVEN J. EARLY
TERESA S. EDWARDS
RANDAL KEITH EFFERSON
DONALD L. FARMER
BRETT VINCENT FEHRLE
THOMAS EDWARD FENNELL
EMIL JOSEPH FILKORN
ROBERT A. FRANKOSKY, JR.
LANCE TAYLOR FRYE
STEVEN MINORU FUKINO
BRIAN L. FULKERSON
DANIEL E. GABRIELLI
ROBERT L. GARVIN
MICHAEL T. GEROCK
BLAKE A. GETTYS
KERRY S. GILL
ERIC ROLAND GOOD
BRENT W. GUGLIELMINO
ALEXANDER G. HALDOPOULOS
CHRISTOPHER PAUL HAMILTON
CHRISTOPHER HARDGRAVE
ROBERT KENNETH HENDERSON
RICKY LEE HERN
JAMES M. HEURING
PENNY C. HODGES–GOETZ
SCOTT P. HOYLE
ROY M. INGRAM
BRANDON G. ISAACS
THOMAS S. JESS
ANTHONY L. JOHNSON
GREGORY G. JOHNSON
KENNETH HOUSTON JONES
DAVID M. KASHIWAMURA
ANDREW PATRICK KEANE
DAVID M. KENNARD
STEPHEN P. KENSICK
JOHN F. KNABEL
KRIS KOLLAR
DALLAS F. KRATZER II
RODRICK W. LEKEY
LORETTA JEAN LOMBARD
ANDREW W. LOVE
MARK ANTHONY MALDONADO
ROLF EBERHARD MAMMEN
MATT MCFARLAND MATHIS
THOMAS P. MCATEE
LANCE P. MCCUISTON
DANIEL RICHARD MCDONOUGH
BRIAN T. MCHENRY
RANDALL GLENN MCNARY
NATHAN R. MELLMAN
CHAD D. MILNE
TIMOTHY SCOTT MOSES
ROBERT J. NIESEN
STEVEN S. NORRIS
WILLIAM ELLIS ORTON
DOUGLAS K. PENNINGTON
SCOTT D. PLAMBECK
DONNA M. PRIGMORE
MICHAEL E. PYBURN
DERON BRANT REYNOLDS
MARTIN JOSEPH RICHARD
JACK J. RICHMOND
FRANK W. ROY
ROBERT THROCKMORT SANDFORD
ROBERT A. SCHULTE
KURT S. SHIGETA
ROBIN WAYNE SKAAR
SHANNON D. SMITH
GARY R. STEFANICH
JAMES S. STUART
THOMAS M. SUELZER
TODD K. THOMAS
LANE ALVIN THURGOOD
THORNE S. TIBBITTS
EDWARD C. TRIEBEL
MICHAEL ANTHONY VALLE
EDWIN ARLYN VANDERWOLDE
MARK AARON VAVRA
JOHN M. VERHAGE
GREGORY J. WALTERS
RITA J. WHITMIRE
MARSHALL LEIGHTON WILDE
CHRISTOPHER J. WILL
ERIK C. WONG
SHANNA MARCIENE WOYAK
KYLE T. YANAGISAWA
BERNARD JOHN YOSTEN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

SHERCODA G. SMAW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531 AND 3064:

To be major

CARL N. SOFFLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNITED STATE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

OWEN B. MOHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

CARMELO N. OTEROSANTIAGO
JOHN H. SEOK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

BRENT E. HARVEY
JOOHYUN A. KIM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JERRY M. ANDERSON
JOSEPH M. BARTEL
DARYL P. BRACH
EDWARD W. LOCKWOOD
ROY J. MACARAEG
WILLIAM M. MYER
SHAWN C. REGER
NEIL W. SALKOWSKI
MAUREEN H. WEIGL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

DENNIS R. BELL
MICHAEL BERECZ
RONALD L. BURKE
TAYLOR B. CHANCE
MARK G. CHAPPELL
MATTHEW J. ENROTH
CHAD D. FOSTER
CARY HONNOLD
NORMAN KREISELMEIER
ERIC D. LOMBARDINI
ANDREW L. MCGRAW
WENDY E. MEY
STEPHANIE L. MONT
BRETT J. TAYLOR
MICHELLE THOMPSON
KENT J. VINCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

DAVID W. ADMIRE
TRACY H. BROWN
BRIAN E. BURK
PETER J. CONTOS
THEODORE W. CROY III
JOHN F. DETRO
GAIL A. EVANS
SARAH B. GOLDMAN
FLORIE GONZALES
KEVIN M. HOUCK
KENNETH E. HYDE
KEARY J. JOHNSTON
IAN E. LEE
LARRY T. LINDSAY
ROBERTO E. MARIN
STEPHANIE A. MEYER
ROBERT D. MONTZ
DAWN L. ORTA
JAMES L. PULLIAM
BILL A. SOLIZ
CAMERON C. STOKES
KERRYN L. STORY
MARK D. THELEN
KATHLEEN E. YANCOSEK
ARTHUR F. YEAGER
D006281

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTOPHER G. ARCHER
BRADFORD A. BAUMANN
RALPH L. BIEGANEK
EARL T. BOWERS
ROBERT S. BROWN
SCOTT M. BULLOCK
JEFFREY A. BURBANK
STEVEN E. CANTRELL
JEFFREY D. DILLARD
PETER O. DISSMORE
SHMUEL L. FELZENBERG
GARY T. FISHER
BARTON T. HERNDON
TAYLOR G. R. HOLLIS
DAVID K. JACOB
PAUL R. JAEDICKE
WILLIAM B. KILLOUGH
MARK R. LEVINE
THOMAS J. MCCORT
RODERICK R. MILLS
CHRISTOPHER G. MORRIS
DAMON P. ONELLION
ALAN T. SAVAGE
PHILIP T. SMILEY
THOMAS B. VAUGHN
DENNIS R. VILLARREAL
ARLEIGH F. VONSEGGERN
WILLIAM J. WEHLAGE
TYSON J. WOOD
PAUL H. YOON
D011470
D011779

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES A. ADAMEC

ELIZABETH E. ADAMS
JEFFREY M. ALLERDING
LARRY B. ARAMANDA
KIMBERLY L. BELL
STACEY E. BERRY
ANNABEL J. BIGLEY
WILLIAM J. BROWN
KARI A. BRULEY
ANISSA J. BUCKLEY
JESS A. CALOHAN
ROMICO D. CAUGHMAN
MONIQUE R. COURTS
CHERYL A. CREAMER
PAUL M. CRUM
JENISE L. DAVIS
PATRICIA L. DAVIS
FRANCISCO C. DOMINICCI
CARABALLO D. ESTRADA
DARRELL B. EVANS
BRETT W. EVERS
STACEY L. FERREIRA
CHARLES M. FISHER, JR.
KENNETH A. FORD
TAMARA S. FUNARI
KRISTEN J. GOODWIN
KENNETH R. GORE
KEVIN GORMLEY
AMY J. HADSALL
ROBIN R. HARROLD
DANIELLE T. HOCKEY
TODDY F. INGRAM
JACK M. JENKINSON
JAROLD T. JOHNSTON, JR.
JOHN D. KEENER
MARK C. KILLEBREW
JOHNNY KING III
JULIE E. LEE
JENNIFER D. LORILLA
CHRISTINE M. LUDWIG
THERESA C. MACK
BRUCE MATHEWS
DENISE A. MCFARLAND
WILLIAM J. MEEK II
ELBRIDGE A. MERRITT
MICHAEL K. MOHAMMADI
ANNE M. MORGAN
TINA M. MORGAN
LELAND B. MORGANS
ROBERT M. MORRIS II
LISA K. MUTZIG
JAMES R. NOLIN
KELLIE J. NORRIS
DORENE A. OWEN
CLAUSYL J. PLUMMER
BRIGITTE Y. POLK
PRENTICE R. PRICE
RIKKINA G. PULLIAM
THOMAS O. RAWLINGS
LAURA E. RICARDO
CHERYL C. RIVERA
CATHERINE A. ROBERTS
AMY K. ROY
PERRY C. RUIZ
JEFFREY D. RUMFIELD
SCOTT D. RUSH
RANDALL M. SCHAEFER
JODELLE M. SCHROEDER
BENJAMIN E. SEELEY
DAWN M. SEELEY
GREGORY V. SHUMATE
LEILANI A. C. L. SIAKI
JERREMIE V. SIEGFRIED
KEVIN E. SNYDER
WARREN A. STEWART
TINA M. STREKER
BING TANWINTERS
MEEMIE J. THA
NORMA TORRES
ELBA M. VILLACORTA
DAVID A. VOLLBRECHT
PAUL R. WARE
KEITH A. WARHURST
EUNOTCHOL WHITE
CONREAU L. WILLIAMS
VANESSA WORSHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

EDWARD P. C. AGER
CAROL A. ANDERSON
RONALD J. AQUINO
EDGAR G. ARROYOORTIZ
ROBERT T. ASHBURN
PRINCESS L. ATUNRASE
SEREKA L. BARLOW
MICHAEL F. BELENKY
MICHAEL W. BOYE
DANIEL D. BRIDON
BURKE L. BRISTOW
SEAN A. CASPERSON
PHILLIP W. CHRISTY
GARY S. COOPER
JASON B. CORLEY
JAMES E. CRAIG
GARRICK L. CRAMER
MISHAW T. CUYLER
CLARISSA DEJESUSMORALES
DAVID A. DERRICK
MICHAEL DESENA
THOMAS D. EYER
SEAN P. FARLEY
GLEN J. FIORENZA
SHELLEY N. FRANCO
LEE C. FREEMAN
KATHLEEN M. GIBSON
JACOB H. GIN
CARL J. GORKOS II
ANTHONY D. GRAY
NIZAMETTIN GUL
MICHAEL HAEDT
VERONICA L. HAGER
DARIN L. HARPER
ANDREW J. HARTMAN
BERNARD HARVEY
CORY L. HEINEKEN
RAYMOND J. JABLONKA
FREDERICK C. JACKSON
ROBERT W. JENKINS
TAMMIE M. JONES
STEVIE T. JORDAN
ERIC J. KELLY
AMY S. KING
ANTHONY M. KING
JOHN W. LEE
SEAN C. LESTER
THOMAS J. LONGO
PETER B. MARKOT
WINICO M. MARTINEZ
JAMES N. MASTERSON
CHRISTOPHER D. MAYHUGH
YVETTE M. MCCREA
DARRYL A. MCGUIRE, JR.
DAVID S. MCILWAIN
SEAN A. MCMURRY
STEVEN A. MEADOW
MARK D. MELLOTT
JAMES A. MORRISON
TROY MORTON
GREGORY J. OBRIEN
MARY A. PETERS
LAWRENCE N. PETZ
MARK C. PLOOSTER
MARK A. POTTER
JOSE F. QUESADA
MCKINLEY RAINEY
PETER A. RAMOS
LYLE D. RASMUSSEN, JR.
DEVON O. REED
JEFFREY L. REIBESTEIN
EVELYN REYESCABRERA
DANIEL E. REYNOLDS
RANDALL W. RHEES
SHANE A. ROACH
JASON L. ROBERTS
ADMINDA L. RODRIGUEZ
DAVID L. ROLLINS
KURT E. SCHAECHER
TIMOTHY A. SHARPE
BRADLEY T. SHIELDS
MICHAEL S. SMITH
NELSON S. SO
STEPHEN T. SPEER
RAYMOND D. SPIAK, JR.
ERIC SPOTTS
SCOTT J. STOKOE
ROBERT J. STROB
JOSEPHINE E. L. THOMPSON
BARBARA T. TRAENKNER
WILLIAM N. UPTERGROVE
ARISTOTLE A. VASELIADES
RICHARD VELAZQUEZ
CARYN R. VERNON
KENNETH L. WALTERS
LAWANDA D. WARTHEN
DOUGLAS L. WEEKS
DOUGLAS P. WEKELL
MITCHELL W. WOODBERRY
DANIEL M. WOODLOCK
HASSAN ZAHWA
DAVID J. ZAJAC
PATRICK A. ZENK
REBECCA A. ZINNANTE
JOHN P. ZOLL

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

TANYA WONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

KAREN R. DALLAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be captain

RONALD G. OSWALD

To be lieutenant commander

NIKITA TIHONOV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MASOUD EGHTEDARI
BRUCE G. GREEN
ISTVAN HARGITAI
THOMAS M. JACKS
LOREN K. MASUOKA
STEVEN A. MATIS
CHRISTOPHER A. STEWART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

RICHARD A. BONNETTE
CAMERON H. FISH
RUSSELL P. GRAEF
DWIGHT A. HORN
KEVIN J. SWEENEY
LOFTEN C. THORNTON
ANDREW A. WADE
THOMAS J. WALCOTT
DARRELL J. WESLEY
GLEN WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JOSEPH J. ELDRED
DAMIAN D. FLATT
PETER D. GALINDEZ
PATRICK J. GIBBONS
KEITH S. GIBEL
MICHAEL C. HOLIFIELD
MARK C. HOLLEY
DONALD C. KING
JAMES M. LUCCI
BETHANY L. PAYTONOBRIEN
TREVOR A. RUSH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TIM J. DEWITT
WENDY M. HALSEY
ANDREW M. HASCALL
ERIC J. HAWN
RICHARD D. HAYES III
SCOTT D. LOESCHKE
PETER J. MACULAN
JAMES G. MEYER
JAYSON D. MITCHELL
JAY A. MURPHY
LATANYA E. SIMMS
DANIEL P. TURNER
GREGORY G. VINCI, JR.
WILLIAM L. WHITMIRE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JANINE D. ALLEN
PAUL B. ARP
CINDY M. BAGGOTT
AMY H. BRANSTETTER
NEWTON J. CHALKER
MAX C. CORMIER
MARTHA A. CUTSHALL
GEORGE L. DYER III
CHRISTINE B. GRUSCHKUSWRIGHT
DEBBIE R. JENKINS
CYNTHIA L. JUDY
WENDY M. MCCRAW
VALERIE A. MORRISON
GREGORY G. NEZAT
ROSEMARY PERDUE
TODD M. STEIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CRAIG S. COLEMAN
JOSEPH S. GONDUSKY
HELEN S. HAGAN
JARED H. HEIMBIGNER
HASAN A. HOBBS
PATRICK W. JOYNER
JAIME H. KAPUR
SHELLIE M. KENDALL
GRANT A. KIDD
RICHARD D. MCCORMICK
CHARLES J. OSIER, JR.
ROBERT F. RENDER
ALBERT J. SCHUETTE, JR.
JEFFREY S. SCOW
JESSICA J. SHANK
LISA M. THIEL
DIANA TOROK
BRIAN R. VINCENT
WILLIAM R. VOLK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

BARRY D. ADAMS
PAUL A. ANDRE
ARTHUR C. ANTHONY
WILLIAM C. ASHBY
FELIX A. BIGBY
TRUPTI N. BRAHMBHATT
MICHAEL F. CRIQUI
WILLIAM M. DENISTON
ROLAND L. FAHIE, SR.
DAVID F. HOEL
DENISE N. HOLDRIDGE
LISA K. KENNEMUR

JAMIE M. LINDLY
RALPH J. MARRO
PAUL C. MILLER
TIMOTHY R. RICHARDSON
GEORGE STEFFIAN
BRIAN G. TOLBERT
JUDITH M. WALKER
GERARD J. WOELKERS
DEBRA L. YNIGUEZ
KIMBERLY A. ZUZELSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ERIC J. BACH
DOUGLAS M. BRIDGES
PATRICK A. BURSON
JEFFERY P. DAVIS
ROBERT K. DEGUZMAN, JR.
SEAN M. EGGE
PRESTON L. GILL
MARK K. HARRIS
JONATHAN B. HAYNES
ELIZABETH L. JACKSON
DAVID M. LOCKNEY
JAMES R. MACARANAS
DARRELL L. MATHIS
RICHARD K. MCCARTHY
MICHELLE D. MORSE
FRANK E. NEVAREZ
KARL E. OETTL
MATTHEW N. OTT III
ERIC OXENDINE
JOSEPH W. PARRAN
DAVID J. RHONE
MARK J. RUNSTROM
ERIC J. SCHOCH
WILLIAM B. STEVENS
ERIC S. STUMP
LORENZO E. WILLIAMS
RICARDO WILSON
JOHN H. WINDOM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DANIEL J. ACKERSON
ELIZABETH M. ADRIANO
SEAN P. BARBABELLA
CHARMAGNE G. BECKETT
WILLIAM A. BECKMAN
RICHARD L. BIGGS
ROBERT F. BROWNING
SARA L. BURGER
ILIN CHUANG
TERESA M. COX
DONALD S. CRAIN
MICHAEL S. DANFORTH
KIMBERLY D. DAVIS
JAMES A. ELLZY
STEVEN J. ESCOBAR
JOSEPH C. FINLEY
JULIE GREEN
HAROLD L. GROFF
NEAL A. HEIMER
VIVIANA V. JOHNSON
STEPHANIE A. KAPFER
DAVID C. KRULAK
CHRISTOPHER B. LANDES
GRAINGER S. LANNEAU, JR.
GABRIEL LEE
WILLIAM T. LENNARD
KEVAN E. MANN
TODD J. MAY
NICOLE K. MCINTYRE
JAMES P. OBERMAN
JOSEPH G. OBRIEN
LISA A. PEARSE
EMERICH D. PIEDAD
BRYN J. H. REINA
NANETTE L. ROLLENE
BRIAN R. SCHNELL
WILLIAM T. SCOUTEN
JOSEPH J. SPOSATO
ALEXANDER E. STEWART
MICHAEL S. SULLIVAN
SEAN D. SULLIVAN
MICHAEL G. SWANSON
AARON M. TAYLOR
GREGORY T. THIER
JEFFREY M. TOMLIN
HARVEY B. WILDS
DIANA B. WISEMAN
FREDERICK E. YEO
SCOT A. YOUNGBLOOD

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

RANDOLPH T. PAGE

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 16, 2013:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ERNEST J. MONIZ, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE SECRETARY OF ENERGY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DALE SOWARDS TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dale Sowards of Manassa, Colorado. Mr. Sowards passed away on March 29, 2013 at his home, he was 95. A native and lifelong resident of Western Colorado, Mr. Sowards' story is one of public service and community involvement that lives on as an inspiration to us all.

Born in Manassa on May 7, 1917, Mr. Sowards went on to receive a degree in Forestry and range Management from Colorado State University and on Christmas Eve of 1937, he married his high school sweetheart Orva Nielson. Following college, Mr. Sowards spent five years serving Colorado with the U.S. Forest Service. He went on the teach biology, chemistry, and agriculture in Manassa and later taught the farm training program at Adams State College.

Mr. Sowards' life in civil service began as a member of the Manassa school board, he later served the President of the Cumbres-La Manga Cattle Association and the Manassa Land and Irrigation Company for 16 years. Mr. Sowards went on to become County Commissioner and, in 1976, was chosen as the Most Outstanding Colorado Commissioner. That same year, he was elected President of the National Association of Counties' Western Region (NaCO). As a NaCO President, Mr. Sowards played a pivotal role in the passage of Payments-In-Lieu-of-Taxes, or PILT, legislation which compensates counties for the tax revenue lost by federal holdings of land. Counties use these funds for education, public safety, and infrastructure projects. In recognition of his efforts, NaCo's annual award for outstanding service of public lands bears his name.

Mr. Sowards was an active member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and served as Superintendent of the Sunday school late in his life. He is survived by two children in Manassa, 10 grandchildren and 15 great-grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Dale Sowards for his lifelong dedication to the people of Western Colorado.

RECOGNIZING THE WOOGMS MEMORIAL DAY PARADE

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Wellington-Oakdale Old Glory Marching Society's Annual Memorial Day Parade, a patriotic tradition in Chicago's Lakeview neighborhood. This vibrant Chicago institution invites marchers of all ages to participate in Lakeview's only "do-it-yourself" parade, where everybody marches and nobody watches.

In 1963, Chicago resident Al Weisman began this annual tradition along with his son, Tony, and a half dozen friends marching around the block with an American flag. Today, the WOOGMS parade is led by Tony Weisman and regularly attracts more than 1,000 marchers. It is a wonderful way Chicagoans celebrate freedom and remember those who have served our country.

The WOOGMS parade's emphasis on inclusion and participation sets this wonderful event apart. Guided by Al Weisman's belief that children would rather participate in a parade than simply watch, the parade encourages Chicagoans of all ages to join in the parade and march; spectators are discouraged from sitting down and encouraged to participate. These annual parades attract parents, children and grandparents who are walking or riding strollers, bikes and wheelchairs down the parade route. Accompanied by the Jesse White Drum Corps, participants march towards St. Joseph's Hospital where they are greeted by welcoming volunteers.

As a longtime Lakeview resident, I've had the privilege of joining the WOOGMS parade since 1983. As the event has grown, so have the participants. It's been heartening to see the children who marched 30 years ago come back to join the WOOGMS parade with children of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in recognizing the WOOGMS parade as one of Chicago's most unique events. Let us look forward to another 50 years of continued success for this patriotic tradition.

HOMES FOR HEROES ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 384, the "Homes for Heroes Act of 2013." I support this bill because it provides much needed assistance to more than 62,000 veterans who can be found homeless on any given night. I support this bill because it will help the 12,700 homeless veterans who were involved in Iraq and Afghanistan. I support this legislation because it is unacceptable that anyone who served this nation honorably in times of war should be without a home in times of peace.

The Homes for Heroes Act creates the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Office of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and charges him or her with the responsibility of ensuring that veterans have fair access to housing and homeless assistance programs at HUD in addition to coordinating HUD programs and activities of the Department relating to veterans; serving as a liaison with the Department of Veterans Affairs; serving as HUD liaison to the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness and State, and local governments, and nongovernmental organizations concerned with veterans.

The Special Assistant also will provide veterans information and advice regarding special housing programs for veterans and assisting them in obtaining housing or homeless assistance under programs administered by the Department.

There are over 304,000 veterans in my city of Houston, and 11,000 homeless men and women, more than 3,600 of which are veterans. These homeless veterans have fallen victim to the effects of post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, and often faced difficulty entering the civilian workforce where experience in military occupations and training do not easily translate. Because of these and other difficulties, a veteran commits suicide every 65 hours.

These men and women are often single, alone, and with little family connections concentrated in large urban areas where living conditions are more likely to be poor. Forty percent of our homeless veterans are African American or Hispanic despite making up a much smaller percentage of the veteran community.

The welfare of homeless veterans of our nation, who fought in World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Grenada, Panama, Lebanon, the Persian Gulf War, Afghanistan and Iraq, should always be one of our primary concerns. They should not be left to fend for themselves when they encounter difficulties upon returning home. The Homes for Heroes act help will ensure that more have a home to live in when they return home.

The sad reality is that too many of our veterans are homeless or jobless or poor. They grow younger by the year. They need our help and support. We owe it to answer the call for them.

I urge all members of the House to join in me in supporting H.R. 384, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2013.

IN HONOR OF THE STEWART HOME SCHOOL'S 120TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Stewart Home School in Frankfort, Kentucky, and to congratulate them on their 120th Anniversary. The mission of the Stewart Home School is the complete and total care of special needs students, as well as the fulfillment of all their needs—physical, educational, social, vocational and spiritual.

Since 1893, Stewart Home School has provided a community where people live in a nurturing environment and participate in programs

designed to specifically meet their individual needs. Their students pursue skills in self-sufficiency, academics, and vocational programs in a setting that stimulates self-confidence and encourages personal happiness.

Stewart Home School occupies the historic campus of the old Kentucky Military Institute, and is now on the National Register of Historic Places. The school offers a one-of-a-kind community where those with intellectual disabilities are appreciated for the people they are.

The Stewart Home School embraces each student as an individual who desires meaningful activity, success, friendships, and acceptance, and strives to develop skills and talents in all areas of life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending the Stewart Home School for the tireless efforts to improve the lives of their students and in congratulating them on their 120th anniversary. I extend my personal appreciation to the Stewart Home for all that they have done for our community. The Stewart Home School is a gem in the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky, not only improving the lives of its students, but also bettering our Commonwealth.

DANIEL NEWMYER TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Daniel Newmyer of Center, Colorado. Mr. Newmyer is one of the many exceptional teachers in the great state of Colorado whose passion and dedication for his students make him a great example for educators everywhere and a strong community leader.

Mr. Newmyer graduated from the University of Colorado at Boulder with a degree in Science Administration and went on to receive a Master's degree from Regis University in Education. In 2009, he joined the Center Consolidated School District to teach math and science at Center High School. Since becoming a teacher, Mr. Newmyer has strived to bring science and math to life for his students, always looking for new and exciting ways to inspire his students.

Mr. Newmyer has received numerous awards and recognitions for his innovation in the classroom, and his dedication as an educator. This year, the Astronauts Memorial Foundation, NASA, and the Space Foundation jointly presented him with the Alan Shepard Technology in Education Award and Mr. Newmyer was named the San Luis Valley Teacher of the Year. Because of Mr. Newmyer's efforts, Center High School has become one of the top STEM schools in the state of Colorado. He has worked to procure grants to allow his students to participate in local, state, and national science and engineering competitions. He has also pioneered a computer-based learning system that uses flight simulators to boost math scores.

Mr. Newmyer is a perfect example of how technology can drive innovation in education. His creativity and hard work are an inspiration to teachers across the country. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Daniel Newmyer for his dedication to his students and his outstanding accomplishments as an educator.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF REV. NIMROD Q. REYNOLDS

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Rev. Nimrod Q. Reynolds, a beloved Alabamian remembered for his remarkable display of bravery and courage in his attempt to integrate the Carnegie Library in Anniston, Alabama on September 15, 1963. Rev. Reynolds passed away on Sunday, May 12 at the age of 82. While I am deeply saddened by his passing I am comforted in knowing that his legacy is one that will live on through his contributions to the state of Alabama and this nation.

Rev. Reynolds was born on April 30, 1931 in Chambers County, Alabama. In 1949, he graduated from Chambers County High School and went on to obtain a degree from Clark College in Atlanta, Georgia. He later received a Masters Degree from the Interdenominational Theological Seminary. But while Rev. Reynolds understood the power of education, he is most remembered for his lifelong commitment to ministry.

At just 17 years old. Rev. Reynolds preached his first sermon at Macedonia Baptist Church in Five Points, Alabama. He went on to Pastor First Baptist Church in Union Springs Alabama before becoming Pastor of Seventeenth Street Missionary Baptist Church in Anniston, Alabama. Rev. Reynolds would remain at Seventeenth Street for over 50 years.

In addition to serving as pastor of Seventeenth Street, Rev. Reynolds founded the Community Action Agency, an organization that was dedicated to addressing poverty in the local community. He came to Anniston in 1960 with a message that stressed the immediate importance of equality. In 1964, he hosted a mass meeting with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and in 1967, his two children fully integrated Tenth St. Elementary. In 1972, he sued the Anniston City School Board and forced full integration of the school system. In 1976, he was elected the first black president of the Anniston City Board of Education. Through his historic efforts to integrate Anniston, Rev. Reynolds became a transformative figure. He would further solidify his place in history on September 15, 1963 when he walked up the steps of Anniston's Carnegie Library. His intent was simple yet complex during these turbulent times in southern states. Rev. Reynolds wanted simply to check out a book.

Instead, he along with others were met with an angry mob that savagely beat Reynolds. The beating resulted in injuries that left him bedridden for days. However, because of his heroic efforts other clergymen returned to the library the day after his vicious attack and were successful in integrating the library. Ironically his beating occurred on the same day of the bombing of 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama.

Anniston City leaders mapped out plans to slowly integrate the city to prevent violent demonstrations similar to those that had occurred in neighboring areas. But for Rev. Reynolds, the pace was unacceptable. As a result, in 1964 he galvanized yet another movement. Under his leadership, local ministers placed a one page ad in the local paper that read "We want our freedom and we want it now." The ad would be recorded in history books as the "Anniston Manifesto."

He went on to serve in countless leadership roles at various organizations aimed at meeting the needs of those in poverty and advancing the cause of blacks in Alabama and across this Nation. Today we honor him for his role in the story of America. We also remember him as a catalyst for change. As the first black woman elected to congress from Alabama I am humbled to stand before the nation and share his story of strength and courage.

Saying thank you to Rev. Reynolds seems woefully inadequate. But, we are truly grateful for the life of this extraordinary leader. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Rev. Nimrod Q. Reynolds.

HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF SACRED HEART PARISH IN OSAGE COUNTY, MO

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 175th anniversary of Sacred Heart Parish. I am proud to recognize one of the state's most historically rich Catholic communities, the Parishioners and Reverend Philip Niekamp of Sacred Heart of Rich Fountain in Osage County on Sunday May 26, 2013.

The Parish of the Sacred Heart in Rich Fountain traces its roots back to May 16, 1838, when the very first mass was celebrated by Father Ferdinand Helias; S.J., in the home of the John T. Struempf family at Struempf's Settlement. Father Helias nurtured this community for 10 years.

The town gets its name from a clear spring that was located nearby. During its early years Rich Fountain became known as Missouri's Bavaria due to the fact that some 25 Bavarian families sought to begin new lives here. Soon after, a number of families from Westfalen and the Rhineland Provinces of Germany joined them in the heart of the Osage River valley.

Sacred Heart's diverse group of parishioners has always been united by a faith in our creator and a strong community spirit.

Key events in the history of the Sacred Heart Parish include the construction of the limestone church of the Sacred Heart in 1879 and the creation of the rectory in 1892, both of which were placed on the National Register of Historic Sites in 1982.

Resting on a slope of a hill these enormous buildings of native limestone have earned the village the title "Oberammergau of Osage County."

RECOGNIZING TERRY SANFORD HIGH SCHOOL'S CENTENNIAL GRADUATION

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Terry Sanford High School of Fayetteville, NC as they celebrate their centennial graduation on June 6, 2013.

Recognized by US News and World Report for receiving the Silver Medal in the annual list of America's Best High Schools in 2006, as well as being ranked one of the top 25 high schools in North Carolina this year, Terry Sanford is a shining example of a school preparing our students for the challenges of the 21st Century.

Terry Sanford offers fourteen different Advanced Placement courses as well as a variety of honors courses. In addition, Terry Sanford is home to the School of Global Studies which offers a rigorous, liberal arts college preparatory education in order to promote academic excellence, global awareness, and cultural and social growth.

I would like to congratulate Terry Sanford High School and its staff for 100 years of excellence and I commend them for their outstanding service in North Carolina education.

IMPORTANCE OF HOME HEALTHCARE

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the value of home healthcare to the people of Indiana's Ninth Congressional District. In addition to being a preferred place for care for most eligible seniors, home health consistently offers seniors the lowest cost venue. In Indiana alone, over 61,000 Medicare beneficiaries receive home health services from more than 8,000 Hoosiers who provide their care. Home health services, properly regulated, need to be encouraged rather than discouraged, to fulfill their mission of quality care for America's seniors and greater value for our Medicare program.

I appreciate the home health care community's efforts to develop their own proposal to weed out bad actors in their industry. One proposal that might save money within Medicare would place reasonable per-provider limitations on 60-day episodes of homecare. Such limitations aim to ensure beneficiary access to care and stop abusive billing practices that appear to exist in a small number of counties nationwide. MedPAC's March Report to Congress referenced 25 counties in the nation where a reasonable reduction in homecare utilization with an episode limit could achieve up to $1 billion in savings per year.

A reasonable but stable reimbursement environment is necessary for homecare providers to continue accomplishing their mission. Since 2010, the homecare industry has been subjected to nearly $70 billion in reimbursement cuts, 21% of their total funding. I have said time and again that our Medicare system needs broad reform to make it sustainable for future generations. We cannot continue to impose cut after cut on our providers and expect to fix the system without shifting more of the financial burden to our senior population or harming patient care. Working together to implement creative reforms like this, we will ensure that this valuable service continues to improve the lives of our seniors in their homes in Indiana and across the nation.

BLM PREVENTS JOB OPPORTUNITIES IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, this month, the United States Bureau of Land Management indefinitely cancelled all oil and natural gas lease sales in California. This includes 1,278 acres of prime oil and natural gas land in Kern and Fresno counties located in my District—California 21.

This land is part of the Monterey Shale Formation located in the Central Valley. The Monterey Shale contains 2/3 of our country's shale oil reserves—the equivalent of 15.4 billion barrels. If tapped, it could generate half a million jobs and generate $4.5 billion in revenue. This would have a significant impact on my district which has faced chronic unemployment for years.

However, citing sequestration, BLM is suspending all future lease sales in California. The decision was made despite the fact that these leases provide significant revenue for the federal government.

This is just another example of the Administration using sequestration to further their environmental policy agenda at the expense of American families. BLM's efforts to prevent energy development are depriving my constituents of quality jobs and increasing energy prices for hardworking families across the country.

It is unacceptable that BLM is halting lease auctions in regions that have been used for oil and gas development for over a century. These auctions generate revenue for the federal government, reduce our nation's dependency on foreign oil, and lead to direct economic benefits as well as local job creation.

Thousands in the Central Valley remain unemployed as the job–creating opportunities within lease sales remain untapped. If we took advantage of these employment opportunities, small businesses would have more customers and local government could direct more revenue dollars to public safety and education. Those of us in the Central Valley are proud of our energy and agriculture heritage.

It is time for Washington bureaucrats to get out of the way and let our valley flourish.

A TRIBUTE TO RECOGNIZE JULIUS KNAPP AND EVAN KWEREL ON RECEIVING PRESIDENTIAL RANK AWARDS

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Julius Knapp and Evan Kwerel on receiving Presidential Rank Awards. Every year the President confers these prestigious awards to a select group of career senior executives with the designation of Distinguished Executive, and Meritorious Executive.

Last month, Julius Knapp, Chief of the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) Office of Engineering and Technology and a dedicated agency employee for nearly 39 years, received the Distinguished Executive Presidential Rank Award. This award recognizes Julius for his ongoing work to unleash new technological innovation.

Evan Kwerel, the FCC's Senior Economic Advisor and a 30-year agency employee, received the Meritorious Executive Presidential Rank Award. As the "father of FCC spectrum auctions," Evan was recognized for his keen economic analysis that has made an extraordinary impact on modern communications policy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House to join me in congratulating Julius Knapp and Evan Kwerel on receiving these very special awards and for their dedicated years of service to the Federal Communications Commission and to the people of our nation whom they have served in an exemplary fashion.

IN RECOGNITION OF LILLIAN KAFKA

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lillian Kafka as she celebrates her ninetieth birthday this month.

Ms. Kafka, or "Libby" as she is referred to by her many friends, was born on May 18, 1923, to Louis and Mae Dubinsky of Sharon, Massachusetts. The Dubinsky family owned Sunset Lodge, a popular summer resort hotel on the idyllic shore of Lake Massapoag in Sharon. Ms. Kafka, along with her siblings Aaron and Edith, would often help their parents with the daily tasks of the family business. Upon the passing of Louis, the Dubinsky children helped their mother even more with running the hotel until it was sold to the Archdiocese of Boston several years later.

On June 18, 1944, Ms. Kafka celebrated her wedding to husband Milton Kafka at the Sunset Lodge, and the two remained happily married until Milton's passing in 2006. The Kafkas welcomed five children into their family: Louis, Millie, Benjamin, Kenneth, and Hirsh. Ms. Kafka has seen her family grow exponentially over the years, and is now the proud grandmother of twelve and great-grandmother of seventeen.

Today, Ms. Kafka stays quite active with her large family, and spends much time in particular with her great-grandchildren, who lovingly refer to her as "G.G." When she is not

busy with family, music and theater take up most of her free time. Ms. Kafka is an active volunteer at the Sharon Community Theater and the Actors Collaborative. She has performed onstage at the Mansfield Music and Arts Society, and she now fills the role of the organization's official backstage hostess. Her love of volunteering and positive outlook are representative of the extraordinary person that Ms. Kafka is, and the entire community has benefited from her many accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Lillian Kafka on this joyous occasion of her ninetieth birthday. She is an outstanding member of our community, and I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her many more years of health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING RANDY JOYCE AS THE 2013 AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mr. Randy Joyce, the 2013 Air Force Association Teacher of the Year.

Mr. Joyce received his Bachelor of Science degree in Physical Education, with minors in Sports Medicine and Social Sciences, from the University of Mobile in 2000. Five years later, he earned a Certification in Gifted Education from the Okaloosa County Alternative Certification Program. He also is affiliated with the Air Force Association, the Civil Air Patrol, and the Okaloosa County Education Association. These achievements and affiliations prepared Mr. Joyce for his career in educating the students of Northwest Florida in the science, aviation, and aerospace fields.

For the last nine years, Mr. Joyce has been dedicated to serving the students of Crestview, Florida. Mr. Joyce began his teaching career at Richbourg Middle School. After five years at Richbourg, Mr. Joyce moved to Shoal River Middle School (SRMS) to teach classes in comprehensive sciences. He has spent the last six years teaching Aerospace and Aviation Science, a program in the Community High Okaloosa Institutes of Career Education (CHOICE) Aviation Institute. Mr. Joyce's dynamic and engaging teaching style has built tremendous interest in aviation studies at his school and has garnered him multiple nominations for the Teacher of the Year Award. This year, he has won that award.

A large part of Mr. Joyce's curriculum involves engaging his seventh and eighth grade students with hands-on educational tools. For instance, his classes visit Pensacola Naval Air Station twice per year to experience the evolution of military aviation while witnessing the impact that aviation and aerospace have on their lives. Mr. Joyce also takes his students to Challenger Learning Center every year to better connect the students with the roles they can play in the future of space exploration. The students participate in numerous labs during the course of the year that begin with learning the basics of lift, drag, gravity, and thrust, and culminate with building their own rockets, complete with making their own fuel mixtures. These exercises and experiences instill an interest in exploring the frontiers of aerospace and aviation in the many students who participate in these courses.

Mr. Joyce has demonstrated his commitment to the success of each of his students. The growing student interest in his Aerospace and Aviation Science course has led Mr. Joyce to push for devoting an entire school day to aviation coursework. He also serves as the Wellness Coordinator and the Academic Team Sponsor at SRMS, which is a further testament to his tireless efforts to benefit his students.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize Mr. Randy Joyce for his great achievements and honorable service. My wife Vicki joins me in wishing him all of the best for continued success.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE INVESTIGATION OF THE MURDER OF HUMAN RIGHTS ATTORNEY PATRICK FINUCANE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing to assess progress on the unfulfilled British commitment—broken commitment, unless the British Government reverses course—in the Finucane collusion case, and how this affects the peace process in Northern Ireland.

In connection with the Good Friday peace agreement, the British Government promised to conduct public inquiries into the Finucane and three other cases where government collusion in a paramilitary murder was suspected. Subsequently the British government backtracked in regard to the Finucane case—the 1989 murder of human rights lawyer Patrick Finucane. The British backtracking came despite the recommendation to hold an inquiry, which, again, the British Government agreed to abide by, of the internationally respected jurist and former Canadian Supreme Court Justice Peter Cory in 2004.

I'd like to thank Judge Cory again, who testified about his recommendation, at a congressional hearing which I chaired in May of 2004. That is now nine years ago—and we are all still trying to get the British government to live up to its commitment. The Finucane family has testified at many hearings—Geraldine, Patrick's widow, and his son John, his son Michael, who testified yesterday—going back sixteen years. And of course there have been many others—and all of these witnesses, advocates, and experts have advocated a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the police collusion with loyalist paramilitaries responsible for brutally murdering Pat Finucane.

Over these years the dedicated human rights activists and experts have established much of what happened, and, after facts have been established, the British Government has acknowledged many of them. In 2011 the British Government admitted that it did collude in the Finucane murder and apologized for it.

Much of the credit for this admission goes to the many of you who have done the work on all the reports that documented collusion, until it was pointless for the British Government to continue denying it.

So that is progress. But the work is not done because the British Government has reserved one final, yet massive injustice: it continues to protect those responsible for the murder of Pat Finucane. Prime Minister Cameron told the Finucane family that the government would not conduct the promised public inquiry into the collusion.

The deliberate decision not to proceed with a public inquiry is a glaring, public breach of faith. It is the source of enormous frustration to Patrick Finucane's family and friends. It resonates throughout Northern Ireland, calling into question the British Government's commitment to peace and reconciliation.

This is particularly sad because the British Government has taken so many other positive, truly honorable steps, many of which were painful for large sectors of British public and official opinion—such as the Bloody Sunday inquiry, released in 2010. To call all that into question by reneging on the promised Finucane inquiry is a tragedy.

Most recently, in December 2012, Sir Desmond De Silva released a new report on collusion in the Finucane murder—really a review of existing case files rather than the gathering of new evidence that the promised inquiry would produce. The De Silva report detailed what Prime Minister Cameron admitted were "shocking" levels of state collusion in the murder, including that it was RUC officers who proposed the killing of Finucane, passed information to his killers, and obstructed the investigation, and that British domestic security had intelligence of the murder threats months before the actual crime yet took no steps to protect him.

It is admirable that Prime the Minister has admitted collusion and apologized for it, but it is really too much to admit a government crime and then to say it will not be investigated—particularly when the government has undertaken a commitment to do so. The question asks itself—after so many positive steps, is the British Government really going to diminish the good it's done since 1998 in order to protect the identity of people who share responsibility for a murder?

I'm sure Congress will continue to maintain a strong voice on this case, which goes to the core of human rights and rule of law.

IN HONOR OF GARDEN STATE PATHWAYS GRADUATES

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the graduating students of the Garden State Pathways Program at Camden County College.

For the past two years, these remarkable students have acquired valuable expertise in career skills while experiencing a college campus atmosphere. The students graduating May 18, 2013 from the program are Ashley Cousins, Kevin Joseph Hillegas, Wesley Jay Johns, Austin Jarrett Parrish, Ashley M. Smollock, and Lucas Alexander Tavlas.

None of this, of course, would have been possible without the invaluable dedication of

their teachers and mentors. The staff of the Garden State Pathways is headed by Ms. Bernadette Gismonde, who is the program coordinator. Her staff includes Ms. Bernadette Stettler, Administrative Assistant; Ms. Danielle Brittin, Job Coach; Ms. Hazel Thompson, Lead Mentor; and Ms. Joyce Howie, Assistant Mentor.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate these young men and women on the hard work they've put in and they have already accomplished. These students have bright futures ahead of them, and I wish them the best in all coming endeavors.

ATTACK ON THE U.S. CONSULATE IN BENGHAZI

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 2013 I joined as a cosponsor of H. Res. 36 to establish a select committee to investigate and report on the attack on the U.S. Consulate in Benghazi. That action was taken to insure a thorough review of the loss of four Americans.

Officials including our U.S. Ambassador and the Obama Administration's attempt to keep witnesses and information from Congress. Fortunately, five committees in the U.S. House acted and produced a joint report on April 23, 2013. The House Government Oversight and Reform Committee, which has government-wide investigative powers and authority, has since begun a series of hearings to examine the Benghazi matter.

It is my belief with this thorough review underway, it is no longer necessary to pursue a select committee on this matter.

Therefore, I am withdrawing my cosponsorship of H. Res. 36.

With the extensive work now underway in the House Government Oversight Reform Committee, a select committee would delay, add cost and not benefit the urgent need to properly review the Benghazi matter.

CONGRATULATING JOE IRONSIDE

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend Joe Ironside on his retirement as Directing Business Agent for District 6 of the Machinists union, which includes Iowa, Illinois and Nebraska. Joe has been an influential and important leader for the Iowa labor community.

Joe began his career in 1972 at the old Iowa Steel and Iron Works factory in Cedar Rapids. Joe was initiated into the Machinists union in March of that year, and wore the badge for 41 years. In 1978, Joe went to Rockwell Goss where he was chief steward, committee person and committee chairperson. He was later elected Business Representative before assuming his current responsibilities. He also served as Vice President of the Iowa Federation of Labor.

Joe's leadership in the labor movement has been felt around the state of Iowa and across the country. He has been awarded numerous awards over the years including the Gary Ketchum Union Citizen of the Year Award. Anyone who knows Joe will tell you that he is a force to be reckoned with, and that he will be missed.

I'm proud to call Joe my constituent and my friend. I congratulate him on his successful career and more importantly for the work he has done to strengthen the labor movement and expand Iowa's middle class. I wish Joe and his wife Debbie all the best in their future plans.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE EVERY CHILD DESERVES A FAMILY ACT

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today with my good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), to introduce the Every Child Deserves a Family Act in honor of National Foster Care Awareness Month. Our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) will sponsor the companion legislation in the Senate.

First, I would like to thank my friend, my sister, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN for being my partner in this important fight. I would also like to pay tribute to our former colleague, Congressman Stark, and the hard work of his staff, Jeff Hild, in first championing this important bill. I am fully committed to moving this landmark legislation across the finish line.

Last week, our constituents—including Philip McAdoo and his son Zaden from Atlanta—came to Washington, DC to highlight how essential a loving home can be to a child in need of support and understanding. Philip, his partner Sean Cavanaugh, and Zaden are a beautiful, loving, globe-trotting family; simply being with them just warms your heart. Their story is the happy ending which every foster care youth and potential parent should have the opportunity to experience.

Today, there are more than 400,000 children in our foster care system, with over 104,000 of them waiting for a permanent family. There are ample ''qualified'' adoptive and foster parents who are overlooked. As result, far too many youth ''age out'' without any family to support and love them. This bill would fix this problem—saving money and heartache and restoring hope and happiness in the process.

The Every Child Deserves a Family Act is a simple and straightforward proposal. It would prohibit any entity that receives federal child welfare funds from discriminating against prospective adoptive or foster parents on the basis of their sexual orientation, gender identification, or marital status. This bill also prevents discrimination against foster care youth on the basis of the sexual orientation or gender identity.

Mr. Speaker, I fought too long and too hard against discrimination of every kind. This is a problem that is fixable. Our common-sense legislation is supported by nearly 100 child welfare, civil rights, GLBT advocacy, and faith-based organizations because it places the best interest of every child first.

Today, we are joined by over 50 Members of Congress in introducing this bill, and I hope all of my colleagues will join us in support of this good will effort. Simply said, the Every Child Deserves a Family Act is just the right thing to do.

RESOLVING INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS TO NON-HAGUE CONVENTION COUNTRIES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, which I chair, held a hearing focused on the persistent and devastating problem of international parental child abduction, which occurs when one parent unlawfully moves a child from his or her country of residence, often for the purpose of denying the other parent access to the child.

The damage to the child and the left behind parent is incalculable and too often life-long. The children especially are at risk of serious emotional and psychological problems and may experience anxiety, eating problems, nightmares, mood swings, sleep disturbances, aggressive behavior, resentment, guilt and fearfulness. These victims are American citizens who need the help of their government when normal legal processes are unavailable or fail.

In 1983, the United States ratified the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction to try to address this serious issue. This Convention creates a civil framework for the quick return of abducted children, and for rights of access to both parents. Absent extenuating circumstances, the child is to be returned within 6 weeks to their country of habitual residence for the courts there to decide on custody or to enforce any previous custody determinations.

The Convention has helped return many children, but it is far from a silver bullet. Even in countries where the Convention is allegedly working, only about 40 percent of children are returned. Other cases are ''resolved,'' but too often with dubious application of the Convention.

Susceptible to abuse by taking parents or unwilling judges, the Convention has too often been stretched to provide cover for abduction rather than recovery of the child. Taking parents have figured out that they can drag out hearing after hearing, appeal after appeal for years until the courts can claim that, ''Yes, the child should have been returned but that the child is settled in the new country now and does not have to be returned under an exception in the Convention.''

Some Hague Convention signatories are simply not enforcing legitimate return orders. The State Department's 2012 Hague Convention Compliance Report highlights six countries—Argentina, Australia, France, Mexico, Netherlands, and Romania—for failing to enforce return orders. Other countries—Costa Rica, Guatemala, The Bahamas, Brazil, and Panama—are non-compliant with the Convention or showing patterns non-compliance.

In other words, abducted American children are not coming home from these countries and American families need other options.

The same is true for many countries that have not signed the Hague Convention. In 2012 alone, more than 634 children were abducted to countries that have not signed the Hague Convention—countries like Japan, Egypt, and India.

More than 300 children have suffered abduction from the United States to Japan since 1994. Congress does not know of a single case in which the Government of Japan has issued and enforced an order for the return of an abducted child to the United States. According to U.S. State Department statistics, the United States is monitoring 54 ongoing cases involving 74 children who were abducted from the United States to Japan and 21 additional children from the United States who may not have been abducted, but who are being denied access to their American parent.

Although Japan has recently taken steps to join the Hague Convention, Japan's ratification will not address current cases for return. Moreover, experts question whether the ratification includes reservations that will make it impossible for even new abduction cases to be resolved with returns.

The United States does not have a bilateral or other agreement with Japan to facilitate the return of American citizen children who are currently abducted-citizens like Jade and Michael Elias, whose father will testify before us today.

Under the Convention alone, if ratified by Japan, the best that American parents of currently abducted children can hope for is a visit with their child. Such visits are projected to be one hour long, once a month, in a secure facility-hardly dignified or unfettered.

Despite our multi-billion dollar investment in Egypt, neither the Mubarak government nor the Morsi government has seen fit to return abducted American citizen children Noor and Ramsey Bower. They, along with 30 other American children in Egypt, are forced to live without half of their culture, half of their identity, and without the love and guidance of an American parent who daily fights for their return. The United States does not have a bilateral agreement with Egypt to facilitate the return of American citizen children, and has so far been unwilling to make prioritization of these cases a condition for the continued funding of the Egyptian Government.

India also has been a source of immense frustration and grief for American parents. In 2012, 32 more children were abducted to India, bringing the total number to 78 open abduction cases involving 95 children. Although some Indian courts make ''Hague-like'' decisions to return some children, returns are uneven. Parents attempting to utilize India's courts for the return of abducted children report corruption and incessant delays. The United States does not have a bilateral agreement with India to facilitate the return of American citizen children Convention.

In the last Congress I introduced legislation—the Sean and David Goldman Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act—to impress upon both Hague and non-Hague Convention countries that the United States will not tolerate child abduction or have patience with countries that hide abductors behind the Hague Convention. The bill would empower the President and Department of State with new tools and authorities to secure the return of abducted American children.

When a country has shown a ''pattern of non-cooperation'' in resolving child abduction cases, the President will be able to respond decisively with a range of 18 actions and penalties. Based on past experience—particularly with the Goldman case in Brazil—we know that penalties manage to get the attention of other governments, and help them prioritize resolution.

The bill also calls for the State Department to work out memorandums of understanding with countries that have not signed the Hague Convention in order to create agreed-upon routes to abduction resolution between countries, rather than the never-ending and torturous maze American are currently forced to run.

The status quo is simply not adequate, while well meaning and sincere, current policy has failed far too many children and their left behind, broken hearted, parents. To combat the cruelty and exploitation of human trafficking, over a decade ago I authored the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. To tangibly assist abducted American children and their left behind parents I introduced ''The Sean and David Goldman Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act'' this week. The United States can and must do more to protect innocent American children and their left behind parents from the horrors of international child abduction.

IN HONOR OF THE VALLEY FORGE ALUMNAE CHAPTER OF DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INC. AND THE 20-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE PATRIOTS OF AFRICAN DESCENT MONUMENT

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Valley Forge Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. and the 20-year anniversary of the Patriots of African Descent Monument.

One hundred years ago, the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority started with 22 women at Howard University. Since then, it has grown to more than 300,000 members in 1,000 chapters worldwide. Today, more than one hundred dedicated alumna from the Valley Forge chapter live in and serve the greater Philadelphia area.

On May 18, 2013, the women of the Valley Forge Alumnae Chapter will pay tribute to the Patriots of African Descent with a wreath laying ceremony commemorating its 20th Anniversary. The Patriots of African Descent Monument, sponsored by the Valley Forge Alumnae chapter in 1993, pays tribute to the service and sacrifice African-American soldiers of the Continental Army provided to our young nation during the Valley Forge Encampment of 1777–1778 and throughout the Revolutionary War.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Valley Forge Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority for its continued efforts to honor African-American patriots who have served this country bravely and honorably.

IN RECOGNITION OF DON WOOTEN

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say a few words about Don Wooten, a man I greatly admire and am honored to call a friend. Tonight, Don is being honored by Augustana College in Rock Island, his alma mater. Due to votes here in Washington, I won't be able to make it, but I want to talk about Don and what he has meant to me, and our community in Illinois.

Don is a former award-winning television reporter and producer. He has also been a teacher, a print columnist and has served on the board of numerous local and state organizations. Don went on to become a public servant, and served two terms in the Illinois State Senate. Afterward, he returned to his roots and founded WVIK radio station at Augustana College in 1980, where he still hosts two weekly radio programs at the ripe age of 85.

Don has been married for more than 50 years to Bernadette and they have 5 children and three grandchildren. As someone who spent years as a journalist herself and has now entered public service, I couldn't ask for a better role model than Don Wooten. He has influenced so many over his life and is a true community leader.

Mr. Speaker, I want to Congratulate Don, and I look forward to hearing his voice on the radio for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE DR. IRENE H. BRODIE

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant from my district, The Honorable Dr. Irene H. Brodie, Mayor of the Village of Robbins. As Mayor Brodie retires after 24 years of service to the Village I wanted to take this opportunity to recognize her many achievements.

Irene Brodie began her career in Robbins as a teacher at Kellar Elementary School where she worked alongside her husband, J. Edmon Brodie, who served as the school's principal. Through her hard work and diligence she later became Assistant Principal at Turner Elementary School. In addition to her professional responsibilities, Brodie continued to be a loving and devoted wife and mother. While doing this, and in spite of her busy schedule, she earned her Doctorate in Education at Northeastern University in Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Now a recognized educator in the region, Dr. Brodie joined the staff of a small junior college that, at the time, had only a few buildings to accommodate its 12,000 students. After two years of serving as a professor, Dr. Brodie became the first African-American Dean at Moraine Valley Community College. During her tenure, Moraine Valley grew to become the second largest community college in Illinois with a student population that now numbers well over 30,000.

Despite her having left the field, Dr. Brodie's dedication to education has never ceased. She has hired, financially supported, tutored, counseled, and graduated hundreds of residents from Robbins and the surrounding communities. Additionally, under her tutelage, the Mayor's Scholarship Fund has funded tuition costs for hundreds of students through the years and her individual efforts have produced teachers, lawyers, doctors, engineers, and educators around the world. Her contributions to education were recognized when Moraine Valley named the ''Dr. Irene H. Brodie Academic Skills Center'' in her honor. This center serves as a critical area of academic enrichment for Moraine Valley students.

During her tenure at Moraine Valley, Brodie also served as Village Clerk for the Village of Robbins for 12 years. Her service there led her to be recognized as a leader by a group of constituents who asked her to lead Robbins as its Mayor. Her election as Mayor marked her retirement from Moraine Valley and a shift in her career from educator to elected leader.

Mr. Speaker, throughout her career Dr. Brodie has served in such leadership positions as Vice-President of the Illinois Municipal League, Executive Board Member and Assistant Secretary of the National Conference of Black Mayors, and Chair of the Education and Scholarship Committee for the National Conference of Black Mayors. Additionally she has served as a member of the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, numerous Gubernatorial Transition Teams, various state and federal advisory boards, and as a member of President Clinton's Environmental Think Tank Group.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again thank Mayor Brodie for her decades of service and congratulate her on her retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO IOWA'S CIVIL WAR HEROES

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the invaluable contribution of Iowa's servicemembers during the United States Civil War as the Kinsman Monument in Council Bluffs, Iowa is rededicated on May 18, 2013. This event will mark the 150th anniversary of the passing of Colonel William H. Kinsman of Council Bluffs, for whom the monument is named.

Born in Canada in 1832, William Kinsman studied in New York and Cleveland before setting off for Iowa in 1858. After travelling across the entire state by foot, Colonel Kinsman settled in Council Bluffs, where he was admitted to the bar, taught school and wrote for the local press. He volunteered at the outbreak of the war and was elected a lieutenant under famed Iowa war hero General Grenville Dodge in Iowa's 4th Volunteer Infantry Regiment. Kinsman was ultimately promoted to the colonelcy of the 23rd Iowa Infantry following a stretch of valiant service, and in 1863 he and his troops joined General Grant's campaign to capture Vicksburg, Mississippi. On May 17 of that year, Colonel Kinsman fought and was mortally wounded in a pivotal battle at Big Black River Bridge that helped isolate the Confederates, leading to their eventual surrender in Vicksburg weeks later. Although Colonel Kinsman passed the following morning, he gave his life for our state, our country, and the cause of freedom.

Kinsman was interred on the battlefield, but nearly 40 years later in 1904, General Dodge, by then a former U.S. Congressman, secured the necessary financial resources to bring his remains home to Council Bluffs to be permanently laid to rest. Today, the Kinsman Monument reminds us of the sacrifice of Iowa's veterans during the Civil War and the strength of our nation's resolve.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to represent the people of Iowa, the city of Council Bluffs, and the legacies of Colonel Kinsman and General Dodge in the United States Congress. Their stories represent just a fragment of Iowa's extensive contributions to this great country made by our selfless veterans and their family members. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in thanking the Iowa Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War for this historic ceremony, and I humbly express my unending gratitude to all of our nation's veterans, servicemembers, and their families for their service and sacrifice.

HONORING ANDREW GOTZON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew Gotzon. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1260, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Andrew cleaned and renovated 13 playgrounds, sanding off the old paint, applying a fresh coat of paint and cleaning up the playground area.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew Gotzon for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

THE LEGACY OF SRI LANKA'S CIVIL WAR

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, four years ago this week, the Sri Lankan military declared victory over the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) after more than 25 years of conflict. Thus ended one of the most devastating civil wars of the century, offering hope of a brighter future for the Sri Lankan people characterized by peace, reconciliation, and economic prosperity.

Unfortunately, four years later this brighter future remains elusive for much of Sri Lanka's population. The Sri Lankan military's final offensive against the LTTE left hundreds of thousands of civilians—most of them Tamils—in a situation of forced relocation, humanitarian disaster, and precarious political rights. We have also learned that the government likely committed serious abuses during the fighting itself, leading to the death, torture, or disappearance of tens of thousands of Tamil civilians. A recent report by Human Rights Watch sheds a startling light on these abuses, documenting widespread and potentially systematic incidences of rape, torture, and sexual assault of Tamil detainees by Sri Lankan forces.

Since the end of the conflict, the Sri Lankan government has blatantly and repeatedly defied the demands of the international community and commonly accepted norms of justice and human rights by failing to reintegrate large numbers of Tamil citizens in a timely manner, denying access by journalists and humanitarian organizations to conflict-affected areas, and detaining former combatants indefinitely without access to legal recourse. The government has also persistently rejected calls by a growing number of governments, international bodies, and human rights organizations for an independent investigation into potential war crimes. If the government truly has nothing to hide, why resist even this basic measure of accountability?

On this anniversary of the end of the 2009 conflict, I call on the government of Sri Lanka to act expeditiously to reintegrate Tamil civilians into their communities, provide ex-combatants with appropriate legal recourse and a path toward reintegration, and open its doors to a truly independent international investigation. I also call on our own government to redouble its efforts to pursue accountability for atrocities committed by all sides of this tragic conflict. In the meantime, I urge Congress to expand current conditions on aid to the Sri Lankan government to cover all forms of military assistance.

It is past time for the international community to finally bring an end to this dark chapter in Sri Lanka's history so that the Sri Lankan people can realize the future they so badly deserve.

RECOGNIZING IGANCIO ''NASH'' CANTU FOR HIS DEDICATION TO BETTERING THE LIVES OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Igancio ''Nash'' Cantu and his devotion to enriching the lives of people with disabilities in my district. Nash, a resident of Carrollton, TX who works as a Direct Support Professional (DSP) at Mosaic in Dallas, was recently named by the American Network for Community Options and Resources (ANCOR) as Texas' Direct Support Professional of the Year for 2013.

DSPs across the nation are vital in helping people with significant disabilities lead a healthier and more meaningful life. This award

honors only those DSPs who have demonstrated an exemplary commitment to bettering the lives of the individuals they serve. Thanks to Nash's incredible work, the people he supports have a greater opportunity to participate and contribute in their community. I am extremely grateful to have Nash as a constituent and am very proud to recognize his devoted service to the people of my district and the state of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the amazing work of Igancio ''Nash'' Cantu. We must always honor those who devote themselves to enriching the lives of others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yesterday and missed roll No. 149. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

HONORING MIKALA JOHOKU JOHN JEFFERSON ZUBER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Mikala Johoku John Jefferson Zuber. Mikala is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 374, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Mikala has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Mikala has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Mikala has earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and the Four Star Religious Award. Mikala has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Mikala constructed book shelves for Gracemor Elementary School in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Mikala Johoku John Jefferson Zuber for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes #144, #145, and #146 on Tuesday, May 14, 2013. I was attending a funeral. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on all three votes.

TRIBUTE TO MAXINE P. CLARKE

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Mrs. Maxine P. Clarke has answered that call by giving of herself as an educator at Dunaire Elementary School, and as a beloved wife, mother and friend; and

Whereas, Mrs. Clarke has been chosen as the 2013 Teacher of the Year, representing Dunaire Elementary School; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents for the betterment of our community and our nation through her tireless works, motivational speeches and words of wisdom; and

Whereas, Mrs. Clarke is a virtuous woman, a courageous woman and a fearless leader who has shared her vision, talents and passion to help ensure that our children receive an education that is relevant not only for today, but well into the future, as she truly understands that our children are the future; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Maxine P. Clarke for her leadership and service for our District and in recognition of this singular honor as 2013 Teacher of the Year at Dunaire Elementary School; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr., do hereby proclaim May 2, 2013 as Mrs. Maxine P. Clarke Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 2nd day of May, 2013.

STATEMENT ON AZERBAIJAN REPUBLIC DAY

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Republic of Azerbaijan in celebration of the 95th anniversary of Republic Day on May 28th. Later this year, Azerbaijan will also celebrate the 22nd anniversary of its freedom from the Soviet Union and the beginning of diplomatic relations with the United States.

Located at the crossroads of Western Asia and Eastern Europe, Azerbaijan was established in 1918 becoming the first democratic and secular republic in the Muslim world before being incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1920. The country regained its independence in 1991.

The U.S. and Azerbaijan have developed a strong relationship through the opening of Caspian energy sources for development by American companies, which has also allowed the country to emerge as an essential player in global energy security. The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline project has become a vital part of delivering Caspian Sea resources to world markets and serves as a prime example of the development of the South Caucasus region.

Azerbaijan has continually assisted the United States on matters of international security, supporting and participating in operations in both Kosovo and Iraq as well as being actively engaged in Afghanistan. Azerbaijan has regularly facilitated landing and refueling operations for U.S. and NATO forces in the region. Furthermore, Azerbaijan offered strong and immediate aid to the United States directly following the devastating events of 9/11.

Again, it is my distinct pleasure to honor the Republic of Azerbaijan in celebration of the 95th anniversary of Republic Day, and to recognize the valuable bilateral relationship between the United States and Azerbaijan.

HONORING JAMES DOUGLAS HOOTEN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize James Douglas Hooten. James is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 374, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

James has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years James has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, James has earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic–O–Say and the Four Star Religious Award. James has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. James designed and planted landscaping for an outdoor classroom at Davidson Elementary School in Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending James Douglas Hooten for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,765,040,725,133.72. We've added $6,138,163,676,220.64 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

INTRODUCTION OF STOP DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING FOR WOMEN'S SERVICES ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing important legislation that will protect the rights of women seeking information on family planning services.

This week is National Women's Health Week, a weeklong effort to empower women to live happier, healthier lives. We want to encourage women to prioritize their health, but not deceive them about what medical options are available. Unfortunately, there are some centers that deliberately misinform or mislead women seeking information on family planning services. Called Crisis Pregnancy Centers (CPCs), they pose as sources of unbiased pregnancy counseling, using deceptive propaganda to dissuade women from considering comprehensive birth-control options or legal abortion. Fake reproductive health clinics entice women with unintended pregnancies through their doors under the pretense of providing the full range of reproductive options and services.

The Stop Deceptive Advertising for Women's Services Act directs the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate rules under the Federal Trade Commission Act, declaring it an unfair or deceptive act for an entity, such as a crisis pregnancy center, to advertise as a provider of abortion services if the entity does not provide abortion services.

Deception has no place when a woman is seeking information about her pregnancy. Working together we can help stop the fraud and confusion these Crisis Pregnancy Centers are perpetrating on the women of America.

CONCERNS REGARDING PROPOSED CUTS TO FUNDING FOR FOOD STAMPS

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my serious concern about the proposed cuts to funding for food stamps in the 2013 Farm Bill.

Food stamps are critical to the health and wellbeing of our Nation's most vulnerable populations. In my home State of New Jersey, nearly 870,000 households rely on this benefit to feed their families. Of that number, 45 percent are children and nearly 25 percent are either elderly or disabled adults.

As it stands, food stamp benefits average less than $1.50 per person for each meal, and that number is already set to drop to about $1.40 this fall when a temporary boost from the Recovery Act ends.

Every one of us knows how difficult it would be to feed their children or aging parents a nutritious meal for that amount of money. And yet, the farm bill would slash federal spending for food stamps by more than $21 billion over the next decade, eliminating food assistance to nearly 2 million people.

I understand the need to bring our budget under control, but I encourage my colleagues to find a smarter path forward. Let us not balance the budget on the backs of those among us who are the most vulnerable.

HONORING TYLER TILTON-LAGERMANN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Tyler Tilton–Lagermann. Tyler is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 393, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Tyler has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Tyler has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Tyler contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Tyler Tilton–Lagermann for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING UCP OF CENTRAL FLORIDA'S GRAND OPENING OF THEIR NEW WEST ORANGE CAMPUS

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize that on May 1, 2013, UCP of Central Florida celebrated the grand opening of their new West Orange campus location in Winter Garden, Florida. UCP of Central Florida is a tuition free public charter school that seeks to serve our young people with disabilities. The communities and families of Central Florida are blessed to have an organization such as UCP of Central Florida that is dedicated to helping improve the lives of thousands of children.

The mission and vision of UCP of Central Florida to open their doors to children, with or without special needs, is to be commended and celebrated. UCP of Central Florida offers the necessary development tools, including counseling, educational services and specialized therapy programs, to help build a foundation of success for children and families. This organization has achieved remarkable results. I am grateful to all those involved with making this organization such a successful part of our community.

On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, I am pleased to congratulate and recognize UCP of Central Florida on the grand opening of their new West Orange campus. I wish them many more successful years of providing quality care to the Central Florida community.

HONORING KBBF RADIO

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN, to recognize and honor radio station KBBF 89.1 FM as it celebrates 40 years of operation.

KBBF was the first bilingual public radio station in the United States, launching its inaugural broadcast on May 31, 1973. Its success has led to the creation 35 other radio stations throughout the country that now serve their local Hispanic and Latino communities.

For 40 years, KBBF and its program hosts have delivered an ever-evolving level of service to Spanish and English speakers alike by providing a diverse mix of information, commentary and culture. Airtime is devoted to public affairs, news commentary, literature, financial and health news, youth and women's issues and news, indigenous programming and music from all over the world.

The radio station was founded by an eclectic group of individuals including a farm worker, a lawyer, a housewife, a college professor and a college student who wanted to provide cultural, educational and informational radio programming to a community that had historically been underrepresented in traditional radio formats.

The vision of a bilingual public radio station captured the imagination of both the local community and the Nation. The late United States Senator Ted Kennedy personally directed a helicopter to fly KBBF's antenna to the top of Mt. St. Helena, the finishing touch before broadcasts could begin.

Mr. Speaker, KBBF 89.1 FM Public Radio is a true pioneer in every sense of the word and it is therefore appropriate that we honor KBBF today on its 40th anniversary.

HONORING WILLIAM W. McCLANNAHAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize William W. McClannahan. William is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 393, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

William has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years William has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, William contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending William W. McClannahan for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN HONOR OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER JOYCE ZONGRONE, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED)

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to honor Lieutenant Commander (LCDR) Joyce Zongrone, who retired after 35 years of courageous service in both the active and reserve service on June 30, 2008.

LCDR Joyce Zongrone has been consistently recognized throughout her career for her service in the Vietnam War, Operation Desert Storm, and the Global War on Terrorists. LCDR Zongrone originally earned her commission in 1974 after graduating Officer Candidate School in Newport, Rhode Island. She then went on to serve with great distinction, being awarded the Woman of Military Achievement Award by the San Diego Chapter of the U.S. Navy League for three consecutive years: 1975, 1976, and 1977.

LCDR Zongrone also received the U.S. Navy Commendation Medal for her service in Operation Restore Hope in Somalia and her duties as the Navy Central Command's liaison to General Colin Powell's Farewell Tour. LCDR Zongrone received a Coast Guard Unit Commendation for her development of a joint anti-submarine warfare curriculum for the Coast Guard and the Navy; and the Humanitarian Service Medal for Operation Babylift, a U.S. initiative that airlifted over 2,500 Vietnamese orphans out of Vietnam after the war.

In addition to her service to our great nation, once released from active duty by the U.S. Navy, LCDR Zongrone worked as a freelance producer, investigative reporter, technical writer for NASA, a teacher, and adjunct professor. In her post-military life, LCDR Zongrone won a Texas Gulf Coast Press Association Award, an Attaway Newspaper Group Color Photography Award, and was included in the 2005–2006 edition of Who's Who in American Teachers. Furthermore, due to her distinction and success, LCDR Zongrone currently serves on the Military Academy Selection Board of the Ninth Congressional District of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I am blessed to have the opportunity to pay tribute to such a selfless veteran as LCDR Zongrone. For those of us who know LCDR Zongrone, we are always in awe of her intelligence and willingness to serve worthy causes. It is an honor to know that as Americans and freedom-loving people, we owe our liberty and security to brave individuals like LCDR Zongrone, who put their liberty and security at risk for us.

GIRLS OF STEEL ROBOTICS TEAM

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Girls of Steel robotics team on winning the Engineering Inspiration Award at the 2013 Pittsburgh Regional F.I.R.S.T. Robotics Competition.

This is the second year in a row in which they have won the Engineering Inspiration Award. This prestigious award, which recognizes the team's outstanding efforts to advance respect for the engineering profession, also qualified the team to compete at the F.I.R.S.T. Championship in St. Louis for the third year in a row. The championship is the final and largest competition of the robotics season and features teams from across the world.

F.I.R.S.T., which stands for ''For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology,'' is an organization dedicated to introducing our youth to the world of science and technology. This year alone, hundreds of thousands of students are gaining practical, team-based engineering experiences by participating in F.I.R.S.T.

As a founder and co-chair of the Congressional Robotics Caucus, I think competitions such as these are outstanding tools for getting students interested in careers in science, technology, engineering, and math. I believe our nation's future economic growth and prosperity depends upon getting young people interested and engaged in scientific pursuits, and I want to commend organizations like F.I.R.S.T. for the important work they do in that regard. The F.I.R.S.T Robotics Competition instills a sense of pride in the individuals who participate in it and allows them to apply their natural creativity in the demanding and competitive field of robotics.

The Girls of Steel team is made up of 40 young women from high schools in and around the Pittsburgh area. In recognition of their hard work, intelligence, and teamwork, I want to mention each of these inspiring young ladies by name. They are Sonia Appasamy, Katie Ashwood, Tammy Bevilacqua, Elizabeth Bianchini, Britt Bovbjerg, Aaminah Bray, Grace Brueggman, Dakota Calvert, Abby Ceraso, Tristan Close-Abuyen, Claudia Contreras, Laurel Donatelli, Samantha Eppinger, Clarisa Espinoza-Delgado, Mackenzie Ferris, Naoka Gunawardena, Heather Harrington, Rosanne Harrison, Kathryn Hendrickson, Imani Horton, Campbell Konrad, Elizabeth Kysel, Sylvie Lee, Sophia Lee, Shana Leshko, Pragna Mannam, Genevieve Nieson, Raina Oravec, Simran Parwani, Korryn Resetar, Kaylyn Rocher, Alex Roth, Rachel Round, Katie Shreve, Lynn Urbina, Molly Urbina, Bryce Volk, Becca Volk, Giulia Watkins, and Natalie Young.

I also want to mention that one of the Girls of Steel—Naoka Gunawardena from The Ellis School—was one of two students at the Pittsburgh Regional who won the prestigious F.I.R.S.T. Dean's List Award, which recognizes student leaders who are outstanding at pursuing and achieving F.I.R.S.T.'s ideals.

I also want to express my appreciation to the staff of the Carnegie Mellon University Field Robotics Center, which has mentored the Girls of Steel. As a result of their efforts, more young women are gaining real-world technological experiences which will certainly aid them in the future.

I congratulate the Girls of Steel and wish them continued success in their academic and professional pursuits.

HONORING JACOB SHIPLEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Shipley. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 320, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Jacob researched and led a restoration of destroyed quail habitat on federal wetlands in northern Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob Shipley for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

INTRODUCTION OF MEDICAL NEUTRALITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Medical Neutrality Protection Act of 2013, which is an updated version of the bill I introduced in the 112th Congress. I have been encouraged by the tremendous support that this bill received since then, including major human rights advocacy groups, medical professionals, U.S. government officials, and medics living abroad who have been persecuted while serving in times of civil unrest.

Since I first introduced this bill in July 2011, we have heard of widespread cases, particularly in the Middle East, where the independence of physicians and medics was severely hindered. Unfortunately, the situation remains dire. Many have been arrested, detained, interrogated, and even tortured for caring for the wounded. Countries that do this to their medical professionals do not deserve our military assistance.

This bill elevates the protection of medical professionals as a foreign policy priority for the U.S. Government so that countries that violate norms of medical neutrality will no longer be able to receive U.S. military assistance.

I first became aware of this issue back in the 1980s during the civil war in El Salvador. The conflict ended in the early 1990s with over 75,000 people killed, some of whom were medical workers who were caught in combat or working in refugee camps. Then, as now, I was concerned that the United States was not doing enough to stop government forces from harming medical workers, who are some of the only unbiased eyewitnesses that we have on the ground.

Protecting doctors and health care workers is a nonpartisan issue that should get broad support in Congress and our government.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

COMMEMORATING THE 1980 OLYMPIC MEDICAL STAFF

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to provide long-overdue recognition for a group of Americans who were denied the opportunity and honor of representing our country at the 1980 Olympic Games: the U.S. Olympic medical staff.

In response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, the United States led a global effort to boycott the 1980 summer Olympic Games in Moscow. Sixty-five nations participated in the boycott, in an unprecedented display of international solidarity against Communist aggression.

Today, we look back at the 1980 Olympic boycott as a dramatic and triumphant moment in Cold War history. For the members of the U.S. Olympic team, however, it also represented a foregone opportunity to fulfill a once-in-a-lifetime dream of representing their country at the pinnacle of international athletic competition.

In recognition of the hard work, determination, and sacrifice of our Olympic athletes, the 96th Congress commissioned gold-plated medals to be minted for each member of the team. In July of 1980, Congress held a ceremony on the East Front Steps to hand-deliver the medals; more than 450 Olympic athletes were in attendance, as was President Jimmy Carter.

During the 110th Congress, it was brought to the attention of Congress that, because of a clerical interpretation, these Americans were not listed as recipients of the Congressional Gold Medal by the Clerk of the House. In response, former Representative Todd Tiahrt worked with the Clerk's office and the U.S. Olympic Committee to officially recognize the members of the 1980 Summer U.S. Olympic Team as recipients of the Congressional Gold Medal.

Unfortunately, this was not the only oversight on the part of Congress. Our athletes were not the only Americans affected by our government's decision to boycott the 1980 Summer Games; our Olympic medical and training personnel also lost the chance to represent their country on the world stage. Like our Olympic athletes, these medical and training professionals were leaders in their fields selected specifically for this honor, but they were never properly recognized for their contributions and their sacrifice.

As a small and belated gesture of gratitude, I stand here today, 33 years later, to recognize the following members of the 1980 U.S. Olympic medical staff for their service to our country: Physicians Tony Daly, Roy Bergman, Jerry Patmont, Doug Shaw, and Tim Taft (of my home State of North Carolina); and Athletic Trainers Bob Beeten, Sherry Babagian, Dave Blanchard, Tina Bonci, Chuck Demers, Tim Kerin, Mike Linkovich, Bob Moore, Al Ortolani, Tony Russo, Larry Standifer, Gail Weldon, and Troy Young.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE LYDIA GARDNER

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of a devoted public servant, a community leader and a special friend, Orange County Clerk of Courts Lydia Gardner. With her passing on May 8, 2013, her family has lost a loved one and our community and the State of Florida have lost a respected and accomplished leader.

Lydia was born in Michigan and graduated from the University of Michigan. She also attended Rollins College and the prestigious John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. However, it was with an early passion for politics that she won the position of Student Council President at Central High School in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Prior to serving as Clerk of Courts, Mrs. Gardner distinguished herself as an educator, achieved success in real estate and as an executive with a Fortune 100 telecommunications company and was later elected as member and chairman of the Orange County School Board.

Lydia was first elected in 2000 and then a subsequent four terms as Orange County, Florida's Clerk of Courts. In 2008 her office received the Sterling Award for operational excellence awarded by the Governor. She has been appointed by the Florida Supreme Court to a number of special committees, most recently one to study privacy and court records. Lydia lent her support to causes important to her and the Central Florida community. She was a strong advocate for the mentally ill and was the recipient of the Central Florida Mental Health Association's Golden Bell Award. She played a key role in establishing the Domestic Violence Commission in Orange County, served on the Jail Oversight Committee, Juvenile Justice Commission as well as the Board of Directors for the Central Receiving Center. In addition, she has served on the Board of the Orlando Science Center and Winter Park Chamber of Commerce, which elected her chairman in 2003.

A devoted wife, mother and grandmother, she truly made an indelible mark on her family, community and our judicial system. My deepest condolences are extended to her husband John, her son Chris and daughter Betsy. In addition, Lydia is remembered by her four grandchildren and three siblings. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives join me in recognizing the distinguished life and service of Lydia Gardner.

RECOGNIZING THE WINNERS OF THE NINTH ANNUAL TECHNOLOGY AND ARTS COMPETITION HOSTED BY SAIC AND THE COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS OF HERNDON

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the participants and winners from the Council for the Arts of Herndon's Ninth Annual SAIC Technology and the Arts Competition.

The Technology and the Arts program grew out of a desire to offer computer savvy teens a way to showcase their abilities in an artistic format. The innovative program challenges students in all Fairfax and Arlington county high schools to create works of animation, digital art, digital music, and digital photography by blending technology and artistry into one cutting–edge masterpiece. Students submit entries at their schools, and teachers are tasked with selecting which works will be entered into the contest. Works are judged by professionals and experts in the field, and awards are given for first place through honorable mention in each category.

This program also showcases how creativity extends beyond the arts into a crucial component of our local and national economies. Technology has been the driving force behind Fairfax County's economic expansion for the past two decades. Knowledge–based enterprises directly employ more than 140,000 people in Fairfax County and some of the world's leading technology firms are headquartered here. America remains the world's leader in technology innovation primarily because of the creativity and ingenuity of these companies. This event is not just about art, it is also about laying the foundation for America's competitiveness in a global market place.

I am pleased to congratulate the following winners of the Technology and the Arts Competition and to enter their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SAIC Sponsor Award: Briana Bui—Taken By The Wind.

CAH Board of Director's Choice: Dean Dickinson Effects of Music.

Digital Art: 1st Place, Kelly Park—Bottle Memories, 2nd Place, Marvin Funes—Untitled, 3rd Place, Aileen Kenny—Bite Your Lip and Tell a Lie, Honorable Mention, J Lash—Found, Honorable Mention, Lauve Gladstone—Feather Brush, Honorable Mention, Dylan Staniszewski—Painting with Poison, Honorable Mention, Heather—Pham Dream, Honorable Mention, Kevin Jo—Jazz Player, Honorable Mention, Roya Sodeifi—Fourth, Honorable Mention, Tony Lunsford—Ticking Transformation.

Digital Photography: 1st Place, Dakota James—Spring Snow, 2nd Place, Wray Sinclair—Photography, 3rd Place, Kyle Kirkpatrick—Hit the Nail on the Head, Honorable Mention, Marisa Ross—Dryer.

Animation: 1st Place, Max Johnson—Dispense, 2nd Place, Samuel Eddy—Neerstorten, 3rd Place, Ian Jelliffe– Fat Lady Sings, Honorable Mention, Kevin Dang—A Day in the Life of a Pencil—Falls Church High School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating this year's winners and thanking SAIC, the Council for the Arts of Herndon, as well as the educators, parents, and community partners for their support of these students and this competition.

HONORING HAGEN R. KIMSEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Hagen R. Kimsey. Hagen is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 10, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Hagen has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Hagen has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned 41 merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Hagen contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Hagen painted the physical therapy room at the United Cerebral Palsy of Northwest Missouri facility in St. Joseph, Missouri. Hagen's work allowed the facility to maintain its license and provide children with developmental disabilities an opportunity for physical activity.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Hagen R. Kimsey for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MIKE CONDOLEON

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life of Michael J. ''Mike'' Condoleon, 81, who passed away March 27, 2013 at St. Joseph Health Center in the presence of his loving family. Mike was born the son of John M. and Angela Condoleon on Nov. 6, 1931, in Warren, Ohio.

Northeast Ohio is known for hard working, honest Americans that work day in and day out to help drive this nation; Mike was no exception to this. He proudly served our nation in the U.S. Army during both World War II and the Korean War. In the early 1960s, Mike was the proud owner and operator of the McKinley Market. He also provided for his family while working at Penn Ohio Towel Co., St. Demetrios Community Center and most recently at Condo Inc.

Mike was a member of St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church and AHEPA Zeus 88. He found joy in reading, landscaping, doing home projects and studying history. Although Mike enjoyed these hobbies, none of them can compare to the love Mike had for his family. Mike is survived by his loving wife, Christina ''Tina'' Condoleon, whom he married August 18, 1963; three children, John (Tricia) Condoleon of Howland, Harry (Holli) Condoleon of Algona, Iowa, and Angela (Steve) Zervas of Cortland; ten grandchildren, Kristin, Michael, Kurt, Caitlyn, Michael John, Nicholas, Gabriel and Laney Condoleon, Christopher and Melena Zervas; one sister, Peggy Kontos of Warren; and numerous nieces and nephews.

Mike's son John is my dear friend, Mr. Speaker. And I know how proud he was of his son and all of his family. I know that his children continue to pass on to their children the values and integrity they witnessed in their father. And isn't that what it is all about? That is why I am honored to take this opportunity to commemorate the life of Michael J. Condoleon. He will be remembered as a friend, a colleague and a mentor to many—but most importantly, he will be remembered as a loving husband, father, and grandfather. His contributions to this his family, our community and our nation will not be forgotten.

HONORING AND RECOGNIZING ST. MARY'S HIGH SCHOOL

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of St. Mary's Bundschu Memorial High School, an historic and admirable educational institution that has been a proud part of my district for well over a century. At this time, I would like to join with my friends and neighbors to say goodbye and thank you to St. Mary's High School, recognizing all that the teachers, staff, and administration have done for generations of our community.

Few institutions can claim the vibrant history that St. Mary's can. It can trace its roots back to 1853, when Father Bernard Donnelly founded the school on a small plot of land, donated by Susan A. Hamilton. On this land was a small one and a half story building, which Father Donnelly converted into a school. From humble beginnings came bold and bountiful blessings.

At that time Independence, Missouri was the farthest point westward to which steamboats could travel on the Missouri River. It would be twelve more years before the city of Independence even opened its first public school, so St. Mary's served as the first public school for the frontier town. The children of merchants, explorers, and pioneers began their education together.

As the town grew, so did St. Mary's. Throughout its history—even in 1876 when part of the building was destroyed by a cyclone—St. Mary's has served the students of this community. In 1946, the cornerstone of the co-educational St. Mary's High School was laid, and by the very next year, a new building was completed and accredited. By 1968, the school opened its doors wide, expanding enrollment to neighboring communities, from greater Independence and Sugar Creek, to Northeastern Kansas City, Blue Springs, Lee's Summit, Raytown, Buckner, Smithville, and Liberty.

Over the years, St. Mary's has dedicated itself to the education and development of young men and women, teaching them to realize their unique potential through an extensive curriculum, instructional excellence, global awareness, service and extra-curricular programs. Thousands of young adults spent their formative years learning and growing in the classroom, on the field, on the stage, and in the pews on North Main Street.

It is with these facts in mind that Mayor of Independence Don B. Reimal dedicated May 14, 2013, to be St. Mary's High School Day, recognizing the positive impact this school has had on the lives of all of us, and urging all citizens to join in promoting the welfare of all children and youth.

As this school year comes to a close, so too do the doors of St. Mary's. But what will go on in these days, months, and years to come, is the lasting legacy of education and experience, living on in the hearts and minds of St. Mary's alumni.

Mr. Speaker, it is my wish that this Congress pay tribute to this valued part of our community.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF MAYO STUNTZ

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the extraordinary life of one of Fairfax County's more iconic figures, Mayo Sturdevant Stuntz, who passed away May 9, at the age of 97. Mr. Stuntz not only witnessed the historical events that shaped our community, but he and his family also dedicated themselves to documenting, sharing, and preserving that history for future generations.

A native of Vienna, Va., Mr. Stuntz spent his early years serving his country. After graduating from Cornell University, he served with the U.S. Army for five years during World War II, where he was a member of the renowned Alamo Scouts reconnaissance unit based in the South Pacific. He went on to serve 25 years with the Central Intelligence Agency. Those accomplishments alone merit our great praise and thanks, but it was what Mr. Stuntz did during his retirement that will leave a lasting imprint on our community.

Mr. Stuntz inherited from his parents an interest in history that grew into a hobby and ultimately became his true passion. His family is steeped in Fairfax County and our nation's history. He was a descendent of a Hessian soldier who came to the colonies during the Revolutionary War to fight for the British but wound up switching sides once he learned the impetus for the war. Mr. Stuntz also was a descendent of the Fitzhugh family, which traces its roots in America to the early 1600s. The family owned a large tract of what later became Fairfax County. At one point, the Fitzhughs were close family friends of George and Martha Washington, who had settled in eastern Fairfax, and another Fitzhugh descendant married Robert E. Lee.

Concerned with the disappearing character along the main street in Vienna that he recalled from his youth, Mr. Stuntz set out in the 1960s to photograph every house on Route 123 between Tysons Corner and Oakton. His wife, Connie, was soon pulled into the project, which eventually led the publishing of three books: ''This Was Vienna,'' ''This Was Tysons Corner,'' and ''This Was Virginia.'' It was also during the mid-1960s that Mr. Stuntz was recruited to join the Fairfax Landmarks Preservation Committee, which would serve as a precursor to the Fairfax History Commission. In a 2005 oral history interview, he said his initial goal was to create a book of historical

buildings and homes similar to one he had seen done in neighboring Arlington County. ''I didn't realize Arlington is about one-tenth the size of Fairfax County, and I bit off a great deal to chew . . . and I'm still chewing.''

All told, Mr. Stuntz spent 47 years on the Commission, chronicling and preserving our community's rich history and culture. In addition to the books he and his wife published, he regularly lectured in local classrooms and community centers. He readily acknowledged that he was not a trained historian, but his local knowledge went back a piece, and he understood the value in connecting the past with our present. It was those connections that continued to drive him, even in his later years, when he lost his sight.

I had the great pleasure of collaborating with Mr. Stuntz on Civil War preservation and a number of historic marker dedications during my tenure on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. You could not help but get carried along by his vast knowledge and passion for our local history. I was able to spend time with Mr. Stuntz earlier this spring when we celebrated the Freeman Store, a local Civil War landmark, being added to the National Register of Historic Places. It was particularly poignant for him as he was the first chairman of the Freeman House ad hoc Historical Commission. His daughter, Anne, is now president of the Commission's successor, Historic Vienna. As we reflected on this latest addition to his historic tally, he pulled me aside to ask me if I had purchased my plot at Flint Hill Cemetery. It is believed to be the oldest cemetery in Fairfax County, and Mr. Stuntz had served as president of the cemetery association for 50 years. He had long encouraged me to get a plot before they were all gone, and even now was still trying to close the deal. He was truly a character.

Mr. Stuntz is survived by his wife of 66 years, Connie, their three children, eight grandchildren, and one great grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and in commemorating the remarkable life of Mayo Stuntz for his tremendous service to our country and community and in extending our deepest sympathies to his family. His strong connection and commitment to our community became a lifelong passion that has preserved milestones in our history for future generations and inspired others to pick up where he left off. He also was my friend, and I shall miss his smile and warm presence terribly.

HONORING DR. GENE JOHNSON

HON. KEVIN YODER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Gene Johnson, Superintendent of the Shawnee Mission School District in Johnson County Kansas, for his unwavering service to our country's greatest natural resource—our children. Dr. Johnson has tirelessly served the children of Kansas during his educational career as teacher, principal, administrative leader, and during the last five years as the Superintendent of one of the largest school districts in Kansas. He will be ending his life-long service in public education at the end of June.

During his time of leadership Dr. Johnson has led through the difficulties of economic challenge and a changing demographic in student population, while continuing to raise the bar of academic excellence and achievement—a great example of excellence in leadership through diversity. He has quietly and brilliantly led this national award winning school district in the increase of their International Baccalaureate programs in the high schools and Advanced Placement Courses; Signature Programs in Bio-Science/Medical Studies, Bio-Technology, Engineering, Legal Studies, Culinary Arts and others while strengthening focus on early childhood education and academic rigor in the Middle Schools.

Thank you, Dr. Johnson, for your servant leadership. You are a hero and champion, and we wish you the best in your retirement.

STRENGTH IN HONOR

HON. E. SCOTT RIGELL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of United States Navy SEAL Lt. Jason Redman. In September 2007, while in the midst of an intense fire fight to capture an Al Qaeda High Value Individual, he was severely wounded. Shot in the face and other parts of his body, he came very close to death. With the help of his devoted wife Erica, Lt. Redman has made a miraculous recovery. The one word he uses which embodies his life and attitude is OVERCOME! He and his wife have started up a new company in Virginia called Wounded Wear. Through their company they are devoted to providing clothing and other gear for those injured in combat. Their goal is to help make the transition easier for American wounded warriors and their families. Lt. Redman and his family make us all so very proud to be Americans and I ask that this poem penned in their honor by Albert Carey Caswell, be placed in the RECORD.

TO OVERCOME

STRENGTH IN HONOR
Strength!
Strength In Honor!
When, hearts caress!
All in life,
all in life and death!
But To Be The Best!
While, all in the throws of death!
All in these,
our most heroic of all quests!
All in those,
moments that which we have so left . . .
Will it be The Angel of Light,
or Angel of Death?
As somehow Jay . . .
you so fought onward . . . with all that you had so left!
While, all in those darkest of all hours . . .
As upon your heart as was so showered,
the determination to so etch!
To so summon up the strength and power . . .
TO OVERCOME!
To rise above,
all in this battle to which your heart had now so come!
To somehow find the light,
from somewhere deep down inside!
As there you were Jay,
all in your SEAL OF HONOR,
as your courage out to all so cried!
All in this battle that you had so begun!
TO OVERCOME!
As upon you,
the dark hand of death would descend!
As you could so see its face,
and felt its hand!
When, life and death could not so wait!
As the tears ran down your most heroic face!
As you so said No to The Angel of Death,
as The Angel of Light came upon your breath!
To so help you find the grace . . .
To so reach deep down from within . . .
To fine THE STRENGTH IN HONOR,
with but your faith to so begin!
TO OVERCOME!
As death so wanted you to own!
As you have gotten stronger,
as your gait has gotten longer!!
TO OVERCOME!
As this battle SEAL,
YOU HAVE SO WON!
Because NAVY SEALS,
are everything Superman wishes he could so become!
As now you've rebuild your new life against all odds,
TO OVERCOME!
Almost like a God!
All in this your most heroic song!
For a town called pity,
is not some where you so belong!
Halfway to Heaven,
halfway to death!
As inch by inch,
step by step!
As you Lt Redman,
quantum leaps you so leapt!
As with you we could not so keep pace,
as all out in front you've so won this race!
That race to recovery,
TO OVERCOME!
All in those most magnificent moments,
that your fine soul so stretched!
To win that battle,
to win that fight . . .
as to our world you so brought your light!
For Faith and Courage,
are but the words you so live by!
And you wounded warrior,
have so brought such tears even to The Angels eyes!
As you fine wife Erica so stood by your side,
as upon her you could so rely!
For some people are put upon this earth,
to so teach us all what so comes first!
To so show us all that even in the very worst!
How to OVERCOME!
As Thy Will Be Done,
as On Earth As It Is In Heaven!
All IN THEIR STRENGTH IN HONOR,
TO SO SHINE LIKE THE MORNING SUN!
TO SO OVERCOME!

HONORING THE SACRIFICE OF ARMY STAFF SERGEANT FRANCIS G. PHILLIPS IV

HON. DANIEL B. MAFFEI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 2013

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor fallen Army Staff Sergeant Francis G. Phillips, IV, who made the ultimate sacrifice to protect and defend the freedoms of the United States of America. He was 28 years old.

This week, he returned home to Auburn, New York, and his family will lay him to rest next week at Arlington National Cemetery.

Staff Sergeant Francis G. Phillips, IV was killed on May 4, 2013 in Maiwand, Afghanistan along with four other members of his unit when their vehicle was struck by an enemy improvised explosive device. Francis Phillips, or Frankie as he was affectionately called by his family, embodied the same values that make this country extraordinary: Dedication, Honor and Pride.

Staff Sergeant Phillips, of Meridian, New York was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 36th Infantry, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Armored Division, Fort Bliss, Texas. Francis joined the Army in 2004 and served one tour in Iraq and two previous tours in Afghanistan. This was Frankie's fourth deployment and third to Afghanistan.

Francis is survived by his wife and daughter, Christine and Sophia Phillips, El Paso, TX; his mother, Cherie Phillips and fiance, Greg Race, Auburn; his dad, Francis ''Frank'' Phillips III, Lyons, NY; maternal grandmother, Jonnie Maxson-Manker, Springfield, Missouri; paternal grandparents, Betty Roberts, Seneca Falls, NY, Frank F. Phillips Jr. Savannah, NY; a brother, David Phillips, Auburn; a sister, Danielle Nicole Phillips, Land O'Lakes, FL; several aunts, uncles and cousins.

Mr. Speaker, in appreciation of this young man's love for country, who gave his life protecting this great nation, I ask this Honorable Body to join me in honoring the legacy of Army Staff Sergeant Francis G. Phillips, IV.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Ernest J. Moniz, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Energy.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3537–S3588

Measures Introduced: Twenty-one bills and seven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 967–987, S. Res. 143–148, and S. Con. Res. 16.

Pages S3569–70

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 607, to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications. (S. Rept. No. 113–34) **Pages S3568–69**

Measures Passed:

Freedom to Fish Act: Senate passed S. 982, to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from taking certain actions to establish a restricted area prohibiting public access to waters downstream of a dam.

Pages S3584–85

National Minority Health Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 145, promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2013 to bring attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations such as American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians, Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics or Latinos, and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders. **Page S3585**

National Police Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 146, designating the week of May 12 through May 18, 2013, as "National Police Week". **Page S3585**

National Foster Care Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 147, recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

Page S3585

National Kids to Parks Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 148, designating May 18, 2013, as "National Kids to Parks Day". **Page S3585**

Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 16, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for the unveiling of a statue of Frederick Douglass.

Page S3585

Appointments:

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki): The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed the following Senator as a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 113th Congress: Senator Chambliss.

Page S3585

Farm Bill—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3:00 p.m., on Monday, May 20, 2013, Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 954, to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018. **Page S3585**

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5:00 p.m., on Monday, May 20, 2013, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Sheri Polster Chappell, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Michael J. McShane, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed; that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Mark A. Barnett, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, and

Claire R. Kelly, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed. **Page S3585**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By a unanimous vote of 97 yeas (Vote No. EX. 127), Ernest J. Moniz, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Energy. **Pages S3538–52, S3588**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Debra M. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Pamela L. Reeves, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

Elizabeth A. Wolford, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

Richard T. Metsger, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2017.

Daniel R. Russel, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs).

Robert James Grey, Jr., of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2014.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S3586–88**

Messages from the House: **Page S3567**

Measures Referred: **Page S3568**

Executive Communications: **Page S3568**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3569**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3570–71**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3571–84**

Additional Statements: **Page S3566–67**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S3584**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S3584**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—127) **Page S3552**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 6:07 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 20, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3585.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGENCIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for various agencies within the Department of Agriculture, after receiving testimony from Edward Avalos, Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Kevin Concannon, Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Elisabeth Hagen, Under Secretary for Food Safety, and Catherine E. Woteki, Chief Scientist and Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, all of the Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS: FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded open and closed hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after receiving testimony from Robert S. Mueller III, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

LAW OF ARMED CONFLICT

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the law of armed conflict, the use of military force, and the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, after receiving testimony from Robert S. Taylor, Acting General Counsel, Michael A. Sheehan, Assistant Secretary for Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict, Major General Michael K. Nagata, USA, Deputy Director for Special Operations/Counterterrorism, J–37, Joint Staff, and Brigadier General Richard C. Gross, JAGC, USA, Legal Counsel, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of the Department of Defense; Rosa Brooks, Georgetown University Law Center, Kenneth Roth, Human Rights Watch, and Charles Stimson, The Heritage Foundation, all of Washington, D.C.; Geoffrey S. Corn, South Texas College of Law, McAllen, Texas; and Jack Goldsmith, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION STRATEGIES

Committee on the Budget: Committee with the Task Force on Government Performance concluded a hearing to examine effective strategies for government reorganization, focusing on reducing fragmentation, overlap, and duplication and achieving cost savings, after receiving testimony from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; John P. Holdren, Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President; Delaware State Senator Nicole Poore, Dover; and David H. Rosenbloom, American University Department of Public Administration and Policy, Washington, D.C.

PARTNERSHIPS TO ADVANCE THE BUSINESS OF SPACE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science and Space concluded a hearing to examine partnerships to advance the business of space, after receiving testimony from Captain Michael Lopez-Alegria, USN (Ret.), Commercial Spaceflight Federation, and Patti Grace Smith, both of Washington, D.C.; Steven Collicott, Purdue University School of Aeronautics and Astronautics, West Lafayette, Indiana; and N. Wayne Hale, Jr., Special Aerospace Services, Boulder, Colorado.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 27, 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'';

S. 59, to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California;

S. 156, to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska, with an amendment;

S. 211, to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions;

S. 225, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Parks;

S. 241, to establish the Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 256, to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, with an amendment;

S. 284, to transfer certain facilities, easements, and rights-of-way to Fort Sumner Irrigation District, New Mexico;

S. 305, to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park, with amendments:

S. 312, to adjust the boundary of the Carson National Forest, New Mexico;

S. 342, to designate the Pine Forest Range Wilderness area in Humboldt County, Nevada;

S. 349, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Beaver, Chipuxet, Queen, Wood, and Pawcatuck Rivers in the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System;

S. 368, to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, with an amendment;

S. 371, to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, to dedicate the Park to John H. Chafee;

S. 447, to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota;

S. 476, to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 507, to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, with amendments;

S. 609, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, with amendments;

S. 684, to amend the Mni Wiconi Project Act of 1988 to facilitate completion of the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply System, with amendments;

S. 736, to establish a maximum amount for special use permit fees applicable to certain cabins on National Forest System land in the State of Alaska, with amendments;

S. 757, to provide for the implementation of the multispecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River, Nevada, and Lincoln County, Nevada, to extend the authority to purchase certain parcels of public land;

S.J. Res. 12, to consent to certain amendments enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission, Act, 1920; and

H.R. 316, to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Regina McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be Chairman, who was introduced by Senator Schumer, and Richard F. Griffin, Jr., of the District of Columbia, who was introduced by Senator Warren, Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, who was introduced by Senator Murphy, Harry I. Johnson III, of Virginia, who was introduced by former Senator Byron Dorgan, and Philip Andrew Miscimarra, of Illinois, who was introduced by Senator Alexander, all to be a Member, all of the National Labor Relations Board, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Srikanth Srinivasan, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Raymond T. Chen, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, and Jennifer A. Dorsey, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Also, committee resumed consideration of S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, but did not complete action thereon.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

MANDATORY E-VERIFY ON SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the effects of mandatory e-verify on America's small businesses, including S. 744, to provide for comprehensive immigration reform, after receiving testimony from Peter Monaghan, Deputy Associate Commissioner, Data Exchange and Policy Publications, Social Security Administration; Kathy Lotspeich, Deputy Chief, Verification Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security; John Arensmeyer, Small Business Majority, Sausalito, California; David R. Burton, National Small Business Association, and Ryan Kearney, National Restaurant Association, both of Washington, D.C.; Sabrina Poole, Systems Engineering Research Development Institute (SERDI), Rockville, Maryland; and Rick Judson, National Association of Home Builders, Charlotte, North Carolina.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 32 public bills, H.R. 2009–2040; and 1 resolution, H. Res 218, were introduced. **Pages H2716–18**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2719–20**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Hartzler to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2659**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:46 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2664**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Dr. Mike Landry, Sarasota Baptist Church, Sarasota, Florida. **Page H2664**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 277 yeas to 132 nays with 1 answering ''present'', Roll No. 152. **Pages H2664, H2681–82**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of all law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. **Page H2681**

Repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation

Act of 2010: The House passed H.R. 45, to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 154.

Pages H2682–H2705

Rejected the Capps motion to recommit the bill to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 190 yeas to 230 nays, Roll No. 153.

Pages H2703–05

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in H. Rept. 113–59 shall be considered as adopted.

Page H2782

H. Res. 215, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 151, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 150. **Pages H2670–81**

British-American Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Representative Cicilline. **Page H2706**

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Representatives Wolf, Pittenger, and Meadows. **Page H2706**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2680, H2680–81, H2681–82, H2704–05, and H2705. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee concluded markup on H.R. 1947, the "Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013". The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a markup on FY 2014 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1911, the "Smarter Solutions for Students Act"; and H.R. 1949, the "Improving Postsecondary Education Data for Students Act". The bills, H.R. 1911 and H.R. 1949, were ordered reported, as amended.

FRAUD ON THE ELDERLY: A GROWING CONCERN FOR A GROWING POPULATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled "Fraud on the Elderly: A Growing Concern for a Growing Population". Testimony was heard from Kay Brown, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; Joseph S. Campbell, Acting Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission; Gail Hillebrand, Associate Director, Consumer Education and Engagement, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; and William H. Sorrell, Attorney General, State of Vermont.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power and Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled "The Fiscal Year 2014 Environmental Protection Agency Budget". Testimony was heard from Bob Perciasepe, Acting Administrator and Deputy Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

OVERSIGHT OF THE SEC

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Oversight of the SEC's Agenda, Operations, and FY 2014 Budget Request". Testimony was heard from Mary Jo White, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN MULTIFAMILY AND HEALTH CARE FACILITIES MORTGAGE INSURANCE AND REVERSE MORTGAGES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled "Sustainable Housing Finance: The Government's Role in Multifamily and Health Care Facilities Mortgage Insurance and Reverse Mortgages". Testimony was heard from the following officials from the Department of Housing and Urban Development: Charles Coulter, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Single-Family Housing; Marie Head, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Multi-Family Housing; and Roger Miller, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Healthcare Programs.

ASSESSING U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PRIORITIES IN EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''Assessing U.S. Foreign Assistance Priorities in East Asia and the Pacific''. Testimony was heard from Joseph Y. Yun, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State; Nisha Biswal, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia; U.S. Agency for International Development.

ASSESSMENT OF DHS CAPABILITIES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a hearing entitled ''Facilitating Cyber Threat Information Sharing and Partnering with the Private Sector to Protect Critical Infrastructure: An Assessment of DHS Capabilities''. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Homeland officials: Roberta Stempfley, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protection and Programs Directorate; Larry Zelvin, Director of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protection and Programs Directorate; and Charles Edwards, Acting Inspector General.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security held a hearing to vote on the motion to request the reports from the Department of Homeland Security on the following bills: H.R. 306, for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic; H.R. 977, for the relief of Esther Njeri Karinge; H.R. 1023, for the relief of Maria Carmen Castro Ramirez and J. Refugio Carreno Rojas; H.R. 1207 for the relief of Allan Bolor Kelley; and hearing on H.R. 1772, the ''Legal Workforce Act''; and H.R. 1773, the ''Agricultural Guestworker Act''. The motion to request reports was passed. Testimony was heard from public witnesses on H.R. 1772 and H.R. 1773.

CASE STUDY FOR CONSENSUS BUILDING: THE COPYRIGHT PRINCIPLES PROJECT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''Case Study for Consensus Building: The Copyright Principles Project''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT ON FEDERAL LANDS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation held a hearing entitled ''Invasive Species Management on Federal Lands''. Testimony was heard from Paul Ries, Associate Deputy Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Jason Fearneyhough, Director, Wyoming Department of Agriculture, and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 623, the ''Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act''; H.R. 740, the ''Southeast Alaska Native Land Entitlement Finalization and Jobs Protection Act''; H.R. 841, to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; H.R. 931, to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon; H.R. 1306, the ''Southeast Alaska Native Land Conveyance Act''; and H.R. 1410, the ''Keep the Promise Act of 2013''. Testimony was heard from Michael Black, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior; Robert McSwain, Deputy Director for Management Operations, Department of Health and Human Services; Jim Pena, Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

LACEY ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing entitled ''The 2008 Lacey Act Amendments''. Testimony was heard from Rebecca Bech, Deputy Administrator, Plant Protection and Quarantine, USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; Stephen D. Guertin, Deputy Director, Fish and Wildlife Service; and public witnesses.

CONSTRAINTS ON OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION ON FEDERAL LANDS AND WATERS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements held a hearing entitled ''Opportunities Lost: Constraints on Oil and Gas Production on Federal Lands and Waters''. Testimony was heard from Tommy P. Beaudreau, Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Government Accountability Office; and Frank Rusco, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office.

ESPIONAGE THREATS AT FEDERAL LABORATORIES: BALANCING SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION WHILE PROTECTING CRITICAL INFORMATION

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled ''Espionage Threats at Federal Laboratories: Balancing Scientific Cooperation while Protecting Critical Information''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IF YOU BUILD IT: THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE AND SMALL BUSINESS JOB GROWTH

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade held a hearing entitled ''If You Build It: The Keystone XL Pipeline and Small Business Job Growth''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3, the ''Northern Route Approval Act''; H.R. 1092, to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center''; and General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions. The Committee approved the General Services Administration Resolutions. H.R. 3 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 1092 was ordered reported, without amendment.

REVIEW OF FAA MODERNIZATION AND REFORM ACT

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled ''Review of the FAA's Progress in Implementing the FAA Modernization and Reform Act''. Testimony was heard from Michael Huerta, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration.

U.S.-EU TRADE AND INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP NEGOTIATIONS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing entitled ''U.S.-EU Trade and Investment Partnership Negotiations''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities''. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing on the following legislation: ''Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act of 2013''; ''Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013''; and ''Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013'', 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''The U.S. Contribution to the Fight Against Malaria'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Eyes in the Sky: The Domestic Use of Unmanned Aerial Systems'', 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing on Internal Revenue Service targeting conservative groups, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, May 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 3 p.m.), Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 954, the Farm bill.

At 5 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Sheri Polster Chappell, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, and Michael J. McShane, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, with votes on confirmation of the nominations at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, May 17

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 1062—SEC Regulatory Accountability Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E678
Barr, Andy, Ky., E675
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E679
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E680
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E686
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E682
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E685, E686
Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E682
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E684
Ellmers, Renee L., N.C., E677
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E677
Graves, Sam, Mo., E681, E682, E682, E683, E683, E684, E686
Green, Al, Tex., E684
Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E682
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E675
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E682
Keating, William R., Mass., E677
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E681
Lewis, John, Ga., E679
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E676
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E684
Maffei, Daniel B., N.Y., E687
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E683
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E681
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E680
Mica, John L., Fla., E679, E685
Miller, George, Calif., E682
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E678
Price, David E., N.C., E681, E685
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E675
Rigell, E. Scott, Va., E687
Rush, Bobby L., Ill., E680
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E686
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E676
Sires, Albio, N.J., E683
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E678, E679
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E683
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E675, E676
Valadao, David G., Calif., E677
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E683
Yoder, Kevin, Kans., E687
Young, Todd C., Ind., E677

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.