United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2013 No. 92

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 25, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY BENTIVOLIO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Last Thursday, Speaker BOEHNER called President Obama ''absolutely crazy'' for moving forward with rules to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from power plants that cause global warming.

What I think is absolutely crazy is the Republicans' constant denial of the overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change is real and human activity is largely responsible. I think it's absolutely crazy that the Republicans voted more than 50 times in the last Congress to block action on climate change.

In March, I talked about a new peer-reviewed report from Oregon State and Harvard that looked at temperatures over the last 11,300 years; and they found that over the last 100 years, coinciding with the widespread use of fossil fuels and turbines, et cetera, that we have seen more temperature increase than over the previous 11,000 years; 100 years versus 11,000 years.

Last month I came to the floor again to talk about a new NOAA report. Oceans are warming, fish stocks, many commercial fish stocks are moving north. Other things, which aren't capable of moving, are deteriorating in stocks.

And then, on the west coast, we've had shellfish failures due to ocean acidification; and the shellfish, of course, are only an indication of what might happen to the rest of the food chain in the oceans.

No one denies the acidification is due to the CO_2 in the atmosphere. But the Do-Nothing Republican Congress just shrugs and says there's nothing to do.

But, unlike the Republicans, President Obama accepts the science; and in about 2 hours, the President will release a plan to combat climate change here at home and lay out steps for working with some of the world's largest polluters, including India and China, to reduce emissions abroad.

The details aren't all out yet, but the President's proposing to do something that I said we should do 5 years ago, that is, use the regulatory powers of the Clean Air Act to regulate new and existing power plants. That's responsible for almost 40 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions.

We can make a huge dent in our emissions by moving forward on responsible, flexible efficiency standards for coal and natural gas plants.

As the administration moves forward, it should take a close look at the climate plan outlined by the Natural Resources Defense Council. Their plan has two key elements: set State-specific emission rates to reflect the diversity of the Nation's electricity sector, and give power plant operators broad flexibility to meet those standards in the most cost-effective way through a range of existing technologies.

The standard for every State would be an overall emission rate average of all the fossil fuel plants, and individual plants could emit at a higher or lower rate. Each covered plant with an emission rate above the State standard could meet the target by retrofitting a more efficient boiler, installing carbon capture, or it could burn a mixture of coal and cleaner fuels such as gas and/or biomass.

The plan would allow for the owners of multiple power plants to average emissions rates of their plants and meet the required emission rate on average by running coal plants less often, increasing generation from cleaner sources, or integrating more renewable resources. Such an approach, that is both flexible and State-based, is exactly what makes the Clean Water Act one of our most successful environmental and public health statutes in history.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to listen to scientists. Get serious about climate change. The evidence is in. The President has a plan. The Supreme Court has given him the authority to regulate. The only question now is whether the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives will listen and act.

AMNESTY GROWS WELFARE ROLLS

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, America suffers from four consecutive trillion-dollar deficits and a $17 trillion debt that risks a debilitating American insolvency and bankruptcy.

Financial responsibility is the key to minimizing America's risk of economic disaster wrought by crippling debt. Yet the Senate Gang of Eight amnesty bill is the height of financial irresponsibility. It makes illegal aliens a bigger financial burden on America, racks up higher deficits, and increases America's risk of insolvency and bankruptcy.

The Senate Gang of Eight bill immediately gives illegal aliens State and local welfare. That is in addition to the Federal welfare illegal aliens already lawfully and unlawfully get.

For example, watchdog group Judicial Watch reports that an assistant case manager in charge of food stamp applications stated:

> Illegals would come by the van load and we were told to give them their stuff. Management knew very well they were illegal. It was so rampant that some employees would tell their illegal relatives to come and get food stamps.

Judicial Watch adds:

> The promotion of the food stamp program, now known as SNAP, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, includes a Spanish-language flyer provided to the Mexican Embassy by the United States Department of Agriculture, with a statement advising Mexicans in the United States that they do not need to declare their immigration status in order to receive financial assistance.

Judicial Watch goes further:

> The United States Department of Agriculture spent taxpayer money to run Spanish-language television ads encouraging illegal aliens to apply for government-financed food stamps. The Mexican Consul in Santa Ana, California, starred in United States Government-financed TV commercials and assured illegal aliens that receiving food stamps ''won't affect your immigration status.''

Judicial Watch concluded that:

> Adding insult to injury, last spring, the United States Department of Agriculture Inspector General revealed that many food stamp recipients use their welfare benefit to buy drugs, weapons and other contraband from unscrupulous vendors, disclosing that the fraud has cost American taxpayers nearly $200 million.
>
> A comprehensive study by the Heritage Foundation found that ''many unlawful immigrants have U.S.-born children. These children are currently eligible for the full range of government welfare and medical benefits.''

The study notes that:

> In 2010, the average unlawful immigrant household received around $24,721 in government benefits and services, while paying some $10,334 in taxes. This generated an average annual fiscal deficit, benefits received minus taxes paid, of around $14,387 per household.

The Heritage Foundation confirms that the Senate Gang of 8 amnesty bill will:

> After 13 years, unlawful immigrants would become eligible for means-tested welfare and ObamaCare. At that point, or shortly thereafter, former unlawful immigrant households would likely begin to receive government benefits at the same rate as lawful immigrant households of the same education level. As a result, government spending and fiscal deficits would increase dramatically.
>
> The Senate Gang of 8 amnesty bill is reckless with the truth and misleads the American people. Not only will illegal immigration increase American taxpayer burdens through welfare, ObamaCare, and other payouts, but illegal immigration is already costing the United States taxpayers more than $14,000 a year per illegal alien household.

□ 1210

All told, per the Federation of Americans for Immigration Reform, illegal aliens already cost American taxpayers roughly $100 billion per year in net tax losses.

The Senate Gang of 8 amnesty bill does not properly manage welfare, does not give border security, mismanages tax dollars, thereby hammering already stressed and overtaxed American families and taxpayers while aggravating America's already bad financial situation, thus increasing America's risk of a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Gang of 8 bill must be defeated at all costs. America's future depends on it.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in 5 days, unless Congress acts, the Stafford student loan program, which helps 7.5 million students pay for college, is set to see its interest rates increase from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Again, this is at a time when student loan debt now exceeds $1 trillion. It's the highest form of consumer debt in the economy. It exceeds credit card debt and car loan debt. And yet, despite the fact that, again, students and families are facing this mounting, crushing burden, unless we move in a very short period of time, we are going to add to that burden by allowing the interest rates to go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

Six years ago, this Congress acted to pass the College Cost Reduction Act, which cut that rate from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent. It was a 5-year bill tied to the Higher Education Reauthorization Act. Last year, with minutes to spare, we extended that lower rate for 1 additional year. Again, here we are today, 5 days away from this rate doubling.

I've introduced legislation, H.R. 1595, the Student Loan Protection Act, and 196 Members of the House signed a discharge petition demanding that the Speaker of the House bring this bill up for debate and passage, which will protect that lower rate for an additional 2 years. We need that time so that we can pass a new Higher Education Authorization Act, which will deal with the broad range of issues that surround how we pay for college and access to higher education, which includes the Stafford student loan program, the workhorse for families to pay for college. It deals with Pell Grants and Perkins loans. It also deals with the obstructions and hurdles that people face when they want to refinance student loan debt after they have left college. Again, that's a big part of that $1 trillion debt burden that's out there in society.

We need a broad, long-range plan to pay for higher education because the stakes are huge. We know that the U.S. economy needs critical skills in our workforce if we are going to continue and grow and prosper. The baby boomers are now hitting retirement age at increasing numbers, and in a whole range of critical occupations, from medicine to science to engineering, we need to refill the ranks. And higher education is the avenue that we can continue to succeed as a country and as a nation. Our competitors know this. They are investing in higher education at a much higher rate than we are in the U.S. We must act to make sure that, again, we don't go backwards on July 1.

The House passed a bill on May 23. The Republican majority pushed a bill through which they claim solves the problem. It changes the fixed rate loan program to an adjustable rate tied to 10-year Treasury notes, which is roughly now at about 2.6 percent. It adds an additional 2.5 percent to that. They claimed when they passed that bill that that solves the problem. Unfortunately, the Congressional Budget Office drilled down deeper and analyzed what the real net impact would be on students. The problem with that variable rate program is that for a freshman entering this fall, like my daughter, who doesn't use the Stafford loan program, if some of her fellow students sign up for the Stafford loan program, under the Republican bill they really don't know what the rate is because it will reset over the 4 years that freshman is in college. Looking at where Treasury notes are projected over the next 4 years, the Congressional Budget Office has told us that, in fact, for that graduating student, 4 years from now the interest rate on the loan that they will graduate with will be over 7 percent.

So, in other words, as CBO told us, if we allow the Republican bill to go forward, it's actually worse than doing nothing and allowing the rates to double to 6.8 percent. President Obama has proposed a different version, which would, again, use the cheap cost of money today with an inflation add-on. But that plan that the President put forward locks in the rate for the student who takes that loan out next year. So, in other words, that freshman who signs up for a Stafford student loan that will go to school with my daughter next year, their rate will not reset from one year to the next. They will have at least the protection of a fixed rate based on the calculation using the Treasury note baseline. It is

a better proposal. The Republican bill has a cap in terms of how high these rates can go over time. The President's does not.

We need, obviously, to get both sides to come together and come up with a real compromise which comes up with an affordable, sustainable way for the Stafford student loan program to work. With only 5 days to go, I would argue that the better course now is just protect the lower rate, give us some time to come up with, again, overlapping good ideas from both sides of the aisle to fix this problem.

Let's not let the rates double. Let's pass H.R. 1595. Let's help 7.5 million college students pursue their goals and dreams and help the U.S. economy.

SYRIA—ANOTHER GUNRUNNING OPERATION BY UNCLE SAM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a civil war raging in Syria. No question about it, President Assad is a bad guy. He hates Israel and he hates his own people. The humanitarian situation in Syria is dire. I have been to Syrian refugee camps in Turkey and seen firsthand the devastation of this war. In one camp I went to, there were 150,000 Syrians in Turkey fleeing from the devastation of war.

However, there are numerous rebel groups trying to remove Assad from power. Who exactly are these rebels? We really don't know. But we do know the most powerful among them is al Nusra, an affiliate of al Qaeda. These extremists on both sides are killing each other in the name of religion, and the people of Syria are caught in the middle.

Lining up on President Assad's side are the nations of Russia and Iran; also, the terrorist group Hezbollah, of course, sponsored by Iran. Lining up on the so-called rebels' side are Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and numerous rebel groups from patriots to criminals to al Qaeda and outside mercenaries.

For 2 years, the United States has just ignored the situation; but now, suddenly, the administration has decided it's time to get involved. The administration's answer: send the rebels American guns. Send the rebels American guns? Blindly traffic American guns into Syria and, I guess, hope for the best.

Does this sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? We've tried this before. We've seen this song and dance in Libya and even in Mexico, our neighbor. This administration is gun-happy to give guns away. In Libya, the administration armed the rebel group to oust Muammar Qadhafi, another bad guy. Well, where are those guns now? Were they used in Benghazi? Who knows. The administration is still silent on Benghazi. Those guns are scattered all over the Middle East and in north Africa.

Were they used in Algeria? Remember, Mr. Speaker, in Algeria there were Americans working at an energy plant there, along with other citizens from other countries. Two Americans were killed in that attack. Were they also used in Mali? Who knows. Only time will tell. And who has died because these weapons end up in the wrong hands every time we give American guns away to rebel groups?

By providing weapons to radical sectors fighting against Assad, we're really taking sides in somebody else's war. We're also arming some radicals who seek to destroy us, like al Qaeda, who is fighting on the side of rebels. More weapons will only escalate this conflict. More people are going to die because the United States picks sides.

But Syria and Libya are not the first time this administration blindly trafficked weapons to terrorists. Let's go back to our own hemisphere. Let's talk about our neighbor, Mexico. Do you remember Operation Fast and Furious? We still haven't gotten answers on that scandal.

In an effort to help fight the drug cartels, the administration sent thousands of weapons to Mexico without even telling the Mexican Government. And who got those weapons? The drug cartels.

□ 1220

Of course these guns ended up in the hands of the terrorists—the narco-terrorists—and resulted in the death of at least two or three Americans and hundreds of Mexican nationals. Another botched gunrunning operation sponsored by the U.S. Government.

Too bad we don't learn from history and stop this nonsense of furnishing guns to groups in somebody else's country. Did we implement universal background checks on the violent criminals we armed in Syria, Libya and Mexico? Yeah, right. Is this the new foreign policy of the United States—international weapons trafficking?

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, this administration is on a tireless crusade to ban guns in the United States. Mr. Speaker, why is the White House so determined on disarming Americans while arming known potential terrorists, bandits, drug lords and mercenaries? Ironic, don't you think? But that's a different issue for a different day.

And I ask this question: What is the national security interest of the United States to be involved in Syria, in somebody else's civil war? There is none. This is not our war.

Mr. Speaker, this is a regional religious war that we should not be involved in. It's a war between the Sunnis and the Shias. These two religious groups have been fighting each other since the year 630, and now we're involved in this regional, religious war. What's next? Is the administration going to propose and implement a no-fly zone? Well, if this occurs, I believe the President must ask for congressional approval under the War Powers Act.

Almost 100,000 Syrians are dead.

No question, the U.S. should help with humanitarian aid.

The U.S. should work for a political solution, not a military solution.

But the Administration's policy seems to be traffic guns to third world countries and subversives and hope for the best.

However, recent history has shown this is a bad idea.

This is a dangerous foreign policy.

What area of the world is next for our gun running government?

Wait and see.

And that's just the way it is.

WAR POWERS ACT

(IN PART)

50 USC §1541—Purpose and policy

(a) Congressional declaration

It is the purpose of this chapter to fulfill the intent of the framers of the Constitution of the United States and insure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, and to the continued use of such forces in hostilities or in such situations.

(b) Congressional legislative power under necessary and proper clause

Under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, it is specifically provided that the Congress shall have the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution, not only its own powers but also all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer hereof.

(c) Presidential executive power as Commander-in-Chief; limitation

The constitutional powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities, or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, are exercised only pursuant to

(1) a declaration of war,

(2) specific statutory authorization, or

(3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, having traveled home this weekend and listened to so many back in my district concerned about the lack of solutions and the lack of effort on behalf of the United States Congress to get things done, I told them to take heart, that sometimes these things are difficult. And I added:

What if I tell you that we could deal with the rising cost of health care, we could bring down the national debt, and do it all by providing better quality, coordinated, and patient-centered care? That would be a good goal, they surmised.

And what if I told you we could do this without raising taxes or cutting Medicare benefits? And what if I told you that all of this notion began from the seeds of an idea that was an outgrowth from the Heritage Foundation,

piloted by a Republican Governor in a Democratic State, and that served as the basis of the Affordable Health Care Act, which is the law of the land?

The Affordable Health Care Act was not, in fact, what many Members on my side of the aisle support—a single-payer plan or a Medicare-for-all approach. But the law of the land is based on the Heritage Foundation idea and a Republican Governor from Massachusetts' formula for making sure that we could provide care to all of our citizens.

Although the health care act has become politically driven and charged, what the American people want to see is a Congress that's serious about solutions, solutions that are workable on behalf of the American people.

So let's start where we all agree. PAUL RYAN has stated over again, very eloquently, that the rising cost of our debt and deficit is due to health care. I agree with him. When it comes to making sure that quality is improved for patients and care is coordinated more effectively, these are not Republican or Democratic ideas; these are American ideas, and why we need to move forward.

We have no less than 10 separate studies—studies from the Institute of Medicine, Reuters, the Commonwealth Fund, among others, that show that there is between $750 billion to $800 billion in waste, fraud, abuse, and lack of coordination within our health care system. Why, then, would we consider, with that kind of waste, taking any money out of Medicare or taking any money away from the beneficiaries who use that to pay for their hospitals, their medical devices, their pharmacists, their doctors?

What we need to do is face what the reality is. The reality is that the United States spends 18 percent of its gross domestic product on health care. We need to drive those costs down. By doing so, as businessmen will tell you, any model that is that inefficient, when the rest of the world is at 8 and 9 percent for health care and provides universal access to health care, and we're at 18 percent, with millions of our people still uninsured, if we drive that down and wring out all the inefficiencies, the waste in the system, then we can have health care for our constituents that's both coordinated and essential and drives down the national debt.

All we have to do is recognize a simple fact. Take the very best of our public health system. Take the very best of science, technology and innovation. And then take the very best of our private sector and its entrepreneurs and have this body come together in a coordinated fashion to bring that about.

It's happening without us. It's happening in the private sector, where leaders like Mark Bertolini from Aetna and others around this country are taking steps to drive down the cost of health care. They're doing it by coordinating care with the Mayo Clinic, with the Cleveland Clinic, with Sloan Kettering, with labs like Jackson Labs in my State. All of this is focused on making sure that we're going to have better outcomes for our people.

We can do this together. Let's work toward solutions. This Congress is capable of doing it.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

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

Guide the Members of the people's House by the spirit of understanding, which will lead them ultimately to eternal wisdom. Since we live in a world of human failure and broken promises, may they be tolerant of the faults of others because they are so aware of their own unfaithfulness. All of us are yet to realize our own full potential as being truly the free children of God.

Bless all with a quiet respect for the diversity of opinions. Through honest dialogue and contemplative listening, may Your servants, gathered in this assembly, search all the avenues open to them to meet today's challenges of integrity and justice.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SLAUGHTER 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.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS SUPPORT ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY POLICIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are focused on solutions that will give our economy the boost it needs to fully recover and help put Americans back to work. Our Nation has an abundance of energy resources that, if accessed, would create jobs, promote our energy independence and lower prices at the pump.

Today, the President will once again abandon his claim to support an all-of-the-above energy stance and will unveil a new plan focused on waging a ''war on coal'' with Big Government regulations destroying jobs.

In contrast, this week, House Republicans will have the best interests of American families at heart when we vote on two key pieces of legislation included in our all-of-the-above energy plan. Increasing our offshore energy production, introduced by Congressman DOC HASTINGS of Washington, and lifting moratoriums on exploration and development, introduced by Congressman JEFF DUNCAN of South Carolina, are necessary to provide American families with a more secure future.

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

Congratulations, former Chief of Staff Eric Dell and his wife, Torry, on the birth of their son, Noah Isaac Dell, on Sunday, June 23.

BOBBY (BLUE) BLAND

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

Mr. COHEN. Bobby (Blue) Bland, a Memphis and American music and blues idol, passed away at the age of 83 on Sunday.

Bobby (Blue) Bland was born Robert Calvin Brooks in 1930, and in the forties he moved to Memphis. In 1949, he joined a group called the Beale Streeters, which was a loose-knit group and it included Johnny Ace, Rosco Gordon, Earl Forest, and B.B. King—giants. He later worked for Junior Parker and B.B. King, two other giants. Then he went on his own way and became one of the great blues singers of all time.

His four top singles were ''Turn on your Love Light,'' ''Call on Me,'' ''That's the Way Love is,'' and ''Ain't Nothing You Can Do.'' He had top 100 hits almost every year for 40 years. His songs were covered by the Grateful Dead, The Band, and Van Morrison. He influenced Otis Redding, Wilson Pickett, and the Allman Brothers. He has been in every music hall of fame you can think of, including the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and the initial class of the Memphis Music Hall of Fame.

He served his country in the Army from 1952 to 1954. He is survived by his wife, Willie Mae, his son, Rodd, his daughter, Patrice, his four grandchildren, and by millions of disks and CDs that people will be loving forever.

WAR ON COAL

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

Ms. FOXX. Allow me to quote from one of President Obama's climate change advisers, Dr. Daniel Schrag:

> The one thing the President really needs to do now is to begin the process of shutting down the conventional coal plants . . . A war on coal is exactly what's needed.

My goodness. Where are the Obama administration's priorities? Not on jobs. Not on affordable energy.

President Obama's war on coal is already a threat to thousands of American jobs, many in my home State of North Carolina, where 17 coal units are already being shut down, in part, because of EPA policies.

Americans want energy independence, more affordable gas, and jobs. The Keystone pipeline, coal, and coal-fired plants have jobs to offer and can play a role in bringing our country closer to energy independence.

The President and his regulators should be less invested in declaring a war on American coal and more involved in supporting American energy producers and the jobs they already provide.

LEAD POISONING PREVENTION

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the majority's proposal to slash funding for the Nation's lead poisoning prevention efforts.

At a time when we should be working to eradicate lead poisoning, the majority's Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations package cuts funding to the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control by over 60 percent. We need to be focusing more on our efforts of ensuring that children live, play and learn in healthy environments free from the lead hazard and not less.

The number of children in the United States who are suffering from lead poisoning remains unacceptably high. A recent report by the Centers for Disease Control found that 1 in every 38 children has dangerous blood levels. Those levels lead to cognitive and behavioral problems, a loss of IQ points, and a lifetime of adverse health effects. It is estimated that lead exposure costs the Nation more than $50 billion in lifetime productivity losses.

Over the past two decades, HUD's Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control has successfully treated 168,000 units for lead hazards and has improved the lead safety. This is no time to backtrack.

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE TAKEOVER TO RESULT IN LOSS OF JOBS

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

Mr. BURGESS. We are 6 months and 6 days away from the full weight of the President's takeover of American health care. It's like a train that's careening down the tracks on a collision course with the American economy. Last week, Gallup released a survey of small business owners, and it's even worse than it looks:

Almost half of small business owners reported that they have frozen hiring because of the Affordable Care Act. Another 20 percent said that they have already had to lay off workers because of this law. So that's one out of every five small businesses laying off people because of legislation the administration has forced on hardworking Americans. That's a staggering number of people who are going to have to suffer because of the administration's shortsighted policy.

The President and his allies are under the faulty impression that educating people about the Affordable Care Act will suddenly make it popular and make it work. The truth is that people are already finding out far too much about this law as it costs them and their family members jobs. We have to continue highlighting the destructive parts of this law before it destroys an already weak economy.

□ 1410

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act.

Over 3 years have passed since President Obama and then-President Calderon agreed on the need to finalize a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement which now needs to be approved by Congress. This agreement would establish a cooperative process for managing the Gulf of Mexico to promote joint utilization of transboundary reservoirs.

The transboundary hydrocarbon agreement set to be enacted after decades of indecision between the Republic of Mexico and the United States allows oil and natural gas production on 1.5 million acres that was previously off limits because of border issues. The Mexican Legislature has already acted on this agreement, and we are now waiting on Congress to act.

The transboundary agreement is good for the United States and is good for our relationship with the Republic of Mexico and is good for economic growth and good for environmental protection.

This agreement would allow the American industry to work directly with PEMEX, instituting cutting-edge technologies.

I ask Congress to approve this.

JOBS AND ENERGY

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, after over 4 years with unemployment at or above 7.5 percent, it is no wonder that the American people do not have faith in this administration's ability to lead.

Of the nine counties I represent in North Carolina, seven have unemployment rates above the national average. And in several of those counties, the unemployment rate is above 10 percent.

Madam Speaker, North Carolinians, like all Americans, deserve better. We need to seize opportunities for economic growth and job creation, and one of those focus areas should be energy independence.

More domestic production would not only increase our country's competitiveness in the energy field, but would create jobs, Madam Speaker. It would also lower prices at the pump for American families who should not have to worry about busting their budgets to fill their gas tanks. Unfortunately, the President's energy plan will only make American energy more expensive and hinder job growth.

Madam Speaker, the American people are focused on jobs and the economy, and this administration needs to do the same.

LISTEN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, two-thirds of the American people want the border secured before other immigration reforms are implemented.

The Senate bill ignores them.

Most Americans feel that legalizing millions of illegal workers would take jobs away from U.S. citizens.

The Senate bill ignores them.

Most Americans want to stop illegal immigration.

The Senate bill only reduces illegal immigration by 25 percent.

Most Americans feel that legalizing millions of illegal immigrants would be a drain on government services.

The Senate bill ignores them.

Most Americans don't want to increase the number of immigrants beyond the very generous 1 million admitted every year.

The Senate bill doubles that number.

Those considering the Senate bill should stop, look, and listen to the American people.

SOLUTIONS FOR ENERGY AND JOBS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our economy continues to struggle. Nearly 12 million of our fellow Americans remain out of work. Why then does the President still insist on standing in the way of creating new jobs by expanding America's energy sector using all of our valuable resources: water, wind, solar, gas, and oil?

An all-of-the-above energy strategy is what America needs to grow our economy, to create real American jobs, and to strengthen our national security. What we don't need is more government regulation and other interference from Washington. It looks like that is all this administration is prepared to offer.

House Republicans have a plan to make the most of all of America's energy resources. We already passed legislation to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, and this week our Offshore Energy and Jobs Act is another part of that plan. It's a commonsense solution, and it's what the American people deserve.

SMARTER SOLUTIONS FOR STUDENTS ACT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the mounting financial challenges facing our college students.

With student loan debt over $1 trillion, even larger than the credit card debt in our Nation, students are taking on a significant financial burden in order to realize their dreams. Soon that burden may grow as interest rates are set to go up significantly on these loans that students hold, thereby increasing the cost of college dramatically in our country.

Congress must act, and the House already has. A month ago the House proactively took action to ensure America's college students and their families continue to have the Nation's support in pursuing their collegiate aspirations. In passing the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, the House would keep rates low for college students and create a permanent solution to this annual problem, getting Congress out of the business of setting interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Senate will take up the Smarter Solutions for Students Act to create certainty for today's college students so that they, too, may have a chance to realize the American Dream.

OUR COUNTRY'S ENERGY POLICIES

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

Mrs. WAGNER. As I stand before you, President Obama is down the street at this moment outlining his proposal to tackle climate change, with the centerpiece of his plan aimed at attacking the backbone of affordable energy in America.

While he will not explicitly say it, this is the next step in this administration's war on coal that they have been waging for the past 5 years and which will not stop until all coal-fired power plants in this country have been shut down by the EPA.

I, on the other hand, believe that producing affordable energy and being environmentally sound are not mutually exclusive, and I truly support an all-of-the-above policy that utilizes renewable and clean technology without eliminating our most reliable source of energy.

Instead, the President's current course of action is a direct attack on the middle class who are affected more by rising energy costs, all under the deception of pursuing climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly suggest that the President consider the American people first when making these decisions on our country's energy policies.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

STAN MUSIAL VETERANS MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2383) to designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri, and southwestern Illinois as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2383

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

SECTION 1. STAN MUSIAL VETERANS MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River that connects St. Louis, Missouri, to southwestern Illinois shall be known and designated as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the bridge referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2383.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2383, to name the new I–70 bridge that connects St. Louis and southwestern Illinois as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge.'' I introduced this legislation, along with my colleague BILL ENYART, as well as ANN WAGNER, JOHN SHIMKUS, LACY CLAY, DAN LIPINSKI, AARON SCHOCK, EMANUEL CLEAVER, SAM GRAVES, VICKY HARTZLER, RANDY HULTGREN, ADAM KINZINGER, BILLY LONG, BLAINE LUETKEMEYER, and JASON SMITH.

Today marks a bipartisan opportunity to honor all of America's heroes as well as a legend of America's national pastime. Nearly 1.3 million of America's 21 million veterans live in Illinois and Missouri. Naming this bridge that links these two States is another way we can honor the brave men and the brave women who have served our country.

Whether it's coming together to pass critical veterans funding measures, just like 420 of my colleagues and I did earlier this month on this very floor, or recognizing our veterans by naming this bridge, this body has shown it can come together in support of our veterans.

This bill would also honor the legacy of Stan Musial. Mr. Speaker, the St.

Louis Cardinals are one of the most storied and successful first-rate franchises in sports history, and the best player to ever don a St. Louis Cardinals uniform was Stan ''the Man'' Musial.

Born in Donora, Pennsylvania, in 1920, Stan Musial lived an amazing, inspiring life. On the field, he was a 24-time All-Star, a three-time World Series champion, three-time National League MVP, and a first-ballot Hall of Famer. He finished his career as a .331 hitter; and he was consistent, earning 1,815 hits at home and 1,815 hits on the road.

During his 22-year major league career spanning 3,026 games, he was never ejected by an umpire. These lessons in consistency and sportsmanship not only serve as a good reminder to Congress, but they are also attributes that I try to impart upon my sons and their teammates as the coach of their Little League baseball team in Taylorville, Illinois.

Off the field, Stan Musial led by example. In 1945, in the prime of his career, Stan took a year off from baseball to go serve his country in World War II. Stan served in the Navy and was based at Pearl Harbor as part of a ship repair unit.

There was more to Stan Musial than being an outstanding athlete who also served his country. He and his high school sweetheart, Lillian, were married more than 70 years and had four children. He also served as chairman for President Johnson's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports; and in 2011, Stan was given this country's highest civilian honor: the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

My first favorite player, Hank Aaron, a Hall of Famer, sums it up best when he said:

> I didn't just like Stan Musial; I wanted to be like Stan Musial.

As an individual, Stan will be remembered as kind, modest, generous, and approachable. As an ambassador, Stan meant more to the game of baseball and St. Louis than he was ever willing to take credit for.

Today, let's honor our veterans and Stan ''the Man'' Musial. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2383, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2383, to designate the new Interstate 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting Illinois and St. Louis as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge''—or the ''Stan Span,'' as many affectionately call it.

This bill names the bridge in honor of one of the greatest players in baseball history, as well as the millions of brave Americans who have served this country in the Armed Forces. Naming the bridge after Mr. Musial and saluting the millions of Americans who have served in our Armed Forces is a fitting tribute to their bravery and sacrifice.

Few players have contributed more to America's pastime than Stan Musial. In his 22 seasons in major league baseball playing for the St. Louis Cardinals, Stan the Man was selected to the All-Star game a record 24 times, named the National League's Most Valuable Player three times, and played on three World Series championship title teams. Musial was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1969 on the first ballot.

Moreover, Stan Musial's contributions go well beyond the baseball diamond. Like many of his generation, Mr. Musial served our country during World War II. During his tour of duty in the Navy, Musial joined with more than 16 million other Americans to serve our Nation as members of the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. In retirement, Stan Musial contributed his time to causes such as the USO, the Senior Olympics, and the Boy Scouts, and served as chairman of the President's Council on Physical Fitness from 1964 to 1967.

Stan Musial received the Navy Memorial's Lone Sailor Award in 2007. It honors Navy veterans who excel in their civilian careers while exemplifying the Navy's core values of honor, courage, and commitment. In February 2011, President Obama presented Stan Musial with the Presidential Medal of Honor. That's the highest honor bestowed on a civilian in America.

My personal appreciation of Stan Musial goes way back to my childhood, growing up in Springfield, Illinois. Our family would make regular car trips every summer to Busch Stadium to cheer on our beloved Cardinals. When we weren't able to make it to games in person, we would listen to them on KMOX radio back home. I still remember the voices of Jack Buck and Harry Caray, who then would go on to announce for the Cubs.

I also fondly remember waiting around Busch Stadium after the games with my brother, my sister, and my mom and dad just to catch a glimpse of some of the Cardinal greats like Curt Flood. We loved watching Lou Brock run the bases. We loved watching Bob Gibson pitch.

And we just loved baseball so much that, later in his life, my dad would go on to work for Major League Baseball. I'm proud to say that my brother, Dan Callahan, would be the head coach of Southern Illinois University baseball for 16 seasons, until he passed away a couple of years ago from cancer. As you see, my family's bond with greater St. Louis, the Cardinals, and baseball is a strong one.

This bill does not just recognize the contributions of one man, but, rather, it salutes the service of all our veterans. Stan Musial was a hero to many, not just for the way he played baseball, but for how he lived his life. Like so many of the heroes who have served this Nation in our military, he lived his life with integrity and with honor. Naming this bridge in honor of Stan Musial and all veterans is a symbol of our gratitude for the sacrifices they made to protect our freedoms.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2383, to dedicate this bridge in honor of Stan the Man Musial and all the men and women who have served our Nation in the Armed Forces. We are proud to remember and honor all they endured for our democracy and to safeguard our democracy.

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

□ 1710

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I'd first like to thank my colleague and my good friend from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for her kind comments, and also for honoring her father's service to Major League Baseball and her brother's service to the youth and to the students at Southern Illinois University during his time there as a head baseball coach.

I now wish to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of veterans, and one veteran in particular, one of St. Louis' all-time heroes, Stan Musial.

Stan the Man Musial is best known as the greatest player in St. Louis Cardinals history, winner of three World Series as a player and one more as general manager, a member of the Baseball Hall of Fame, and as one of the greatest players to ever play our beloved national pastime.

However, Stan Musial was also a great patriot. He temporarily left the St. Louis Cardinals during the Second World War to serve his country in the Navy. Stan and the Cardinals had just won the 1944 World Series when Stan left to serve during the war. And after the war, he returned to his beloved St. Louis Cardinals to bring home yet another World Series Championship in 1946.

His athleticism and his greatness as a player are self-evident. His 3,630 hits are the fourth-highest in baseball history. Stan is also one of only seven players to hit 400 home runs and have over 3,000 hits.

A model of consistency, Stan Musial could hit a baseball anywhere he was, home or away, finishing his career with 1,815 hits at home and 1,815 hits on the road. A former teammate described Stan's tremendous talent like this: ''He could have hit 300 with a fountain pen.''

Those who had the privilege to see Stan Musial play baseball swear that he was the greatest player they ever saw put on a St. Louis Cardinals uniform. Yet Stan the Man stood for something more than his two decades of sustained excellence in baseball—he was an exemplary human being.

To baseball fans around the country, Stan Musial represented perfection as a ballplayer and as a gentleman. But to those of us from St. Louis, he represented so much more; he was our neighbor and he was our friend.

There has never been a better representative of the Cardinals or baseball—or, for that matter, humanity—than Stan Musial. Carrying himself with dignity, Stan was always willing to sign an autograph and meet fans, or do anything to help a friend in need.

I recently asked constituents to share some of their Stan Musial memories with me. And while many of them remember watching him play baseball, it was his kindness and his humility that set him apart. One constituent told me that as a child he lived in the same neighborhood as Stan Musial. Stan would play baseball with him and other neighborhood kids during the off-season.

Many from St. Louis remember Stan going out of his way to sign autographs for young fans or lend his good name to charitable and civic events. Others remember his visits to St. Louis hospitals and the joy that he brought to both the patients and the staff. But all remember that he was a happy and a joyful person who made you feel better and made you want to be a better person just by being in his presence.

After he retired from baseball, Stan Musial came to nearly every Cardinals Opening Day because he felt it was his duty to be there for the city and the team that gave so much to him. And each year at the induction to the Baseball Hall of Fame, Stan would play ''Take Me Out to the Ball Game'' on his harmonica. The new inductees would often mention Stan playing the harmonica as one of their favorite moments during the induction weekend.

The best description of Stan was rendered by former baseball commissioner, Ford C. Frick: ''Here stands baseball's perfect warrior. Here stands baseball's perfect knight.'' These words adorn the statue of Stan Musial that sits outside Busch Stadium in St. Louis city.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a part of this bill that names the I–70 bridge after Stan Musial and our veterans. I urge my colleagues to support this bill as a lasting tribute to Stan the Man and all those who have served our country so honorably.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2383, a compromise measure to name an extraordinary structure in honor of extraordinary heroes.

Today, I'm proud to join my colleagues in bridging a great divide—not the aisle here in the House dividing Democrats from Republicans, but a divide that is sometimes even wider, the mighty Mississippi River between Illinois and Missouri.

Today, in the spirit of compromise, we come together to honor people we hold dear and to recognize the values that make them special to us in both Illinois and Missouri, regardless of our politics or which side of the river we call home.

For millions of baseball fans in mid-America, Stan Musial is a hero. Stan spent a career accumulating Major League records and World Series rings while playing for the St. Louis Cardinals. But he was much more than one of the best baseball players to have ever played the game. No, to us in the region, he epitomized what it meant to be a resident of mid-America. He worked hard; he achieved success with humility; he was always a gentleman.

In a time when society too often glorifies all that is loud, showy and brash, Stan was the opposite. Quiet and humble, he was the textbook of integrity in all that he did.

Stan the Man was a hero for another reason. That's because he wore only two uniforms: one for the baseball team he loved and one for the country he loved. I'm proud to support this bill today because it recognizes not only Stan Musial, but all of our Nation's veterans.

As a veteran of two of our Nation's Armed Forces, this is a commitment that is very personal to me. I represent Scott Air Force Base, just 15 minutes from the new bridge, and I'm proud to represent a district that has one of the highest percentages of veterans in the United States.

The people of southern Illinois have answered each and every time our country has called. The service and the sacrifice of our veterans and their families can't be taken for granted, nor can their service be remembered only 1 or 2 days a year. Our Nation remains a beacon of freedom and liberty because of that dedication and sacrifice.

So today, I'm proud to rise in support of this measure to designate the new Interstate 70 bridge linking East St. Louis, Illinois, to St. Louis, Missouri, the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge.''

On my way to Washington, D.C., today I passed this new bridge still under construction. The bridge cables were gleaming in the sunlight. I looked out and saw dozens of my constituents hard at work on this structure. It's a much-needed infrastructure investment for our region and the country, a partnership between our States and the Federal Government. It's my hope that every traveler who crosses over this striking structure will not only read the name of that bridge, but will remember the values we honor with that name: hard work, integrity, humility, service and sacrifice. These are fitting ideals for all of us. And they are a fitting reason to name this bridge in honor of Stan Musial and in honor of all our veterans.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my colleague, Mrs. WAGNER, for her comments and support for this bill. I'd also like to thank my colleague, Mr. ENYART, for his support, and also for his service to our country. Thank you, sir.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly great man, a great baseball player, and a decorated veteran, Stan the Man Musial.

Growing up a Cardinals fan, I recall watching Stan Musial from the stands of Sportsman's Park as a boy as well as sneaking my transistor radio into my bedroom late at night so I could listen to Cardinals games and my mom and dad wouldn't know I was up late.

In 1938, Musial was signed by the Cardinals as a free agent at the age of 20. He led the Cardinals to a World Series victory the following season. In May of 1944, during the midst of World War II, Musial put down his bat to serve his country for 2 years in the Navy—a service for which he would later receive the Navy Memorial's Lone Sailor Award.

□ 1720

After serving his country, Musial went on to play for 20 more seasons as a Cardinal. After his 22 seasons, Musial was ranked number one in singles, doubles, and triples among records with a single team—all records he still holds to this day. He was selected to a record 24 All-Star games and was named the National League's Most Valuable Player three times, winning three World Series championships with the Cardinals. One of Musial's most famous feats was hitting five home runs in 1 day during a double header. Musial was a first-ballot inductee to the baseball Hall of Fame in 1969. But not only was Musial a great Cardinal, the greatest to ever play the game in St. Louis, he was also a great philanthropist, an integral and valuable member of the St. Louis community. And for this humanitarian commitment and his athletic achievements, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in May of 2011 by President Obama.

Though he passed away in January of 2013, Musial is remembered dearly in the hearts and minds of not only Cardinals fans, but also in the entire baseball community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise in support of naming the I–70 bridge after Stan the Man and in honor of all of our veterans. I urge Members of this House to stand with me in unwavering support of the Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan legislation that I am pleased to cosponsor with my colleague and friend, Mr. DAVIS, to designate the new Interstate 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting the city of St. Louis and southwestern Illinois as the Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge.

As the U.S. Representative who has the honor of representing the St. Louis Cardinals, it is a special privilege for me to speak about Stan Musial from the perspective of a Member of Congress, and also from the memory of a

young boy at Old Sportsman's Park with my dad, former Congressman Bill Clay, as we watched Stan play near the end of his remarkable career.

Stan Musial was simply one of the greatest baseball players of all time. As was noted earlier, he was elected to baseball's Hall of Fame on the first ballot, and that much is known to the world. Mr. Speaker, what is less known is that as good a player as he was on the field, Stan Musial was even a better man off of the field. In his own quiet way, Stan Musial was also on the vanguard of fighting discrimination and changing America.

Stan was born in the small town of Donora, Pennsylvania, the fifth of five children. Donora is also the hometown of baseball's famous Griffey family.

As a young man, Stan was no stranger to the challenges of African Americans and the evils of segregation. Years before the desegregation of baseball in 1947, Stan, a gifted athlete, was playing basketball with Buddy Griffey, the father of the great Ken Griffey, Sr., and the grandfather of the great Ken Griffey, Jr. When their high school team was supposed to have dinner in a segregated hotel, Stan and the rest of the team walked out.

In 1947, 6 years after Stan was called up to the Cardinals, Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier with the Brooklyn Dodgers. Many more great Black and Latino players would follow. They faced racial taunts and threats on an almost daily basis, sometimes from the fans in the stands, sometimes from the opposing team, and sadly, sometimes from their own teammates. When some White players on the St. Louis Cardinals threatened to boycott the game if they were forced to play with Blacks, Musial stood tall for justice and stopped the boycott before it started.

When Stan died, stories from those difficult days were told with great reverence and respect. Upon hearing of his death, Hall of Famer Willie Mays recalled a story from an All-Star game in the 1950s. Before the game, in one corner of the National League clubhouse, sat Mays, Hank Aaron, Ernie Banks, and Frank Robinson, playing cards all by themselves. The White ballplayers on the National League roster either ignored them or were openly hostile. So Stan Musial, who by then was one of the biggest stars in the game, simply walked over, sat down, and said, ''Deal me in.'' That was his way of saying, ''Fellows, you belong here, it's gonna get better, and I'm glad to have you on my team.''

When asked about his friend's passing, the great Hank Aaron, baseball's legitimate all-time home run king, and someone who faced much hateful racism himself, said this of Stan:

> I not only liked Stan Musial, I wanted to be like Stan Musial.

Two years ago, I was privileged to accompany Stan and his family to the White House as President Obama awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The President said this about Stan:

> His brilliance could come in blinding bursts—hitting five home runs in a single doubleheader; leading the league in singles, doubles, triples, and RBIs over a single season. Stan Musial made that brilliance burn for two decades, even as he missed a season in his prime to serve his country in the U.S. Navy during World War II. Stan remains to this day an icon untarnished, a beloved pillar of the community, a gentleman you'd want your kids to emulate.

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely true. And soon, when millions of Americans cross the beautiful new bridge that will bear his name, I hope they will remember that Stan Musial was more than just a proud veteran and a great ballplayer. His life and legacy truly symbolize the best of the greatest generation.

I thank my colleagues from Missouri and Illinois for supporting this bill.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and my colleague, Mr. CLAY. Thank you for your service. Thank you for the stories about Stan Musial being ''the man'' when it came to a difficult time in Major League history. I would also like to thank you for your father's service too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of baseball's greatest heroes of all time, St. Louis' Stan Musial. Stan the Man was an unblemished icon both on and off the field.

Musial's historic numbers over his 22 seasons with the St. Louis Cardinals make him one of the greatest to ever play the game. With 3,630 hits, 475 home runs, 1,951 RBIs, and a lifetime .331 batting average, he was one of the most consistent hitters of his era. Musial's performance on the field earned him 24 All-Star appearances, three National League MVP awards, seven National League batting titles, a rightful place in the Hall of Fame, and three World Series championships for Cardinals Nation.

□ 1730

Stan the Man was immortalized in the hearts of Cardinals fans when his No. 6 was retired and his statue was erected outside Busch Stadium with a fitting quote from Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick: ''Here stands baseball's perfect warrior. Here stands baseball's perfect knight.''

But Stan Musial was more than just an example of baseball excellence; he epitomized modest Midwestern values and a devout faith rarely found in today's age of fame and record contracts. When fellow baseball great Ty Cobb compared Musial to other greats and said he was better than Joe DiMaggio, Musial humbly replied: ''Cobb is baseball's greatest. I don't want to contradict him, but I can't say that I was ever as good as Joe DiMaggio.'' Stan Musial lived his faith through his life as a devout Catholic, his charitable work and his devotion to his family, with nearly 72 years of marriage and four children. For his lifetime of work and service, Stan Musial earned the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2011, as Lacy so aptly identified.

It is fitting, as we name the I–70 bridge the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge,'' to remember his service to our Nation as well as that of countless other veterans in the St. Louis area and Cardinals Nation. Like so many other young men and women of his generation, Stan Musial put aside his career when he was drafted into the United States Navy during World War II.

With the passing of Stan Musial, we lost a beacon of our community and our team, but this legislation is a fitting tribute to a player who will always be remembered in the hearts of Cardinals fans as ''the Man.''

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. In closing, I would like to thank Congresswoman BUSTOS for managing this bill with me today. It has been an honor. I would also like to thank Congressman ENYART, Congresswoman WAGNER, Congressman SHIMKUS, Congressman CLAY, and Congressman LUETKEMEYER for coming to the floor today in support of H.R. 2383.

I would also be remiss not to thank former Congressman Jerry Costello for his vision to turn this bridge from an idea into a reality, and I would like to honor him today, too, for his service to our country as a Member of Congress.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation so that we can honor our veterans—and Stan the Man Musial.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2383.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1092

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, and any successor air route traffic control center at that location, shall be known and designated as the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the air route traffic control center referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1092.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill honors the work and commitment of Mrs. Patricia Clark for her 60 years of Federal service.

Mrs. Clark began working at Boston Center in Nashua, New Hampshire, in 1963 when it first opened, and has worked there ever since. In her years at Boston Center, Mrs. Clark has never taken annual or sick leave. According to her colleagues, Mrs. Clark's dedication to her job is as impressive as her length of service to the FAA.

To recognize her dedication, Mrs. Clark's colleagues decided that it was appropriate to celebrate Boston Center's 50th anniversary by renaming it in her honor. The dedication and hard work of Federal employees like Mrs. Clark should not be overlooked. I voice my support and encourage my colleagues to support this bill, which recognizes the work of an exemplary Federal employee.

I want to clarify that, while honoring Mrs. Clark, this bill does not require any funding for the renaming of the Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of 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.'' The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure unanimously reported this bill by voice vote just last month.

Mrs. Clark has worked at the Nashua center since it opened on March 31, 1963, and she has provided more than 50 years of government service. Mrs. Clark does administrative work at the center, including payroll, mail processing, and travel arrangements, and she has not taken a single sick day in her long career. Mrs. Clark's managers and colleagues at the Federal Aviation Administration initiated the idea of naming the facility to honor her for her valued service.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill, introduced by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and other members of the New Hampshire delegation. This bill is a companion bill to S. 540, which passed the Senate by unanimous consent earlier this year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1092, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), for introducing this piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER. Thank you, Mrs. BUSTOS, for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1092, which is a bill that I introduced with Congresswoman SHEA-PORTER, to rename the air route traffic control center in Nashua, New Hampshire, after Patricia Clark, an exemplary Federal employee.

I want to thank Senator SHAHEEN and Senator AYOTTE for leading this legislation and ensuring its swift passage through the other body. I also thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL and their hardworking staffs for passing this bill through the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and bringing it to the floor today.

The Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center was built 50 years ago as part of a network of 20 centers that guide commercial air traffic in our Nation. The center is staffed by a dedicated team, which ensures the safety of our skies and of the aircraft that travel through them; but while much has changed in the 50 years since the center was opened, one thing has remained constant—Patty Clark.

Patty started work at the Boston Center the day after it opened, and since that time she has been the gold standard for Federal employees. Patty does administrative work, including payroll, travel arrangements, and manning the phones, and as you've heard today, over these past 50 years, she has never once taken a sick day.

Patty is beloved by her colleagues for her dedication and her positive attitude. To quote one of her colleagues, she is simply the ''cream of the crop.'' So, as the 50th anniversary of the Boston Center approached earlier this year, management and workers got together at the center and decided that the only way to appropriately mark this extraordinary milestone was to honor the woman who had been through it all.

This is no cost, bipartisan legislation that will recognize the dedication of an incredible woman who has served our Nation for 50 years. I urge my colleagues to join me and the entire New Hampshire congressional delegation in honoring Patty Clark by supporting H.R. 1092.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to personally thank Mrs. Clark for all her years of dedicated service. This is truly an honor—benefiting a Federal employee of her high caliber. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1092.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1740

KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON SPOUSAL IRA

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2289) to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2289

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

SECTION 1. KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON SPOUSAL IRA.

The heading of subsection (c) of section 219 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is

amended by striking ''SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN MARRIED INDIVIDUALS'' and inserting ''KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON SPOUSAL IRA''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we are considering legislation to rename the Spousal IRA the ''Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA,'' and I want to thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for cosponsoring this bill.

Mr. Speaker, a fellow Texan, an extraordinary woman and the first Texas female United States Senator, Kay Bailey Hutchison established during her time in the Senate a long and distinguished record of service to the great people of Texas and to Americans across our Nation. A fitting example of the Senator's service is her successful effort to help families save for retirement.

Back in 1993, Senator Hutchison first led the effort to change an unfair tax rule that limited the ability of homemakers to fully contribute to their own personal retirement accounts known as IRAs. At that time, homemakers could only put aside $250 in an IRA as opposed to $2,000, the maximum allowed for the working spouse. In response, Senator Hutchison introduced legislation allowing homemakers to fully contribute to their own accounts.

In 1996, Congress passed legislation that included the Senator's proposal to do just that. As a result, homemakers are no longer penalized for undertaking the important work of raising a family when it comes to saving for retirement. As the Senator said back in 1996:

> There is no question in my mind that the work done inside the home is as much a part of the American family, if not more important to the American family, than the work done outside the home.

I can't think of a better way to recognize the now former Senator's efforts to make it easier for families to achieve retirement security than by renaming the Spousal IRA the ''Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague from Dallas, Texas (Mr. JOHNSON) for his leadership on this matter.

This spring in another part of Texas in San Antonio, with the committed leadership of Katy Flato, we had our first-ever Bexar County edition of the Texas Book Festival. Among the many authors who were celebrated there, an active presence to make this book festival a success, was our United States Senator and New York Times best-selling author, Kay Bailey Hutchison, who presented her new book, ''Unflinching Courage: Pioneering Women Who Shaped Texas.''

In this book, she takes a look at other women who have made Texas and this Nation what it is today. She tells some incredible stories from Jane Long, who's often called the Mother of Texas, and her delivery of her own baby on a beach, to the tale of Margaret Houston, the wife of the hero of Texas, Sam Houston, who reportedly had an operation to remove a tumor, bit on a silver coin, survived and had six more children.

Senator Hutchison was a pioneer in her own right. She graduated, as my colleague said, from the University of Texas School of Law in 1967 when the number of women in the graduating class was in single digits.

As the first Republican woman to be elected to the Texas House of Representatives, she served there and in the Texas Constitutional Convention where I had an opportunity to get to know her as another member of that convention, as well as her husband, Ray Hutchison, who served with distinction in the House of Representatives. She is to date our only woman to have represented Texas in the United States Senate.

We're grateful for her long service, her willingness to work with Members of both parties, and in San Antonio we're particularly grateful, as well, for her service as it relates to the San Antonio River and the expansion of the River Walk.

When she first came to the Senate in 1993, she began working on legislation to help women take charge of their own futures, and one part of that is the Spousal IRA. The bill was the product of her own personal experience. When she married Ray, she learned that she could no longer contribute $2,000 to her retirement annually, but was limited to $250.

Early on, she approached Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI about becoming the Democratic lead sponsor on the Spousal IRA bill. Together, Senator Hutchison, working in a bipartisan manner with Senator MIKULSKI, got the legislation approved as a part of the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996.

The Spousal IRA that became law is an important tax benefit for stay-at-home spouses. It allows the stay-at-home spouse to make a full IRA contribution to the stay-at-home spouse's own IRA, even if a husband or wife has made a full contribution to the working spouse's IRA.

At a time when too many people are not saving enough to provide a secure requirement, this measure helps many contribute to ensure that they have a full retirement. Under the rules in place before, that limitation would have been a very nominal $250. Under Senator Hutchison's legislation, the contribution can now go up to $5,500, a big contribution, each year.

So I think it's very appropriate that we honor Senator Hutchison here with the naming that is proposed.

I reserve the balance of my time at this point.

□ 1750

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Chairman JOHNSON, thank you for your leadership on this issue and, Mr. DOGGETT, for your eloquent support.

When American families are fortunate enough to have children, they often face an important decision: Can they afford to have one parent stay at home to care for the children or is it financially necessary that both parents continue to work outside the home? If they choose to have one parent stay home, it is often a great financial sacrifice that affects not only their day-to-day living but their retirement security as well.

I believe the government should support their decision by encouraging them to save for their retirement by using the Spousal IRA tax provision which became law in 1996. This provision brings a measure of equality to the Code and allows parents to contribute to IRA retirement accounts whether they work outside the home or not.

While the Spousal IRA provision was included in the Contract for America and the Contract with the American Family, it only exists today because of our dear friend and former Texas Senator, Kay Bailey Hutchison.

Years ago, she recognized the unfairness of the Tax Code to those moms and dads who chose to stay home with their children, even if it meant missing out on the usual tax incentives enjoyed by those with outside jobs who were putting money away in a traditional IRA as a nest egg. Well, stay-at-home parents didn't have that IRA option, so Senator Hutchison went to work to balance the scales a little for those parents.

I remember Senator Hutchison for years tirelessly crisscrossing the State of Texas and lobbying her colleagues in the House and the Senate for a spousal IRA because it was the right thing to do for our families and families across the country. She never stopped raising awareness of this inequity and never gave up. I think all of us would agree that ''never giving up'' is a Kay Bailey Hutchison hallmark.

She also turned her incredible energy to getting it passed in Congress. She

was finally and justifiably successful in 1996, working across the aisle with leaders like Dick Armey and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Bill Archer; but also signed by and supported by President Clinton.

Since that time, millions of American children have benefited from their stay-at-home parents, and their parents have benefited from Senator Hutchison's magnificent work to bring some retirement fairness to these wonderful families.

Therefore, I join with my colleagues to urge them to vote in support of renaming the Spousal IRA section of the Tax Code the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA. It is an honor much reserved for the one person most responsible for its existence.

Mr. DOGGETT. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a pleasure to join my friends from Texas on the floor today to honor Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison and the work that she did with creating the Spousal IRA.

Look, back in the 1990s, I was just a regular guy practicing medicine back home in Texas. What did I know about this stuff? Well, not much. But what I did know was that for the 15 years that I had been in private practice, my wife and I had shared our contribution to our IRAs every year. That meant each of us was able to deposit $1,100 every year into the IRA account.

Well, I've got to tell you, it's pretty frustrating to try to save for retirement when every year your contribution is limited to that rather austere amount. So it was a very big day, and I remember that day when we actually both were able to make the full contribution to our IRA accounts, and it was because of the hard work done by Senator Hutchison.

She never forgot her constituents back in Texas. She never forgot women—yes, women in the workforce, but also those women who were exercising their option to spend all of their energies raising their children and raising their families. It was a great day for Texas, for Texas constituents when that tax bill was passed, and we are very grateful to Senator Hutchison for her leadership. It is appropriate that we honor her tonight with the naming of the Spousal IRA in her honor.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, to close briefly, last fall Senator CORNYN hosted a memorable bipartisan dinner honoring Senator Hutchison appropriately in the LBJ Room here in the Capitol, where all of us who are gathered here today, and a number of our colleagues, joined in honoring Senator Hutchison. At about the same time, Senator MIKULSKI introduced a resolution in the Senate to accomplish the same objection as this resolution. I hope the Senate will act promptly to approve this legislation. It has strong bipartisan support because this is an important measure to ensure more retirement security provided by a Texas leader of which those of us of both parties can take pride.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. DOGGETT, for his words.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill in honor of Senator Hutchison's commonsense effort to make it easier for families to save for retirement.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of renaming the "Spousal IRA" so that it carries the name of its champion—my friend and fellow Texan—Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison.

This bill was a product of Senator Hutchison's personal experience before joining the Senate. After putting aside money for her retirement as a single working woman, Senator Hutchison found that she could only put aside $250 in an IRA once she married her husband.

When Senator Hutchison was elected to the Senate in 1993, she led the effort to change this discriminatory part of our tax code, and worked to pass the "Spousal IRA".

Senator Hutchison has said that, over the course of her 19 years in the U.S. Senate, this law is the accomplishment she is most proud of. I think it is therefore fitting that we should amend the tax code so that women in America know that they're benefitting from the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support H.R. 2289, introduced by Representative SAM JOHNSON (R–TX).

This bill amends the Internal Revenue Code to rename the section heading of provisions relating to the individual retirement accounts (IRAs) of married individuals as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.

Senator Hutchison, from Texas, along with Senator MIKULSKI, co-authored the now 15-year-old law that allows homemakers to make the same deductible contributions to their IRA as salaried workers. The Spousal IRA was one of Senator Hutchison's proudest achievements while in Congress.

I thank Senator Hutchison for her years of service to the U.S. Senate. I believe this is a fitting tribute for her championing of this issue. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2289 to honor Senator Hutchison.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, its a pleasure to recognize my colleague and friend, former Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, for her efforts to help women. Her many contributions include her success in changing federal law to help women save for retirement. Her efforts expanded the availability of Individual Retirement Accounts for women, regardless of their family or work status, to set aside money for retirement.

Senator Hutchison's success in changing the tax code to help stay-at-home spouses underscores the family values that are critical to our nation. Americans should not be limited by federal law when they work at home to raise children and help their families.

Senator Hutchison deserves recognition for her support of American families. I was a cosponsor of H.R. 2289, to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA. I applaud Senator Hutchison and thank her for the exceptional work she has done on behalf of the State of Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2289.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2383, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1092, by the yeas and nays.

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

STAN MUSIAL VETERANS MEMORIAL BRIDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2383) to designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri, and southwestern Illinois as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge'', on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 2, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

YEAS—395

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

NAYS—2

Amash
Massie

NOT VOTING—37

Amodei
Bishop (UT)
Bonner
Brown (FL)
Clarke
Costa
DesJarlais
Engel
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Higgins
Kaptur
Keating
Labrador
Lamborn
Lee (CA)
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Neugebauer
Noem
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Young (FL)

□ 1855

Messrs. WEBER of Texas, ROGERS of Michigan, and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA CLARK BOSTON AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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'', on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 3, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—392

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

Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Flores
Harris
Massie

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Mulvaney

NOT VOTING—38

Amodei
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Bonner
Brown (FL)
Castor (FL)
Clarke
Costa
DesJarlais
Engel
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Higgins
Kaptur
Labrador
Lamborn
Lee (CA)
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Neugebauer
Noem
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Young (FL)

□ 1903

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 287 on H.R. 2383, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, to designate the new Interstate Route 70 bridge over the Mississippi River connecting St. Louis, Missouri, and southwestern Illinois as the ''Stan Musial Veterans Memorial Bridge'', I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 288 on H.R. 1092, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, To designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center'', I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1213

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1213.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

WAR ON COAL

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my frustration and disappointment with President Obama's war on coal. This war on coal is a war on the middle class. It's a war on good-paying jobs, and it's a war on American prosperity.

You cannot pay for our critical social safety net programs unless you have a growing economy. You will not have a growing economy without low-cost American energy.

President Obama's new regulations will shutter coal mines and power plants. It will raise energy costs and significantly impact moms and dads sitting around the kitchen table paying their monthly utility bills.

It is time for President Obama to stop forcing Americans out of work and to stop giving a leg up to foreign competitors like China. It is time for President Obama to take his hand off the dimmer switch for the American economy. It is time to end this war on low-cost American energy so Americans can grow, prosper, and shine brightly once again.

CONGRATULATING CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the 2013 Stanley Cup Champion Chicago Blackhawks. Last night, sorrow quickly turned to joy when the Hawks netted two goals in 17 seconds late in the game to avoid a game seven. The crowd at Palmer Place in LaGrange erupted as Chelsea Dagger played, and we celebrated a second Cup in 4 years.

Congratulations especially to Captain Jonathan Toews, Conn Smyth Trophy winner Patrick Kane, and goalie Corey Crawford. But this was truly a team victory—from all of the players on the ice, to Coach Q, to GM Stan Bowman, to owner Rocky Wirtz. The entire organization deserves to be commended, and I thank all of them for once again making us proud.

I also want to congratulate the Boston Bruins for their great season and a hard-fought final befitting an Original Six matchup.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks, and I look forward to seeing the Cup back in Chicago.

□ 1910

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S WAR ON AMERICAN ENERGY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the President declared war on America's energy. The administration issued an imperial-style edict ordering the EPA, in essence, to shut down domestic energy: oil, natural gas, and coal.

Never mind the consequences. By shutting down coal, for instance, he's shutting down 37 percent of America's energy. But he doesn't care that Congress has rejected this policy in the past. He just wants it his way.

Well, he won't get it without a fight. I have introduced the Ensuring Affordable Energy Act. This bill will put an end to the back-door, monarch-style administration that ignores Congress and circumvents the will of the people.

The bill would prohibit any EPA funds from being used to implement the regulation of greenhouse gases. The White House's new war on energy will only raise the costs for our families, cripple the economy, and put Americans out of work.

This war is out of touch with the real world. It's a war against America that Americans can't afford to lose.

And that's just the way it is.

ADDRESSING HEINOUS HATE CRIMES

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. No American should live in fear of becoming a victim of a violent hate crime. In my role as the former lead hate crimes prosecutor for the Alameda County District Attorney's Office, I saw, firsthand, the devastating impact that hate crimes can have on our communities.

Sadly, since taking office I have heard from constituents and leaders from the Hindu, Sikh, and Arab American communities about the ongoing threats that they face. That is why in March I sent a letter to the FBI Advisory Policy Board requesting that the FBI add three additional hate crime categories to track anti-Hindu, anti-Sikh, and anti-Arab American hate crimes.

Gathering this information will encourage the affected community members to report hate crimes to law enforcement and will help strengthen relationships among communities, local and State law enforcement, and the FBI.

I'm happy to report that the policy board followed up on my letter and has

recommended that FBI Director Robert Mueller make these additions. Our progress towards addressing heinous hate crimes is possible because of groups like the Hindu American Foundation, who have been tireless advocates for the safety of their communities.

I urge Director Mueller to act swiftly on the policy board's recommendation. This important step would extend protection to millions of Americans.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PTSD DAY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Day. PTSD is a serious mental condition affecting many of our Nation's servicemen and -women, both past and present. Up to 20 percent of those who have been returning from Iraq and Afghanistan are at risk of dealing with PTSD, and their personal battles can continue far beyond their time spent overseas.

I'd like to especially recognize the Minnesota National Guard and their Beyond the Yellow Ribbon program and their initiative in this area. This comprehensive and very unique program has helped many of our returning servicemen and -women with their transition to home life, and it has inspired programs around the country to ensure our military members and families have the support they need after they leave active service.

So let's continue to do what we need to do to support our veterans in their time of need and ensure that they have the best services and care available to them upon their return home, especially those that are suffering from dealing with PTSD.

MILITARY RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, an enemy of religious freedom who has a hotline to the Pentagon is at it again. Mikey Weinstein is still fighting to prevent our military personnel from expressing their religious beliefs.

Last week, in a rant, Weinstein referred to Christians as bigoted slimeballs, homophobes, Islamophobes, and carpetbaggers for Christ who spout twisted Christian-jihad poison and who committed spiritual rape and are faith-based racists.

The First Amendment protects Weinstein's right to such words of hatred against Christians. Unfortunately, he has high-level influence with the Pentagon, bragging that he made a threatening phone call and, within an hour, the Air Force rushed to remove a piece of artwork from a dining hall that referred to a Bible verse that said simply, ''Blessed are the Peacekeepers.''

I now officially and publicly call upon DOD to stop following Weinstein's anti-First Amendment orders and return him to the status of an ordinary citizen, where he belongs.

SAY NO TO THE WAR ON COAL

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn President Obama's announcement that he is going to forge ahead with the war on coal. The President's own climate advisor shed some light on the administration's plan for coal when he said, ''A war on coal is exactly what's needed.''

Well, I'm here to tell you that is not what West Virginia or this Nation needs. Not only will these regulations put good, hardworking West Virginians out of a job, but they will drive up the cost of electricity for our consumers at a time when the economy is still so weak.

The President failed to get his environmental agenda through Congress for a reason. Congress recognized the effects it would have on our Nation's economy. Yet, despite our opposition and common sense, the President has decided unilaterally on this job-killing agenda.

By dictating these devastating regulations, the President will shut down existing coal plants and the development of clean coal technology facilities. Not only will his decision hamstring our Nation's ability to become energy independent, but it will prove devastating for American workers and, in particular, for our West Virginia families.

Mr. President, don't turn the lights out on our Nation's economy.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S CLIMATE CHANGE PLAN

(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, the Obama administration's excessive regulatory actions have been taking their toll on the Nation's economy for some time now.

Unfortunately, the President's new climate change plan announced today appears even more costly and contentious than his previous proposals, which were resoundingly rejected by his Democratic colleagues in the Senate.

America needs a diverse supply of low-cost and abundant energy sources. Coal is, by far, the cheapest and most abundant source of energy. Protecting the environment and developing our abundant natural resources such as coal are not mutually exclusive, but that's not what the President would have us believe.

The Obama administration continues to grossly underestimate the cumulative impact of its regulatory actions, and this new plan to unilaterally impose new energy regulations will cost more jobs and further harm family budgets through higher electricity prices.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S WAR ON COAL

(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 of the House, I too am here to discuss the President's war on coal.

The President would have you believe that we must choose between the environment and affordable, reliable energy, but that is not the case. There is a better way, and the President could even take some credit.

Based on research that is currently out there, there are technologies that the Department of Energy has invested in on clean coal which will make a huge difference and will allow us to use our abundant coal resources and protect the environment. But instead of focusing on those possibilities, and focusing on that, the President, instead, wants to regulate coal out of existence.

The timelines that will be set up will not allow this new technology to take place in a timeframe that will work for the American public and for our economy. So, folks, there is a better way, and I urge the President to stop the war on coal and seek the better path.

□ 1920

THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN REBUILDING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity for this hour. Joining me tonight will be MARK TAKANO from the State of California.

We just heard 4 or 5, maybe 10 minutes of talk about the energy issue. I would like to put a slightly different face on it. It's not the main subject matter of this hour, which is really about jobs and how education fits into that, but this is sort of along the line, and it follows directly on what my Republican colleagues are talking about: denying that there is real climate change going on.

We can no longer deny the fact that we as human beings have, over this last century, been putting into the atmosphere a vast amount of carbon dioxide that is changing our environment. But what I want to spend just a moment on here is to discuss how education fits

into this issue of climate change. It's an area in which the institutions of higher learning and students play an enormously important role combating climate change and developing a clean energy economy.

Today, as we just heard from our Republican colleagues, President Obama outlined a plan to address the threat of climate change. He recognized what the scientists have said, which is during 2013—this year—we'll have another record year for climate problems. Deadly flooding, superstorms, droughts, and impacts on sensitive species are just a sampling of the dire consequences that climate change is already bringing to America and the rest of the world.

In my district, home to the University of California, Davis, vitally important research is already being carried out to rise to the challenge of climate change. This research ranges from how changes in our climate are going to negatively impact agriculture and native California fish, flora, and fauna, and what we can do about it.

Just this month, Dr. Daniel Sperling of the University of California, Davis Institute of Transportation Studies was one of two recipients of the 2013 Blue Planet Prize for his monumental work in clean transportation, hydrogen fuel infrastructure, and research into how we can achieve a 100 percent renewable energy economy for the globe and for America. The expansion of the clean energy section would also play a very, very important role in what we will fundamentally discuss here today, which is creating jobs and spurring economic growth.

Recent research indicates that the revenue generated from clean energy globally within the next 5 years will create $1.9 trillion of revenue. Studies also show that States with larger green energy sectors are much more economically sound postrecession. We're on the right track. Last year, California led the national record for the most jobs created in the green energy sector, with over 26,000 new jobs being created. It's evident that we have the building blocks in place to make the changes that are needed for our future, especially in my home State of California. As Dr. Sperling said, solutions are all around us, and indeed, they are.

Let me just go into how that fits into our common agenda here, an agenda that we speak about nearly every week. We're talking about Make It in America. There are these seven things that are involved in the Make It in America agenda.

Trade policy is critically important. It's not the subject for tonight, but it's the trade policy of the United States as it affects jobs and bringing jobs back to America.

Taxes. Tax policy is exceedingly important. I don't think the American public knew that prior to 2 years ago, American corporations were rewarded for offshoring jobs. When the Democrats controlled the House of Representatives, we eliminated some $16 billion annual tax deductions that American corporations had to offshore jobs.

Energy issues. That's not the subject for tonight, but given what our Republican colleagues were talking about and my little 1-minute here, that is a major issue. And we know that the green energy economy creates jobs. The old coal economy doesn't.

Labor issues. The value of labor, rebuilding the middle class. Research is critically important, but not the subject for tonight. And infrastructure, which is often our subject, we'll put off until next week.

What we want to talk about tonight is education. We want to talk about the role of education in rebuilding the American economy. A critical, critical part of the education issue is something that's going to happen in 5 days.

At the end of this month, on July 1, 2013, thousands upon thousands, indeed, millions of students across the United States that have received Stafford loans are going to see a doubling of their interest rate, an interest rate that will go from 3.4 to 6.8. It's an incredible burden on the students across the Nation. Some who have finished school, others who are about to finish school or maybe just finished their graduation ceremonies are going to be greeted with a doubling of their interest rates.

On the Democratic side of the aisle, more than 200 of us have put forth and already signed up for an effort to bring to the floor a solution to this problem. So we want to talk about that tonight. We want to talk about the Democratic solution to avoid this extraordinary problem that will be faced by millions of students who have graduated and have just picked up their degree this month.

Joining me tonight for this discussion is MARK TAKANO, a newly elected Representative from the State of California, who represents the University of California, Riverside campus.

MARK, please join us. Take up that microphone in front of you and tell us how this affects your district and the students in your district.

Mr. TAKANO. Well, I thank my colleague, Mr. GARAMENDI of California. We're both Californians.

What this will do is further burden many of my students who are already burdened with a great deal of debt load from the University of California. But there are many students who bear even a greater debt load because they attend some of the private universities in my area. Many of my students leave my district for other schools and are going to out-of-State schools.

The student loan debt is, I think, a hugely serious, serious problem. Before I came to the Congress, I was a teacher for 23 years. I taught high school. I always tried to counsel my students to be careful about the debts they took on.

I would like to let my colleague know that when I was graduating from high school in the late 1970s and went on to an Ivy League school on the east coast, I had a package that the Ivy League school put together—contribution from my parents and some work study. But my total loan indebtedness from 4 years of Harvard College did not exceed $15,000. That was an amount that I could fairly easily manage. I am just horrified that students are racking up debts for undergraduate study of $80,000 or $100,000 worth of debt, let alone the debt they're going to have to incur when they go on to their master's programs.

□ 1930

A doubling of the interest rates would add just a tremendous burden to these students.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We can just take a very quick look at the math. If it's a $100,000 debt and it's 3.4 percent—and you're paying just the interest rate, not the principal of the loan—you're talking about $3,400 a year that you would be paying at the current rate. Double it, you're talking $6,800 a year. So just that alone, without paying down the principal, you're looking at a very significant burden on a person that's leaving school, graduating just this year. We need to deal with that. And the effort that's under way here by the Democrats in Congress—and also by President Obama, who's put forth, I think, a very solid program—gives the students an opportunity.

This is a very interesting chart here, MARK. And I think it's one that you're aware of. I know you've paid off your loan now, but that group hasn't.

Mr. TAKANO. I did actually take on some more debt to get my master's degree before I came here. Two years before I came to Congress I completed my master's degree, and it was a 2-year master's program. Because of my income as a teacher, many years as a teacher in, but I came close to $40,000 worth of debt that I'm paying off to the Federal Treasury. But it's not the Stafford loan that subsidized it. But I have a sense of just—that's part of my horror of the amount of debt load that students are carrying.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, then you're one of these students—ex-students. $1 trillion, this number, the total student loan, is well over $1 trillion today. This is greater than the total credit card debt of every American. So we're looking at a situation where student debt is now larger than the credit card debts of all Americans. This is an enormous burden.

But what this also does—and perhaps you have not only personal experience, but other—is that when a student graduates, their first obligation is to pay off this debt. You can't go into bankruptcy. This debt is going to follow you. With or without bankruptcy, you've got to make these payments.

Now, last year we passed a bill that tends to modify how much you can pay. I think it's no more than 10 percent. The President's proposal takes

that further and applies the 10 percent not just to the new loans that are taken out, but to all existing loans. So as your income from a teacher, you would be required to pay no more than 10 percent of your income to pay down this debt. But if this debt has an interest rate of 3.4 percent, well, you can get it paid off more quickly. But if it's 6.8 percent, it's going to take longer and be more difficult.

Mr. TAKANO. The compounding effects on that amount of debt is going to seriously add to those students who will take, say, public service jobs or jobs in teaching, or jobs in the public sector, nonprofits. It will severely limit the kind of employment that young people might seek out.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, certainly that. And then a young person graduating from college, sometimes they want to get married. They may have to delay that. They want to form a household, buy a house, rent a house, buy the furniture. They can't because they've got to pay this off first.

Mr. TAKANO. Well, it certainly hurts our economy in that way. They're going to delay buying a car; they're going to delay buying a home; they're going to delay starting a family with this debt overhanging.

Beyond the interest rates, I also believe we need to focus on lowering the principal, making sure we support our public institutions of higher ed to make sure that the principal isn't there.

But certainly I support our caucus's effort to keep interest rates from doubling. It's a very sad fact to say that doing nothing—if we don't get our way, that doing nothing is actually better than what the Republicans propose.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I'm going to put up another chart here that speaks to what you just said. This chart talks about our colleagues' proposal. That was one that we passed here. We like to say that this is really about making education more expensive. Here's how it works.

Our proposal is to keep the interest rate—and this is a person that's maxed out. They've borrowed the maximum amount from the Stafford loan; this is the subsidized portion of it. This is the total interest that they pay over 5 years of a subsidized loan. The proposal that we put forward would be $4,174 of interest. What's going to happen, unless we pass a law, is that that number will go to $8,808. That's the doubling of the interest rate from 3.4 to 6.8 percent.

Now, the thing that I'll never understand—and this bill passed the House of Representatives a couple of months ago—was the proposal by our Republican colleagues that would actually force the students to pay more than just the doubling. You go, What's that all about? Why would they do that?

So under the proposal that we say actually makes education more expensive, the Republican proposal would go to $10,109, as opposed to our proposal, which would keep it at $4,174. Or even allowing the rate to double, the Republican proposal is actually more expensive. It doesn't make sense. I would say nonsense is probably a better way of describing it—no sense. But it just creates a serious problem.

Now, the proposal that the President has made is somewhere between these two numbers—actually, just a little over $4,000. That proposal is based on a 10-year note, the 10-year Treasury bond that would then set the floor.

This one is also based on a Treasury bond—that's the GOP proposal—but it is like an adjustable-rate mortgage on your home. So every year, as the interest changes, you're going to pay more and more. And we know that right now interest rates were, just 3 weeks ago, at an all-time low. But now you're looking at a situation where we're looking at those interest rates going up, and the Republican proposal would automatically adjust upward. It's one of the adjustable-rate mortgages that got this country into such great trouble.

I notice that RUSH HOLT is here from New Jersey. RUSH HOLT, please join us. I know that this is an issue that is very important to you.

If I recall correctly, you represent a university. What is that university?

Mr. HOLT. I represent a number of students in universities, students who have been to university, and students who hope to go to university for whom this is very important.

As a member of the Education and Workforce Committee, I was involved in writing the legislation that resulted in the current lower interest rate. So I take this very personally for all sorts of reasons.

As you point out, there are a number of problems with what is about to happen and what the majority, the Republican Party, is proposing here with adjustable rates that could trap students or former students with unmanageable debt. But what bothers me the most is why they are doing it.

The point is they are trying to raise revenue without appearing to raise taxes. They are unwilling to ask a fair share from people in this economy who are doing well and instead want to turn to students and recent graduates and ask them to balance the budget, to reduce the deficit. That's why the interest rates are going up. It is so that they can collect more money. And they would be collecting it from students, just as you've been discussing. Just the wrong thing to do for an economy that is going to create new jobs, new job entry, create economic growth.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me see if I understand what you were saying.

The Republican proposal—which has passed the House of Representatives, is over in the Senate, and hopefully will die there—by their proposal of allowing an adjustable rate on the student loans, they will actually bring money into the United States Treasury to reduce the deficit, or are they going to use that money for education?

Mr. HOLT. Oh, this is very definitely a revenue-raising measure, because they have this hard-and-fast principle against collecting revenue from people who can afford to pay it and who are doing well.

□ 1940

Mr. GARAMENDI. We certainly have seen this many, many times over here on the floor.

MARK, maybe you want to comment on this.

Mr. TAKANO. I want to take a little different slant on this, if I might, JOHN and RUSH. I actually want to turn to a topic, and the reason why I want to turn to this topic is because of what the Senate is doing, what it was doing yesterday and today. They're considering the comprehensive immigration bill. Of course, in that comprehensive immigration bill is a provision on the DREAMers.

The point you're making about the Republican attempt to raise revenue without straightforwardly asking for it and put on the burden of our students, our young people, we wouldn't have to do this if this House would follow suit and pass a comprehensive immigration bill. I'm going to tell you why. I'm going to make an economic argument for why comprehensive immigration is good for our country and our economy.

As the debate continues on immigration reform, the effect that fixing the immigration system would have on our economy is becoming quite clear. Opponents of immigration reform don't seem to understand the benefits of our broken system. Many of the undocumented immigrants in this Nation are already working, yet because of their legal status they are forced to pay into the underground economy with no labor protections and no way to pay into the system.

We should allow these individuals to come out of the shadows and put them on the pathway to citizenship. As an example, say there's an undocumented worker in my district. Because he or she is undocumented, that worker 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, it will mandate that all workers be paid minimum wage, which will in turn increase their buying power, raise revenues for businesses, and drive up wages for everyone else, thus increasing our GDP growth rate, not needing to have to resort to these tricks of variable interest rates on our students to raise revenue for our government.

Recent analysis by the Social Security Administration showed that, without comprehensive immigration reform, our annual growth rate would only be 4.5 percent, but with comprehensive immigration reform, our annual growth rate shoots up to 6.1 percent. This increase in GDP is going to have a tremendous effect on our job market.

Earlier this year, Republican Senator MARCO RUBIO sent a letter to the Social

Security chief actuary asking for an analysis of the legislation. In his response, Chief Actuary Goss said that the Senate immigration reform proposal would create 3.2 million jobs by 2024—new jobs.

In his reply, Chief Actuary Goss also said:

> We estimate a significant increase in both the population and the number of workers paying taxes in the United States as a result of these changes on legal immigration limits.

3.2 million new jobs by 2024 is a serious jobs plan for America.

A report by the Cato Institute analyzed the data and estimates that there will be a $1.5 trillion increase in 10 years to household income.

The middle class has been struggling for some time as their wages have remained stagnant for 30 years. The squeeze on the middle class has forced average American families to go heavily into debt just to get by. Mortgage payments, college loans, and the cost of health insurance have all skyrocketed, but wages have barely increased. Passing comprehensive immigration reform will help close this gap.

The more people we have working and the more they consume means that our Federal deficit will come down at an estimated—get this—$875 billion over 20 years.

But it doesn't stop there. Social Security, itself, is going to benefit greatly as well. As some 75 million baby boomers prepare to retire, the immigrant community, which is generally younger than the overall population, will help the balance sheet by bringing in more revenue to offset retirees taking out benefits. It's been estimated that comprehensive immigration reform will add $4.6 trillion, net, to Social Security over the next 75 years.

The problem we face with Social Security is the ratio of workers to retirees. Sixty years ago, there were 16 workers for every retiree. Twenty years from now, when the last of the baby boomers retire, that ratio will be down to 2½ to 1 unless we pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Comprehensive immigration reform is going to help Social Security in several ways:

First, most immigrants who come to the United States are between the ages of 18 and 35. For decades, these working immigrants will be contributing to Social Security;

Second, few come to the United States with their parents, and the seniors that do come aren't eligible for Social Security; and

Finally, immigrants tend to have more children than native-born Americans, and their offspring will also pay into the system for decades to come.

The numbers don't lie. Comprehensive immigration reform will improve our Nation in many different ways, but especially economically. The time is now.

Thank you.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman for presenting those numbers, because it's been in the news recently that the immigration bill would actually reduce the deficit. I'm sure a lot of people around the country scratch their head and say, ''How could that be?'' but you've made it quite clear. It actually improves the economy in several different ways, just as making college more affordable improves the economy. The result is we are all more prosperous. The result is the deficit goes down. The result is we all have improved quality of life.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That's very interesting.

Mr. TAKANO, you're absolutely correct about the role of immigration and the comprehensive reform. There are some pieces that we often talk about: the DREAMers, the young men and women that came here as children, brought here. They don't have their papers, but they also do not have the opportunity to really get the kind of education. So we have the DREAMers.

But here's what I think Mr. HOLT was talking about that's really important, and this is part of what you were saying, Mr. TAKANO, about immigration reform—access to all the benefits of the economy and what it means.

If you happen to be a person that has less than a high school education, which is where you started your discussion on the immigration act, you're taking a look at perhaps as high as 14 percent unemployment and the average median—or excuse me, not average, but the median weekly earnings, less than $500 a week, $451 a week. If you get a high school degree, you may get $638, the median weekly income, but you're still looking at 9.4 percent unemployment.

Here's where the issue of education comes in at the post-high school education and here's where the Stafford loan issue comes in. If you're able to go to college and get that bachelor's degree, your income is going to be more than double if you don't finish high school and nearly double what you would have if you were able to finish high school.

So getting that education—and this is part of the immigration issue, and it's the facts that you were laying out so very well, Mr. TAKANO. If you're able to get that education with borrowing money, a Stafford loan, subsidized or unsubsidized, with a low interest rate, you're going to be looking at a median weekly earnings of well over $1,000 and your unemployment rate will be less than 5 percent.

If you go on to get that professional degree—and here's where you and your own history have been able to get that professional degree, that master's degree—-you're looking at $1,600 median weekly income and the unemployment rate is down.

So here you begin to see not only how immigration fits into education, but how an individual, an immigrant or not, will be able to improve their life. And as they improve their personal life, they are improving the economy; they're bringing greater wealth to the economy, greater productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency to the economy.

All of this is dependent upon immigration reform, as you pointed out so very well, as well as how we finance education.

□ 1950

Now, if we allow this situation that's going to occur in just 5 days—we're coming up against a crisis for the education for those men and women, immigrants or not, for those who want to get an education, who want to move beyond high school—they're looking at a doubling—at least 6.8 percent—of the interest rates on their Stafford loans. So they're going, Well, maybe I can't finish college; maybe I can't even start; and maybe I'm not going to be able to get that master's degree or that doctorate when I know that I will be able to be more productive to the economy and earn a higher living.

So these things fit together, and I thank you so very much for pointing out the way in which the immigration issue fits into this. We really must have comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. TAKANO. It's my pleasure. You have seven points to our economic agenda. Really, comprehensive immigration reform should be the eighth one. The wealth of our country really is in the skills and knowledge of our people. We need to find the pathway for 11 million people—have them come out of the shadows, have a pathway to citizenship. That, tied together with investments and their skills and knowledge, really raises up the true wealth of our country, which is in her people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. This is the Make It in America agenda. As you say, you could easily add to this immigration reform as one of the things we need to do. These men and women—some 12 million who are here without documents—are unable to really rise up into these more highly skilled jobs. In many ways, their educational opportunities and their children's educational opportunities may be limited. This is the fundamental investment in any society; and giving access to people with that education, immigrant or not, allows us to build the American economy.

Mr. TAKANO. So much of the focus, as you say, does go back to education, the need to find effective ways to educate all the immigrant children.

If you could leave that poster up just a little longer, there are investments we need to make in our basic scientific research and to make sure we have the scientists. The scientists are so important. It takes years and years of developing people to become these highly skilled, highly knowledgeable scientists who will create, in turn, the inventions and the technology that will transfer into our preeminence in trade. We are a great country because we are so great at patents, because we are so

great at creating new medications. This all comes from a highly educated workforce. By the way, comprehensive immigration reform means we can draw in some of the best talent into Silicon Valley, the best talent into our pharmaceutical research labs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's really true. The comprehensive immigration reform bill that's being discussed does bring into our economy those people who have the high skills, many of whom came here and got an education but who under the current law have to leave and go start their businesses in China, India or somewhere else around the world. Part of that comprehensive immigration reform would allow those men and women who have taken their education in the United States—gotten their degrees, their doctorates in engineering or electrical engineering or whatever—to stay in the United States.

It turns out that our State, California, is the great engine of economic growth. Some of it is in southern California with the entertainment industry and the way in which it is now merging into the electronic industry and all of the things that are going on with Google and the use of the smartphones for disseminating content—movies and the like. In the Silicon Valley, many of those start-up companies are immigrants. In fact, the majority of start-ups in the Silicon Valley are immigrants—a very interesting fact that goes back to the issue of immigration reform.

We want to bring to America the talent. We want to bring—we want to be able to use—in America these extraordinary workers and make sure that they have access to the education system that then is the fundamental investment and make sure that they are able to participate and move our economy forward.

Mr. TAKANO. Most of us come from immigrant stock. I think you're Basque Italian. My forebears came from Japan. We, ourselves, are examples of the striving of generations. I'm pretty sure your parents, as well as mine, instilled the importance of education. It's the story of America repeated over and over again—of people coming here because they hear about the freedom, the way of life that we have and the opportunity that our country represents. Much of it is embodied in our belief in education being the platform, the launching pad, for entering the middle class. Certainly, this dream will be cut short if we don't watch out for things like the doubling of the interest rates or allowing interest rates to be tied to variable rates.

As Mr. HOLT pointed out, he asserts that, really, it's a very sly way to try to raise revenue without actually being straightforward about it. It's a way to raise revenue on the backs of our children. I say let's do sensible things—pass comprehensive immigration reform. It, by itself, by the numbers I just showed, provides a tremendous amount of revenue to our government simply by the fact that we harness the energy of so many aspirational people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. All of that is true, and we've got 5 days. The Congress of the United States has 5 days in which to make a fundamental decision about how we treat those who are participating in the most important investment that any society makes, which is the investment in education.

Right now, we are asking most students to pay for their own education through loans and through some grants that are given through Pell Grants, but they've taken on enormous amounts of debt. Students in the United States have taken on $1 trillion of debt. A large portion of that debt is the Stafford loans, subsidized and unsubsidized. The loan rate on those programs is going to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent in just 5 days, creating an enormous burden on the students on whom we rely to grow our economy.

They've made the investment, and this society has made the investment in them. We need to free them so that they can participate more fully in our society—so that they can participate as consumers and so that they can participate as small businesses men and women, the entrepreneurs. All of this is possible if we take action, and we must. We owe it to those students. We owe it to the economy. We owe it to our ability to make it once again in America. All of these things come together with immigration reform, as you've pointed out, Mr. TAKANO. I really appreciate you being with us tonight.

I think we've pretty much closed off this subject. We'll be back next week to talk about Making It in America—about jobs. Today, we've talked about how education fits into the jobs agenda. We've got 5 days to solve a very, very serious problem for millions of Americans who have gotten their educations or who have just graduated who are now going to be faced with a doubling of their interest rates. We can do this. We have the power, we have the ability, and we have the proposals—the President's proposal and the proposal here from the Democrats—and we ask that those proposals be acted upon.

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

□ 2000

AFFORDABLE ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to be here on the floor tonight with my colleagues to discuss a very important issue, and that's affordable energy.

Mr. Speaker, like we did a few weeks ago, I just want to invite all of our constituents that might be paying attention right now, that they can contact us at #affordable energy.

We are trying something new, Mr. Speaker, as a way to continue communication with those that we represent back home in an effort to answer very important questions about some of the things that we've read in the news recently today.

Today, this subject couldn't be any more important. That's because today President Obama launched his latest assault in the war on coal. Those aren't my words. That's what President Obama's own climate adviser told The New York Times just hours before his speech today. And let me quote him:

> The one thing the President really needs to do now is to begin the process of shutting down the conventional coal plants. Politically, the White House is hesitant to say they are having a war on coal. On the other hand, a war on coal is exactly what is needed.

A war on coal? A war on coal ultimately amounts to a war on American energy and a war on American families. And the regulations that President Obama announced today are unprecedented executive actions aimed at punishing industries critical to domestic energy production, particularly the coal industry. These regulations would not pass the United States Congress, not the Republican House and not even the Democratic Senate.

President Obama is trying to accomplish through executive regulations that which he cannot accomplish legislatively or electorally.

He also again passed the buck on approving the Keystone pipeline. This is a project that would create up to 20,000 jobs and increase domestic energy production, but a project that has been delayed because of regulatory approval for almost 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, what strikes me the most about President Obama's aggressive unilateral actions is how out of touch he and his administration are with the American people. That's why we're here tonight.

I remind my constituents all the time that I'm Riley's wife and a mom to my two kids, Margaret and George. I'm putting gas in the car. I'm picking up carpool. I'm going to the grocery store. I see directly in my everyday life how these inflammatory statements and just in-your-face remarks to the American people that are going to be directly affected by this President's policies—I see it as milk prices increase, as gas prices go up, as domestic energy prices continue to skyrocket, and this is just unacceptable.

I'm joined by my colleagues tonight. The gentleman from Colorado I know serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee and can certainly weigh in on these matters. But again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind our constituents that it's #AffordableEnergy. And as we move through this leadership hour, we want to hear from you, our constituents

back home, about the issues that are important to you when it comes to energy production in the United States of America.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama for her leadership tonight on this very important issue about the energy future of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, she is right. The conversation that we are having isn't something that is just occurring tonight on the House floor. It's not a conversation that's just occurring inside the beltway of Washington, D.C. It's a conversation about energy that's happening in California, in Virginia, in my home State of Colorado. It's about a strong future for this country. It's about our children finding the kinds of jobs and opportunity that we know they deserve, a kind of country that is growing stronger each and every day with better jobs and a stronger and growing workplace.

Tonight I hope that people, Mr. Speaker, around the country will send thoughts to #AffordableEnergy. Mr. Speaker, if they wish to join in that conversation, they'll be able to participate, and we can all see around the country what's happening with that conversation in their own homes, at their own dinner table tonight at #AffordableEnergy and what it is that they're seeing, whether their utility rates are increasing, whether they have a job in one of the shale plays booming around the country, or perhaps they're trying to find work. And energy presents an incredible opportunity for them to do just that.

Often times in Washington, D.C., you see this fight break down between the House or the Senate or Republicans and Democrats unnecessarily so. We ought to be focused on what's right for this country, not what's right for a political party, not what's right for this group or that group or favoring this special interest. It ought to be about what's good for the American people, the jobs that they're trying to keep and hold on to, the college that they're trying to pay for for their kids, to build a brighter future for their family.

The conversation is one that we know isn't just about left or right. That's not what energy is. Energy is about how we can produce it here in the United States, what we can do in our own backyards to create a more vibrant future. All of us have our own energy experience, whether that's as kids when we were told by our parents to make sure you turn the light off before you leave the house, go up and turn the light off in your bedroom before you go to school, or whether it's today trying to run a business, trying to make sure we're using efficient computers to lower the cost of our utility bill year after year.

Mrs. ROBY. I reached out specifically earlier today, Mr. Speaker, to my constituents on Facebook, and I've got a few examples of that. As you say, everybody has their own energy story.

Howard from Dale County, Alabama, pointed out that he's already struggling to make ends meet as is, especially with ObamaCare and an increase in payroll taxes. Now the President wants to raise his electric bill.

Suzanne from Montgomery, Alabama, said that the President just doesn't get it. She watched the President's speech today, and she doesn't understand why he won't focus on improving the economy instead of hurting it. She said the President doesn't have a clue how his policies actually affect the middle class.

Spike, a young man from south Alabama, correctly pointed out that regulations have a trickle-down effect that are felt by hardworking Americans. These new regulations on energy sources will be felt by young Americans just like him.

Kevin from Dothan, Alabama, works for the military and has recently been furloughed due to the President's sequester, and he worries about how rising energy costs would affect him, especially since he's already having to deal with less take-home pay.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my constituent's thoughts, and that's why we're here tonight.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I'm RICHARD HUDSON from North Carolina, and I represent a district that's been hit very hard with job losses. People out there are really struggling.

I go home every weekend and I travel my district and I talk to real people every day who are struggling to get by. I talk to folks who have lost their jobs either in the textile industry or in the furniture industry. I talk to folks who are just trying to keep their companies afloat. I talked to a homebuilder the other day who is just trying to keep enough work so he doesn't have to lay off any more of his crew so he can keep a skilled labor force there, so when the economy does pick back up, he'll have the folks that he needs to get the job done.

People are really hurting out there, and there are some signs that the economy is getting better. But, Mr. Speaker, in my district, we're just not feeling it yet. In fact, I was in Richmond County, North Carolina, yesterday, and the folks there tell me that home foreclosures have increased this year over last year. We aren't out of this yet.

On top of this economy, where folks are struggling and just trying to stay afloat, trying to keep food on the table for their families and paying the bills, the President comes out today 4 years to the day from when he introduced his disastrous cap-and-trade ideas and has this new scheme that's going to add cost to our energy, that's going to destroy jobs in this country, and it's just unconscionable.

The people in my district are wondering the same thing they are in other places around the country: why doesn't the President understand what's going on here. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to continue to fight for an energy policy that makes sense.

We've got energy off the shore of North Carolina that we ought to be going after. We've got huge reserves of oil and natural gas. We've also got a potential for fracking in North Carolina. I want to get North Carolina in the energy business. I want to create those energy jobs in North Carolina like we see in western Pennsylvania and North Dakota and other places. Now is the time. Now is the time to start getting American energy sources, getting Americans in the energy game, not taxing and regulating our energy industry out of business, which is not only destroying the jobs but is increasing the cost of energy. When the cost of energy goes up, Mr. Speaker, everything gets more expensive, whether it's food or the cost of transportation of goods. It's hitting us really hard.

Mr. GARDNER. I think that you bring up an excellent point about this issue of regulations, about how the President has spent all of this time developing incredibly onerous regulations that will increase the cost of electric generation. It will increase the cost to produce the electricity that each and every one of us use every day at home and at our workplace.

□ 2010

And yet, it has taken years for him to develop this. And concentrating on this, this big announcement today, which will hurt American jobs. It will, indeed, impact negatively the middle class of this country. And yet, there's a project out there, like the Keystone XL pipeline, that he could approve today. After mountains of paperwork have been completed, environmental impact studies completed, people could be put to work today on the Keystone pipeline. Instead of focusing on putting them out of work, instead of focusing on regulations that will hurt our ability to grow the economy, like the President announced today, his plans to disarm our energy plans in this country, the fact is we could have a Keystone XL pipeline putting people back to work.

People that I talk to back in my district strongly support the Keystone pipeline. There are people in Colorado that I've heard from who don't support it. And one of the questions they lead with is: You know, Representative GARDNER, it's not really going to create jobs here in Colorado. Well, you know what? We know, thanks to research that's been done, done by a university, the impact of the Alberta oil sands development on U.S. State economies, in Colorado alone, the job increase, thanks to the Alberta oil sands development—and the Keystone XL pipeline is a major part of this—that we would receive about 11,200 new jobs as a result of further development of the Alberta oil sands in Colorado alone. That's 11,000-some jobs that we could benefit from because of the construction of the Keystone pipeline and further development of the Alberta oil sands.

In North Carolina alone, my colleague from North Carolina, 18,400 jobs could come from further development of the Alberta oil sands, the Keystone pipeline being a critical part of that.

And so today, the President announces a plan to make it more difficult to generate electricity, to increase the cost of coal-power generation. His top science adviser has said we need a war on coal. This is the President of the United States saying we need a war on coal—his administration saying that—and yet today we have an opportunity to say ''yes'' to a pipeline to create jobs in this country.

So instead of putting people out of work, why don't we put people into work by approving things like the Keystone pipeline.

Mrs. ROBY. I have with me kind of a checklist here about this administration and President Obama's energy record: obviously, delaying the job-creating Keystone pipeline you've already mentioned; stopping job-creating natural gas exports; regulating oil and gas production on Federal lands; investing in green energy failures.

Mr. Speaker, you can learn more about this at gop.gov/energy. So we continue to focus on this here tonight with all of my colleagues who have joined us.

A recent report from CBO came out which sought to find out just how higher energy costs would affect the economy, and the report said raising the cost of using fossil fuels would tend to increase the cost of producing goods and services, especially those requiring electricity and transportation. We have already mentioned that tonight.

I talked about being a mom and driving carpool and buying milk at the grocery store—it is very evident what is going on based on these policies. Higher production costs lead to higher prices for our goods and services. Areas in the country where electricity is produced from coal, places like Alabama and other States represented here, would tend to experience larger increases in electricity prices than other areas of the country would. Specific to Alabama, 36 percent of electricity is produced from coal, the largest of any fuel source. And as for jobs in Alabama, it is the sixth nationally for total electricity generation. All of us have stories here tonight that are just right along these lines.

We have an opportunity here as Members of the House of Representatives to, whether it is through oversight on Energy and Commerce and other committees of jurisdiction, to rein in this. That's our responsibility to our constituents. That's what this conversation here tonight is about.

And, Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell you again that #AffordableEnergy, if you want to know more or make a comment, Mr. Speaker, about what we are doing tonight, #AffordableEnergy. And any of my colleagues who want to chime in, please do.

Mr. HUDSON. I would love to address this war on coal a little bit more. I just think it's outrageous that the President of the United States' advisors say that the President wants a war on coal. You know, we ought to have a war on gas prices. We ought to have a war on energy prices. We ought to have a war on joblessness. I mean, these are the things that we should be concerned about and angry about and upset about.

You look at the fact that the United States has more coal than any country in the world, and we've got technology to use that coal for energy production in a clean way. Clean coal technology, liquefied coal, there are plenty of ways we can use that energy, Mr. Speaker, here in America, putting Americans to work to reduce our energy costs. That's what we ought to be focusing on. Let's get Americans to work making American energy. Let's bring American energy costs down, and let's stop the war on jobs, which is what we are seeing from this administration.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I would ask the gentleman if he doesn't agree with me that we would be much better off as a Nation if we focused on a way to have affordable energy, clean coal technology, and not just have a war on coal, and thus create those jobs that you were speaking of. Would you not agree with that?

Mr. HUDSON. Absolutely.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I would say it is interesting that the President has taken this action to have a war on coal when his Department of Energy has been investing in some clean coal technology, maybe not as much as some of us would like, but some clean coal technology which right now appears to be on the cusp of actually yielding benefits. They are working right now in Alabama on a plant to test out a chemical looping formula. That chemical looping formula would produce coal ash and pure carbon dioxide. There's no carbon capture, it's just right there. There's no SO_X, there's no NO_X, there's no mercury, and there are a lot of jobs. While it is a little more expensive than conventional plants using coal to produce energy, if this technology works, which the administration has already invested in, we could have both clean coal, affordable energy, jobs, and still protect the environment.

One of the problems that I have, Mr. Speaker, is that so often people say you can't have one and have the other. I believe the United States should be the leader in making sure that we develop and have available not only for companies in the United States but the entire world clean coal technology, because if we don't look at this as a global problem, if we just say we're going to shut coal down in the United States, what we do is we send our jobs to places like India and China and Russia and Kazakhstan, and the list goes on and on. And they don't have the regulations that we even had in the year 2000 on the burning of coal. And all that stuff goes into the atmosphere. And guess where it goes? According to a NASA study, it takes 10 days to get from the middle of the Gobi Desert to the eastern shore of my beloved Commonwealth of Virginia.

So ladies and gentlemen, when we talk about this, it's not a matter of choosing the environment versus coal; it's a matter of choosing America first and making sure that we make America's coal affordable, usable, and clean. And we can do it.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. You know, when I look at this issue of energy, what strikes me is the President talking about jobs sounds good, but he doesn't like this sort of job or that sort of job. For example, he talks about wanting to create jobs, but he doesn't want the Keystone pipeline kind of jobs, he doesn't want the kind of jobs that come from coal. He doesn't want the kind of jobs that come from fracking, this technology that we have developed in the United States that is helping us lead the world. So he wants to talk about jobs, he has this idea that there are somehow these jobs out there, but not the ones that are right under his nose.

□ 2020

I am holding in my hand a Washington Post article from earlier this year, and the headline is, ''European Industry Flocks to U.S. to Take Advantage of Cheaper Gas.''

Wait a minute. I've heard the President talk a lot about jobs. I've heard him talk a lot about wanting more manufacturing jobs. Natural gas that is being developed here in this country, cheap natural gas, clean-burning natural gas, abundant natural gas, that is what is helping this economy.

Despite all the regulatory obstacles that this President has put in front of this economy, despite record debt, despite all of the problems that we in this body want to address, the economy is still doing some incredible things because the private sector is leading, and natural gas is a big part of that.

I've got another article here from The Wall Street Journal, from October of last year. The headline is ''Cheap U.S. Gas is Europe's loss.'' Manufacturing in Europe moving to the United States because of innovation in the area of natural gas.

Now, the interesting thing is I know the President is in a political bind because workers want jobs and environmentalists want to kill a lot of these projects, so he's torn between the two. How about you just go with the jobs?

Working Americans need jobs, Mr. President. And it seems to me, those are the folks that you ought to put first.

And I would note that there's a lot of talk by the environmentalists about killing coal and having a war on coal. Do they not realize that if you kill coal use in a country that regulates it very closely and that has developed clean coal, that coal's still going to be used?

But who's it going to be used by?

It's going to be used by China, where they don't have the clean air rules that we do, and so they're going to make even more pollution. Instead of turning to clean coal and the coal technology that we have here, he's sending it overseas.

Mrs. ROBY. I just want to chime in for a second. I think that it cannot be said enough in this Chamber tonight that his war on coal is a war on American energy and American jobs; and that what you will see if this unilateral decision happens, you're going to see an outsourcing of manufacturing to places like China that are unregulated, when all any of us in this room hear every time we travel our districts is: How come we can't bring the manufacturing jobs back to the United States of America?

And it's these type of threats coming from this administration that are chasing jobs offshore left and right, and this is not what our economy can withstand right now.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. This is another reason that folks may want to go elsewhere to create jobs. We've got the gift of abundant, cheap energy. Let's not mess it up.

And let's be clear. This is not just a war on coal. This is a war on working people. This is a war on the family who is sitting at their table trying to figure out how they're going to pay their power bill, how they're going to heat or cool their home, how they're going to put food on their table.

And you know what?

Energy costs. We all know this. When it goes up, it's passed down through the cost of product.

I will tell you that Arkansas, where I'm from, a big percentage of our energy is based on coal

Mr. GARDNER. And I don't think that there can be any doubt that that's the President's intention under his plan that he announced today. The talk, the conversation, the focus tonight is about affordable energy. And there are people sending tweets around the country right now with the hashtag to affordable energy, hashtag affordable energy, about that very subject tonight.

But if you listen to the pattern of statements the President has made over the past several years, from the time he was a candidate to his administration today, as a candidate, President, then-Senator Obama said: Under my plan, energy rates will necessarily skyrocket.

He said years ago that his energy plan was for energy rates to skyrocket. Just a few years later, when he nominated Secretary Chu to be Department of Energy Secretary, the Secretary of the Department of Energy said he'd like to see gas prices around $8, European level prices of gasoline, doubling what they are today. They're already too high, nearly $4 in Colorado. That's too high.

Mrs. ROBY. I don't understand. All of us have heard this President, this administration, say, repeatedly: I support an all-of-the-above approach to energy production.

And then you try to promulgate a rule like what came out today and unilaterally announce a war on coal, a war on American families, a war on jobs in the United States of America, and what reasonable individual would put that with an all-of-the-above approach to energy production so that we can become independent in the United States of America?

It makes no sense. We should hold this administration accountable for this. We, in Congress, have a job to make sure our constituents back home understand this doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense for jobs. It doesn't make sense for families. And we absolutely have to hold him to this.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Let me say briefly that one of the interesting things I note is that when we were talking about this at the Energy and Commerce Committee, Lisa Jackson was in there and we talked about regulating greenhouse gases and how that was going to make the cost of energy go up and people wouldn't be able to heat their homes in my district, and she said we have programs for that. But in the President's budget request this year, he cut the LIHEAP program, which is the assistance to folks who are having trouble making their heat bills and paying those bills.

So while on the one hand the administration is going to make our electric bills go through the roof, on the other hand they want us to cut the assistance program that would help the poorest of the poor. That doesn't make any sense. I don't understand it, because they're really going to hurt American families.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. GARDNER, will you share the testimony, because I've watched it, and it's really powerful. You were questioning, in the Energy and Commerce Committee, about whether there's ever—and you can tell the story better than I can because I've just watched the clip—any connection between the number of jobs that would be affected by the regulations that come down from the EPA.

Mr. GARDNER. One of the most stunning things, of course, in the administration is their focus on regulations and a complete lack of focus on that regulation's effect on jobs.

We had an assistant administrator of the EPA come and talk to the Energy and Commerce Committee about whether or not a regulation on energy production was good. And I asked a very simple question, and the question was whether or not there was a jobs analysis that was performed when they issued the regulation; did they look at whether or not jobs would be impacted by this regulation.

And after 5 minutes of what can only be described as an Abbott and Costello ''Who's on First?'' kind of conversation, the answer was clearly no, that this administration did not take into account the impact energy regulations would have on job creation.

And so, as we have a conversation with the country about an all-American energy plan, we have got to realize that not only does it impact the coal-fired power plant or the nuclear plant or the wind farm down the road, but it impacts our families' ability to afford a brighter future.

Mrs. ROBY. In the President's speech today, he basically made the case that more regulations and restraints on the energy sector, to your point, would be good for our economy and create jobs.

Regulations creating jobs?

I know none of us in here believe that, and I know we've never heard from one constituent who owns a business that regulations, more regulations, create jobs.

And furthermore, this is the same President that tried to sell us Solyndra. And we're going to take this, we're going to take him at his word? It's really unbelievable.

Mr. YODER. Well, if I might add to the gentlelady's point, the gentlelady from Alabama, this administration has continually pushed the notion that the gentlelady's describing, that regulations do create jobs. Their argument is that when they regulate our industries, when they regulate our local companies, when they regulate the local small businesses in our communities, that those businesses have to then hire people to respond to the regulations. Therefore, presto, this administration has created jobs.

Mrs. ROBY. But aren't those businesses supposed to be—I mean, they want to create product to then sell to the American people, not hire people to follow regulations.

Mr. YODER. So to the gentlelady's point, what this administration has done is created a country that has focused their job creation on bureaucracy and regulation and red tape, and so they're forcing debt on our kids and grandkids to pay for bureaucrats to come out into our communities to force our small businesses to hire people to respond to the bureaucrats. I mean, what a maddening system. In a country where we are supposed to be the inspiration around the world, the land of hope and opportunity, and they are taking us towards becoming the land of regulation, the land of unemployment, the land of mandates and taxes.

And all this together, it's no wonder that our unemployment rate is still almost 8 percent, or 7.6 percent. It's the longest the unemployment rate's been this high since the Great Depression for this long. And for this administration to say that this is somehow a job-creation agenda, regulating our local businesses, regulating our energy costs and driving up the cost of energy.

And ultimately, the sad point is, and the gentleman from Arkansas spoke to this a little bit ago, is that this is not just a war on a business. This is not just a war on an energy producer. This

is not just a war on a coal company. This is a war on the American people.

□ 2030

They are the victims in this. It is not the small business owner that's the victim. It is the American people. It's the people struggling to pay their bills. It's the person on the fixed income. It's the single mom. It's the senior. It's someone whose energy costs are that big a proportion of their monthly budget that this really hurts them in the pocketbook. It's that family that's trying to make that life work. They are the folks that ultimately get hurt in the situation.

So we have to stand up for the victims in this country, that silent majority that is being hurt by these anti-energy policies. And at the end of the day, that's why I join my colleagues to support an all-of-the-above energy approach to put people back to work, to lower the cost of energy in this country, and to make us more secure by making us less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I've got some good news for my colleagues here tonight.

Mr. YODER. We need it.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I would like to lay this out and give the President the opportunity to digest what I'm about to say and change his mind on the Keystone pipeline. We know that he's been torn between workers on one side and environmental extremists on the other. And he's been looking and grasping for any excuse not to approve the affordable energy and the jobs that come with the Keystone pipeline. And there's a lot of these same, similar arguments, whether you're talking about coal or the Keystone pipeline or the natural gas that we're getting out of the ground that has really revolutionized this country and provided so many jobs for so many workers.

But one of the reasons that opponents of the Keystone pipeline have said that they're opposed to the Keystone pipeline is that the tar sands that's being taken out of the ground in Canada at its core, its bitumen, which is a little bit different kind of crude, a lot of them have said, Well, we're opposed to the Keystone pipeline because it's different than other pipelines. This crude is different. This crude is more corrosive. This crude is dangerous. This crude should not be going through pipelines across this country because it is somehow more dangerous.

Well, I've got great news for the President tonight if he's watching this. The great news is in January of 2012, we put in a requirement in the legislation. I want to be real clear about this because this is breaking news. It broke today. It hasn't gotten a lot of attention, but it's critical. We put in our bill that became law that the Obama administration needed to do a study through the Department of Transportation to determine whether this bitumen really was different than other crude, whether it was really more dangerous to pass through a pipeline across the country, whether it was really something we needed to be extra worried about. Because all the environmentalists, all the different folks who opposed the Keystone pipeline preach about bitumen and how dangerous it is.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I can't wait. What did the study say?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Here's the study, my friend. And this is just great news. It's from the National Research Council and not some third-party political group working for the Obama administration, the Secretary of Transportation, pursuant to this Congress's request that they study it. I have got the executive summary right here. And this just came out today. Here's what they concluded. And this is big news because this is one of the reasons the President is against the Keystone pipeline.

It says:

> The committee does not find any causes of pipeline failure unique to the transportation of diluted bitumen. Furthermore, the committee does not find evidence of chemical or physical properties of diluted bitumen that are outside the range of other crude oils or any other aspect of its transportation by transmission pipeline that would make diluted bitumen more likely than other crude oils to cause releases.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Are you saying it's just as safe as the oil that goes through pipelines in hundreds of thousands of miles already across the United States of America?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I wish I could have said it that clearly. But the bottom line is, this isn't TIM GRIFFIN saying it. This is the Obama administration's own study that we mandated they conduct. And I'll tell you, if you look at the argument against the Keystone pipeline that the environmental extremists have been putting out there, this is numero uno, number one, at the top. They've been basing almost their whole deal on this. And the Obama administration says, Sorry, not backed up by the facts.

Mrs. ROBY. So we need to say, What's the holdup? What's the holdup, Mr. President?

Mr. Speaker, again, I cannot emphasize this enough. And the whole point of this hour tonight is to say, based on that information and this new war on America families and American jobs, what is the holdup? What is the deal? This is 20,000 jobs. And we're just continually seeing the President, who's for the all-of-the-above energy approach, at every corner attack domestic energy production. I just don't understand.

Mr. GARDNER. In Colorado, the district that I represent, we really do have it all. We have a coal mine, and we have wind energy. Not only the wind farms, but we have wind energy manufacturing. We have one of the Nation's most promising oil and gas plays right now in the Niobrara in Weld County. In western Colorado, we have thousands of jobs that are being created and thousands more that could be created if the government would get out of the way and approve the permits that they're holding back on. In fact, the Bureau of Land Management, if they were just to approve a handful of permits waiting right now, it could create over a hundred thousand jobs that this country could put to work right now if these permits were approved.

And so we hear the President talk about an all-of-the-above energy policy and then see his actions go in a complete opposite direction.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I would almost rather the President just be straight up and say, I only like some kinds of jobs. And I don't like any of those kind.

Mrs. ROBY. And I only like some kinds of energy.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Just be straight up with us, President. Just say, I've got a war on coal. I've got a war on the Keystone pipeline. I've got a war on natural gas and removing it out of the ground, slowing down permits. I like a certain kind of energy, and I'm going to try to fund it through the government. Just be straight up.

Mrs. ROBY. And let me just say this real quick, as a reminder: Mr. Speaker, tonight's conversation is at #affordable energy. So I just wanted to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that that's where we're having this conversation tonight, alongside countless others. I just wanted to throw that in there as this conversation continues.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Well, I would also point out, again, going to the environmental responsibility that we have—you as a mother; I'm a father of two, a 3-year-old and a 5-year-old—we all want clean air and clean water for them.

I would point out that Duke University last month, working with the University of Arkansas and working with the Obama administration's own U.S. Geological Survey, tested about 130 wells in Arkansas, something like that, and concluded that well water was not polluted by the natural gas extraction that's going on there. Just more factual evidence that we can have the jobs; and if we extract the energy responsibly, we can take care of the environment at the same time.

Mr. GARDNER. One of those promising things about American energy development is not just the fact that it's creating thousands of jobs, but it's the side benefits of the revenue produced and what that revenue goes to. In fact, in Weld County, Colorado, in my district, it's probably the only county in the country that has zero bonded indebtedness because of the natural gas and oil production. They don't have any debt. If they need a road, they pay for it. They pay for it with the money that they've received out of severance tax payments from oil and gas development.

Two companies paid their 2011 property taxes a couple of months ago. They paid $150 million to one single

county. Forty percent of that revenue of $150 million goes to the school districts, goes to the community colleges. So not only are we able to develop affordable energy for the American people, not only are we able to put people to work but we're also doing better things for our schools and our community colleges because that revenue then turns around and goes to the core community institutions that make our country strong.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Let me follow up on that, if I might, real quick. In one of my counties, when you take away the money that comes from Richmond and take away the money that comes from Washington for education, 70 percent of the tax dollars in that particular county are derived from the coal and natural gas severance tax. You eliminate coal, they don't know how they're going to be able to fund their schools. So we're not just talking about big business. We're talking about the schools and the classrooms and the students.

□ 2040

Mrs. ROBY. So it's a war on education as well.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Well, it's a war on everything that we hold dear when you get right down to it. Because the truth of the matter is, when you're the number one nation in the world, everybody else wants to be where you are. Right now we're the number one nation in the world, but this administration wants to throw away what has helped us get there, and that is an affordable, reliable energy plan.

And we can't just throw it all out and expect to still have the standard of living that we have. That means we won't have the money for education, we won't have the money for roads, we won't have the money for so many things that people think of today as just automatically being there. But the money has to come from somewhere, and it just can't come out of thin air. I'm sorry, Mr. President, money doesn't grow on trees.

Mrs. ROBY. So when it comes back to our responsibility as a Congress, this week we're going to debate and hopefully vote on the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act. This is legislation that will increase production of home-grown energy, and it will drive down costs and it will increase American jobs.

What it does is it expands U.S. offshore energy production in order to create over 1 million new American jobs, lower energy prices, grow our economy, strengthen national security, and strengthen our communities by lowering our dependence on foreign oil. And the bill removes government barriers that block production of our own resources right here in the United States.

You know, currently, the Obama administration keeps 85 percent of our offshore areas off-limits to energy production—85 percent. So H.R. 2231—again, we will be debating and hopefully voting on later this week—will open new offshore areas for that energy production and require the Obama administration—and again, Mr. President, who's for an all-of-the-above approach—require him to submit a new lease plan by 2015 for developing our offshore energy resources.

Mr. YODER. And to the gentlelady's point, what a great opportunity for Members in both political parties to work together to do something that can help create jobs for the American people.

You've talked about the over 1 million jobs that could be created this week if folks on both sides of the aisle will just work together for some bipartisan, commonsense legislation that creates affordable energy job opportunities and puts Americans to work.

I'm sure this legislation will pass this week, but it's an opportunity for folks to vote for something that will actually make a difference. I challenge folks in both parties to stand up and support this legislation. Now, the real hope will be whether the Senate will actually take it up.

You know, we've passed dozens upon dozens of bills that create jobs, that help put the American people back to work, yet we still have almost an 8 percent unemployment rate in this country. I'll tell you what: I am fed up with Washington getting in the way of progress. At every turn the solutions out of Washington are greater taxes, greater mandates, greater burdens on the American people.

What we're talking about here is creating prosperity and opportunity for the American people to go back to work, to put food on the table for their families, and it's done through what is such a simple thing, domestic forms of energy that are right here at our grasp. Why wouldn't we utilize this energy that's right here in our country? It seems foolish and shortsighted. And frankly, it hurts the American people when we're not supporting domestic forms of energy.

So this week is a great opportunity for folks who say they're for job creation, who say they're for an all-of-the-above energy approach to step up and lead and to join us in proposals that will put Americans back to work and help rebuild this country.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I totally agree with the gentleman. We understand—and hopefully we can get more and more folks to understand—that this body is not creating the jobs. We want the private sector to continue to create the jobs and lead. But sometimes the barriers to job creation and growing jobs in this country are barriers that Washington has put into place.

I find that a lot of the times when we're legislating in this body, we're not trying to create jobs to get in the way of the private sector. We go to people in the private sector and we say, what's your biggest hurdle? What's your biggest barrier? How can we help you grow more jobs? And more often than not they will say: Get out of the way. A lot of the bills that we put on the floor are to help Washington get out of the way, move it out of the way and let the private sector continue to lead in this area.

I want to mention one more thing real quickly on optimism. If you study where we are as a country, whether it's with regard to the debt and regulations—some of these things, yeah, we've got a lot of work to do there. But if you study where we are with regard to innovation, energy extraction, natural gas extraction, the low cost of natural gas, the companies that I mention in these articles that are moving from Europe, I smell nothing and I see nothing but optimism.

The future of this country is limitless. And when I'm long gone, my kids that are 3 and 5 now are going to be living in a country—if we do things right—that just continues to grow and has all the energy we will ever need.

And as an economist pointed out to some of us earlier tonight, if you're Russia and you're Saudi Arabia and you're looking at the innovation that has come out of American companies, and you're looking at the deposits of natural gas and shale oil that we have in North America, you're worried.

Mr. GARDNER. It is exciting, the energy future of this country. When you see studies that are being done—here's a study that I will cite right here, it says: ''America's shale oil revolution is loosening the grip of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries on global oil markets.'' OPEC. Because of the work that we're doing here in this country, we're loosening the grip of OPEC.

Daniel Yergin, a renowned energy expert, testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee talking about how the energy development in the United States is allowing our sanctions against Iran to work, that we're lessening their ability to sell and fund terrorism activities because we're able to produce it here in the United States, displacing around the world the sale of Iranian oil, the sale of Iranian energy.

So when our colleague from Arkansas talks about the optimism that we have in this country, the people of my district who see it each and every day in little tiny towns that used to have one stop light, that now have a new housing development going up because of the production in the energy field, or traffic that they never had before because they've got activity going to and from the worksite that never existed before. People who graduated from the local high school who for the first time in their lifetimes—maybe even their parents' lifetimes—know they can stay there in that hometown with their family, with a good-paying job and benefits because of energy development.

We've talked a lot tonight about oil and gas and coal, but in Colorado we do have it all. We have wind energy and solar energy. And it's not just regulations that are blocking the traditional

fossil fuels; it's regulations that are holding up wind energy projects. The ability to site a transmission line, to get the power from the wind farm to the people who use it, is being held up because of governmental regulations.

And so there may be people out there who think that we're just down here talking about regulations on fossil fuels. Well, you know what? It's regulations that are holding up clean energy too. And if we truly cared about affordable energy, if we truly cared about doing something good for our country—which I believe we all do, and the American people are ready for it to happen—then we would get government out of the way and let America work. And our chance is this week.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. That is one of the problems that we see in my district. I have a lot of counties that are really hurting. And it's not because we couldn't have jobs, it's because Washington is getting in the way. Every month we're having layoffs in some coal plant here or some coal plant there, or a company that makes things for the coal plant—or the railroad that hauls the coal, or the trucking company that helps move the coal. So while they've remained internally optimistic, it's really hard when that layoff slip comes to your house and you know that you're no longer going to be able to have that job.

That's why this war on coal affects each and every one of us, but it affects folks in my district maybe a little bit more because we're on the front lines and we're getting those layoff notices now. I have people that I know who are casualties in the President's war on coal, and I'd like to hear from them at #AffordableEnergy. And I hand it back off to you, Madam Chair.

Mrs. ROBY. Well, I just want to thank all of my colleagues for joining this conversation tonight. And Mr. Speaker, we will continue this conversation at #Affordable Energy.

But the bottom line is this: While the President continues to promote his political agenda, we here in the House of Representatives' majority are committed, as we have demonstrated time and time again, that we are committed to the all-of-the-above approach. And that this isn't, as you've heard from all of my colleagues tonight, Mr. Speaker, this isn't just a war on coal, this is a war on the American family and American jobs. We are committed to getting government out of the way so that the American family and the American business can thrive.

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

□ 2050

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the upcoming implementation of ObamaCare.

Prior to coming to Washington, I was a nurse for over 21 years, and I'm passionate about health care. My husband is a general surgeon, and he continues to practice in our hometown of Dunn, North Carolina. I'm very, very proud of that.

A couple of years ago when the President was proposing his legislation to basically overhaul health care in America, my husband and I became very active speaking out. That was well before ever considering running for Congress. As a result, because of our passion and concern for this country and health care as a whole, I found myself winning my election and here fighting this fight. We continue with this fight, and we are 98 days away from the open enrollment process going into effect for ObamaCare. This is something that the American people have been sitting back and watching for quite some time, and there are many, many questions that remain to be answered.

Mr. Speaker, a recent GAO study shined some light on some areas that we've been asking questions about for a very long period of time. Serving on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee put forward a request to the GAO to find out where exactly are we in the implementation of ObamaCare, this takeover of America's health care affecting one-sixth of our economy and affecting jobs across this country. It's the number one reason today, Mr. Speaker, that employers are not hiring, because they're not sure of the effects that this will have once fully implemented.

There again, this week, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office put forward their findings. I just want to highlight some of those for you:

States have yet to complete 85 percent of the required program activities. That means essentially, Mr. Speaker, that only 15 percent of what needs to be in place at the State level for ObamaCare is actually in place. Core functions of both Federal- and State-based exchanges have yet to be completed with less than 4 months before open enrollment, any other missed deadline threats, and timely establishment of exchanges. Exchanges are not in place, exchanges are not ready to be implemented, and yet we continue on this timeline path.

HHS has not yet completed the critical steps needed to determine eligibility for credits and cost-sharing subsidies. There's much groundwork that still needs to be laid and implementation figured out, and we don't even have those answers from HHS.

Key data-sharing agreements between the Federal exchange and its Federal and State counterparts are not complete.

Consumer assistance and outreach activities to individuals and employers have yet to be implemented and have been delayed.

It cannot simply be a political campaign on the road touting the virtues of ObamaCare that will implement this program. This is a major, major concern for all of us who know how important health care is.

I can go on. There are many more pieces to the GAO report, which basically cites the fact that CMS is not ready. CMS is supposed to come in and help the States that haven't implemented yet or aren't ready. Where are they? They're not there. They're not acting. We have these questions, but who does this affect? What are the questions that need to be answered?

This afternoon, I had the opportunity to go to National Children's Hospital and meet with some of the families there, very ill children, children dealing with diabetes, cancer. I got the opportunity to see a 1-year-old who's waiting for a heart transplant. These are the children that will be affected by the implementation of ObamaCare. Why? Because research will be affected, because lifesaving cures and treatments will be affected.

How can we implement a health care system that no one at this point can actually state will improve the quality of care of our health care system? It's very important that when we talk about health care and the takeover of health care that we separate the two issues: one, health care pay-for, health care insurance, health care coverage; and then health care itself. They both suffer as a result of ObamaCare being implemented.

We simply cannot stand by and allow this to happen. My colleague from Kentucky, he is here this evening as well, and he has some words. I yield some of our time to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

It seems there's no shortage of red flags regarding ObamaCare. The one-size-fits-all health care law is proving to be disastrous for consumers, for employers and health care providers alike.

Just last week, as my friend from North Carolina said, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office warned:

> Because government officials have missed multiple key deadlines to set up the new health insurance exchanges, there is serious concern that the exchanges will not be ready in October, as scheduled.

Employers and families across Kentucky have expressed serious concerns about meeting the requirements of the law and wondering if they will lose their coverage, be forced to choose different providers, or be saddled with enormous new costs. Now these individuals are left with even more uncertainty.

When talking with business leaders across my district, I hear a barrage of questions and concerns. Small businesses, the backbone of our economy, are likely the hardest to be hit. Some

local insurers say the law could put them out of business. One restaurant owner says it will be a challenge for the whole industry and many will be forced to lay off employees. Others simply say it will be difficult to insure all of their existing employees.

A Gallup poll released last week showed that 41 percent of small businesses, the engine of our economic growth, have stopped hiring new employees because of ObamaCare. The same poll also showed that one-fifth of those surveyed have reduced their workforce because of the law.

Citing the uncertainty, these business leaders don't know what type of insurance programs they might be able to implement or if they will have to alter the shape of their workforce. The uncertainty seems likely to continue given the striking, but not surprising, report from the GAO.

The Government Accountability Office warns that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services still has many duties to complete across core exchange functions, including eligibility and enrollment. With enrollment less than 4 months away, these missed deadlines will likely result in even more confusion as Americans are prepared to be placed into the exchanges. It's no wonder that this law is so wildly unpopular and individuals fear being placed in exchanges.

But it's not just families and businessowners who are left in the dark. Insurance companies don't know what to plan for when the exchanges open, and some are already fleeing the market.

Aetna recently announced they will not participate in any statewide exchanges and they will exit the individual insurance market in California entirely. This mood can set a dangerous precedent: insurers not being willing to take the financial risk to meet the demands of ObamaCare and not participating in the exchanges altogether.

With competition dwindling and individuals not knowing what they can expect in terms of coverage and cost, we are left with a very scary and unacceptable reality. There are simply too many unknowns in the law that completely overhauls our Nation's health care system. This has led to unintended and negative consequences for employers, patients, and providers.

This law is not the solution to our Nation's health care problems, especially given the lack of information and tools available for implementation. Instead, we need to enact a patient-centered plan that lowers cost and ensures access for all Americans.

□ 2100

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, continuing with our discussion about the implementation of ObamaCare, I think it's important, as my colleague from Kentucky has cited, that back home, in his district, many businesses, many individuals, many families are being negatively affected as this moves towards implementation.

Tomorrow, in the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, we will be holding a hearing that actually discusses the challenges facing our American businesses. Back in my district and actually testifying here tomorrow is one of my constituents, Mr. Steve Lozinsky, who will be here with his wife, Kathy. They actually own a business, Sparkle & Shine Cleaning Service. It's a family-owned business, and it's based in Apex, North Carolina. Sparkle & Shine was started in 1998 with one employee, and, today, it has over 240 employees.

Put simply, Sparkle & Shine cannot afford the $2,000 per employee fine attached to ObamaCare. My friend, my constituent, back home cannot provide the health care coverage. He employs low-income workers. They are entry-level jobs. They are hard workers. Many of these individuals actually served time in jail and are now on a second chance at life. Mr. Lozinsky and his wife, Kathy, have given these individuals a second chance, and now their jobs are in jeopardy because of this devastating health care law.

To my colleague again from Kentucky, I'm sure that he also has many, many stories to share.

Mr. GUTHRIE. We hear stories like that all the time when we're home.

We had one in the Energy and Commerce Committee when we had a gentleman who had a chain of restaurants he's developing in New England, which isn't where I'm from, but he was before the committee. His testimony was that he had eight restaurants and planned to open a ninth, and he decided he had to wait because he has no idea what this health care bill is going to cost him when he has to provide health care for his employees. Of the net income of his eight restaurants, he estimated—if he could come up with it because, as we know, you still don't know exactly what the health care bill is going to look like. We know what the bill looks like, but what we don't know is what's really in it because the rules have not come out to say what you have to provide your employees. It's supposed to happen in October and be ready for January 1. So he has decided to just not open a restaurant until this gets implemented so he can then move forward. He said it's going to take half of his net income, he has estimated, if what's in the rules comes out.

If you've ever been in business, it's something you always take home, but if you're growing a business, hoping to open a ninth, 10th, and so on and create a chain, the net income is what you put into the business to grow the business and move forward. It's half of his net income, according to his estimate and as best as he can estimate, because nobody knows the details of what's actually going to be required until, hopefully, we see it before October 1. It's just frustrating for him. It's frustrating for people. It's frustrating for employees.

A guy stopped me in a store the other day. He just got a job at a retail store. He said, I was promised 40 hours, and I was just told I'm going to be working 29 hours. That's the new class of people working, particularly in retail. He was retired, and he was kind of looking for extra income, and he's going to be a 29er. That's a term that we hear quite a bit.

So dealing with health care is something we absolutely have to deal with but not dealing with it in the way of this bill. They didn't try to cut costs, and it's actually implemented on top of the system even more, which is going to cost more. Employers are really concerned, not about being able to cover their employees, but they're concerned about, Are they going to be able to afford to stay in business and even have employees? That's the concern of most of them whom I hear talk about it.

I'm sure you hear the same. I know our good friend from Texas is now here on the floor, and I'd like to give this back to my friend from North Carolina.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Just to follow up on some of the remarks that my colleague has made, in getting back to the issue of jobs and job creation, there was a recent Gallup Poll out this week that found that 41 percent of small businesses have stopped hiring because of ObamaCare. That is a staggering number. Then to the point of good patient-centered health care, that is not what ObamaCare will provide. In fact, the CBO has estimated that 31 million in 10 years will still remain uninsured.

So what are we doing? Why are we creating this system that will be broken from the start and on which we will only spend hard-earned taxpayer dollars trying to fix and plenty of time? Who will go without the good patient-centered health care that every American deserves?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I don't think you were here when we were debating ObamaCare.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I was at home, watching the TV, ready to put my foot through it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. When we were debating it, the number was always 40 million people uninsured. So we've completely upended the health insurance market and have put all this uncertainty into the economy. I think it's the biggest drag on the economy. Now, we haven't had growth, and we're going to have 31 million uninsured. That's not even by a bipartisan group. That's by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office that we're going to have 31 million people uninsured—all of this because we had 40 million uninsured and, after all of this, 31 million uninsured.

So did we get our $1 trillion worth?

Mrs. ELLMERS. That's a wonderful question.

I have another constituent who has shared numerous times with me his concern for the implementation of ObamaCare.

Jerol and Telia Kivett, from Clinton, North Carolina, owned, again, a family-

owned business that was started by his father back in the fifties. This company makes church furniture—church pews for synagogues, funeral homes, churches. Jerol and his wife are so concerned about this mandate and are wanting and needing to avoid this government mandate that it makes it extremely expensive for him to do business. He at one point had 160 employees. He is now down to about 45 employees.

As you can imagine, in order for him to continue to do his business in the way that he sees fit, in the way that was started by his father, how will he continue into the future doing business when he knows that working his way back up again in this awful Obama economy—for him to hit that 50th employee—will mean a penalty for him if he is not providing health care coverage for his employees? If he is able to provide that health care coverage, it will be devastatingly expensive.

With that, I would like to welcome my colleague from Texas, Congressman BURGESS, for a few comments as well for he is well-versed in health care and in, again, the devastation that ObamaCare will bring.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank you for yielding. I really thank you for bringing this important topic to the floor tonight.

Look, we are 6 months and 6 days away from the full-on implementation of the Affordable Care Act. We are 3 months and 6 days away from the open enrollment period of October 1. I just can't help but feel it's like a fast-moving train that's charging down the tracks, moving toward a head-on collision with the American economy, and it's going to be the small business that suffers the devastating effects of that head-on collision.

We've had opportunities to talk to the people from the agencies to the extent that they will. I'm worried. I don't see how they can have that Federal hub up and running by October 1 and have it work the way it's intended the very first time, especially if they don't have time to test it before they turn it loose on the American people. I am very worried about what the world is going to look like after January 1.

I've got to tell you, from the standpoint of a practicing physician of a small practice—we had five doctors in my practice—well, look. Remember when part D came? Maybe you don't. I was here on January 1 of 2006. It was rough for the first several weeks, but there we were talking about the prescription drug benefit for seniors on Medicare, for maybe 42 million, 45 million people out of 310 million people. We were just talking about the prescription drug benefit, and that was difficult to implement.

□ 2110

There were pharmacists all over the country who basically did not get paid for the prescriptions that they filled for 1 month to 6 weeks, but they were able to keep going because they had other prescriptions, they had other business going on in their pharmacies. But this is going to be everything from tonsillectomies, to childhood vaccinations, to ER visits. If the cash flow is disrupted for even just a few weeks, the small businesses, which are medical practices in this country, will have a very difficult time enduring.

More importantly—and you all have correctly addressed it—is the 29ers and 49ers in this country, the people who are scared to add one more than 49 people to their employment rolls or the people who've had their hours now cut to 29 hours a week so that they will not require a health care benefit.

That wasn't the way it was supposed to work. The gentleman from Kentucky nailed it right off. The people of America in 2009 were saying to us, Whatever you do, don't mess up the system that's working for 65 percent or 70 percent of us. The other thing they said was, If you're going to do anything at all, please help us with costs. And what have we done? Exactly the opposite. We've messed up the entire system, and it's becoming more and more apparent every day. If you don't believe me, wait until a year from now or 16 months from now, and just see how bad it is.

The other thing is we didn't do anything to help with cost. If anything, we've made it worse. By ratcheting up the demand side, not increasing the number of providers, we've guaranteed that prices are going to go up not just next year and not just the year after that, but for every foreseeable year in the future. And I know that's hard for people to estimate. I know the Congressional Budget Office can't give us a figure on that. Just do the arithmetic yourself in your head, on the back of an envelope and you'll be able to see that we are headed for a significant disaster.

It's all well and good for me to criticize the administration and the way they've implemented this, but I've got to ask: Where are our Democratic colleagues? Where are the solutions that they're offering? Clearly we should do something to help the small business owner who is having to restrict employment hours to 29 hours a week. Surely we should do something to help that. Where are the solutions from the other side? They're nonexistent.

We should do something to help that small employer who wants to grow beyond 49 employees, but is now frightened to do so. Where are our Democratic counterparts? Where are the people from the agencies coming to our committee and talking to us about how this might be managed or maintained? Why aren't they talking to us about their contingency plans? You know they've got them. You know they're over there at the Department of Health and Human Services right now talking about what if the Federal hub doesn't work, what if it doesn't work the way it was intended. We'll have to have a way of narrowing the scope, of confining the number of people we bring into this new ObamaCare environment. But they won't talk to us about that. The Democrats won't come forward with a solution.

We're doing what we can to bring people's attention to this very important topic. To some it may be complaining; but if you don't think about it, you can't prepare. And If you're not prepared, it is the unprepared person who is really going to suffer in this new environment that, again, is created in 6 months and 6 days.

I do thank the gentlelady for bringing this topic to the floor tonight. I think it is important that we continue to talk about it and we continue to talk about our ideas and our solutions. There are many out there. And people need to assess for themselves how they will be best served in this new environment that's brought by the administration, or perhaps it's not too late or perhaps there are some things we can do to alter that course, to move it off that center of destruction where it's aimed right now.

I thank the gentlelady for having this tonight.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my colleague from Texas. His insight on this very important issue is vital to coming up with the solutions that we need.

I do want to touch on one of the points that you were making, Dr. BURGESS. Basically, I saw a report this morning put out by the Republican Study Committee that basically said that there was a study that is showing that we will have a shortage of 30,000 doctors within this country in 2 years. That is devastating.

Mr. BURGESS. You know, you're in a medical family. I know because I hear it everywhere I go. Physicians all across the country are concerned. They don't know what they're getting into, and they don't know what the world will look like.

As a consequence, like anyone else, they are reluctant to make those big decisions, they're reluctant to hire a partner, buy a new piece of equipment, open a branch office. They are like everyone else: they are in that hunker-down mode where so many small businesses have been for the last 4½ years.

But without expanding the provider core, without expanding the health care manpower, you can pretty much predict that there is going to be a price spike because you know you're ratcheting up demand by increasing coverage, and at the same time you're not providing for areas where those people can be seen.

What's really unfortunate, by some of the means with which coverage has been expanded, we already know that there are places in this country where it is hard to get a new patient appointment if you're a Medicaid patient. The reimbursement rate is so abysmally low that a provider can't possibly keep their doors open if they accept those

levels of payment. As a consequence, they don't. What are those patients going to do? They do what they've always done and go to the emergency room, which is the highest cost point of contact care that you can have.

So instead of solving a problem that every Democrat here talked about 4½ years ago, we've doubled down and made it worse. Again, as a consequence, the cost of care is going to go up and providers are going to drop out just because the frustration is going to get so high that it will simply not be worthwhile to continue in practice, or you'll go work in a practice environment where you simply don't have to put in the number of hours that you would in a solo or small-group practice.

But we've really selected against those practitioners, those men and women who go to work every day early before the sun comes up and they work until after the sun goes down taking care of their patients. We're actually self-selecting against that very type of individual that we all knew, we all grew up with, we all look to as our leaders in the medical profession. It will be very difficult for those people to endure.

We'll look to academic medical centers, perhaps to hospitals, perhaps to the government itself for that leadership, but it's not going to be the same thing.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to the gentleman.

I do want to take a moment to talk about another group of young individuals in this country, young Americans who are also being negatively affected as a result of the implementation of ObamaCare: our students who are paying back student loans.

As we all know, July 1 student interest rates are scheduled to double, essentially. My staff and I have done some research on this. And if you all remember back in 2009, when President Obama was implementing the health care bill, they also took over the student loans in this country. That was for pay-for. And according to the Congressional Budget Office, over the next 10 years, $8.7 billion of that student loan payback will come from those student loans.

Not only are we affecting health care in this country, but we are also affecting our young people, those individuals who are graduating from colleges around this country who may or may not have a job to go to, a job that they have prepared a career for; and yet they too will be paying for ObamaCare.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That's a great point that I brought up when we were debating it back in 2009.

What people don't realize, as it didn't get a lot of coverage, Mr. Speaker, is that the Federal Government took over the student loans.

So you're going to hear a lot about student loans in the next few days because after July 1 the student loan rates are going to go up. The House was active. We passed a bill. It's in the Senate. I've heard the President talk about it.

What people need to realize is that when the health care bill passed—as my friend just said, the Federal Government can loan money at a low rate because we can pretty much borrow from ourselves at a low rate. When we loan it to students, they pay a little over 3 percent; and the difference, the flow, comes back to the Federal Government, the profit from loaning to our businesses.

Do you know where $8.7 billion of that is going to? To pay for the health care bill. Instead of taking $8.7 billion and giving it back to students who are struggling with affordability of college—I'm in that world right now because my son is leaving this summer to go off to college and I have a daughter in college. So most of the people that are peers of theirs that I see, we talk about the affordability of college. One of the things that we did is we took money that students are paying back on their student loans to pay for the health care bill. Instead of rebating it back to the students to put it in their pockets to pay for their loans, it goes to the health care bill.

As we hear a lot of people on the other side and in the White House this week talk about health care and that the Senate hasn't passed a bill to deal with student loan interest rates that will go up, I want people to remember, Mr. Speaker, that $8.7 billion of what people are paying back in interest is going to fund the health care bill.

□ 2120

Mrs. ELLMERS. With that, I would just say that the good news for the House is that last month we passed the Smarter Solutions for Students Act, and now it lies with the Senate for passage as well.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1613, OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF TRANSBOUNDARY HYDROCARBON AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2231, OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2410, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 29, 2013, THROUGH JULY 5, 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL (during the Special Order of Mrs. ELLMERS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–131) on the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1613) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2410) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from June 29, 2013, through July 5, 2013; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COFFMAN (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. LAMBORN (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. SANFORD (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of flight delays.

Mr. STEWART (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of his presence in Utah as his daughter departed for a year and a half of church missionary service in England.

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2013, 2014 AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY 2014 THROUGH FY 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Office of the Speaker,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal years 2013, 2014 and for the 10-year period of fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2023. This status report is current through June 17, 2013.

The term 'current level' refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and

revenues with the overall limits set in H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for fiscal year 2013 and H. Con. Res 25 (113th Congress) for fiscal year 2014 and the 10-year period of fiscal year 2014 through 2023. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2014 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for action completed by each authorizing committee with the ''section 302(a)'' allocations made under H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for fiscal year 2013 and H. Con. Res 25 (113th Congress) for fiscal years 2014 and the 10-year period 2014 through 2023. ''Action'' refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 with the ''section 302(b)'' sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending caps allowed under section 251(b) of the Budget Control Act.

Table 4 gives the current level for fiscal year 2015 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 601 of H. Con. Res. 25. This list is needed to enforce section 601 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

In addition, letters from the Congressional Budget Office are attached that summarize and compare the budget impact of enacted legislation during the FY2013 and FY2014 fiscal years against the budget resolution aggregates in force during those years.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Restuccia at (202) 226–7270.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—TABLE 1—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND 2014 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AS ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 112 AND H. CON. RES. 25

[Reflecting action completed as of June. 17, 2013—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year—2013[1]	Fiscal Year—2014[2]	Fiscal Years—2014–2023
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	2,793,848	2,760,943	n.a.
Outlays	2,891,589	2,811,260	n.a.
Revenues	2,089,540	2,310,972	31,089,081
Current Level:			
Budget Authority	3,007,563	1,888,786	n.a.
Outlays	3,057,704	2,306,696	n.a.
Revenues	2,015,873	2,310,972	31,089,081
Current Level over (+) / under Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	+213,715	−872,157	n.a.
Outlays	+166,115	−504,564	n.a.
Revenues	−73,667	0	0

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2015 through 2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

[1] The appropriate level for FY2013 was established in H. Con. Res. 112, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 5. The current level for FY2013 starts with the baseline estimates contained in Updated Budget Projections: Fiscal Years 2012 to 2022, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

[2] The appropriate level for FY2014 was established in H. Con. Res. 25, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 243. The current level for FY2014 starts with the baseline estimates contained in Updated Budget Projections: Fiscal Years 2013 to 2023, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—TABLE 2—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 17, 2013

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	2013		2014		2014–2023	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
House Committee:						
Agriculture:						
Allocation	−1,577	−1,503	−2,631	−2,501	−209,044	−208,556
Current Level	−106	−106	0	0	0	0
Difference	+1,471	+1,397	+2,631	+2,501	+209,044	+208,556
Armed Services:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	+77	+94	0	0	0	0
Difference	+77	+94	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce:						
Allocation	−18,098	−7,096	−21,712	−7,430	−217,458	−198,921
Current Level	+2,580	+3,275	0	0	0	0
Difference	+20,678	+10,371	+21,712	+7,430	+217,458	+198,921
Energy and Commerce:						
Allocation	−20,137	−4,661	−22,996	−20,659	−1,604,166	−1,596,356
Current Level	+9,762	+11,695	0	0	0	0
Difference	+29,899	+16,356	+22,996	+20,659	+1,604,166	+1,596,356
Financial Services:						
Allocation	−8,562	−8,495	−11,465	−10,428	−94,439	−94,325
Current Level	+5,245	+5,245	0	0	0	0
Difference	+13,807	+13,740	+11,465	+10,428	+94,439	+94,325
Foreign Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:						
Allocation	0	0	−305	−305	−12,575	−12,575
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	+305	+305	+12,575	+12,575
House Administration:						
Allocation	0	0	−34	0	−295	−130
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	+34	0	+295	+130
Judiciary:						
Allocation	−8,490	−594	−11,506	−637	−47,461	−45,809
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	+8,490	+594	+11,506	+637	+47,461	+45,809
Natural Resources:						
Allocation	−460	−229	−900	−632	−17,995	−17,225
Current Level	+259	+596	0	0	0	0
Difference	+719	+825	+900	+632	+17,995	+17,225
Oversight and Government Reform:						
Allocation	−8,146	−8,113	−11,758	−11,758	−165,996	−165,996
Current Level	−9	−9	0	0	0	0
Difference	+8,137	+8,104	+11,758	+11,758	+165,996	+165,996
Science, Space and Technology:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	−36,626	−9,354	−78	−47	−116,444	−951
Current Level	+6,588	+6,200	0	0	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—TABLE 2—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 17, 2013—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	2013		2014		2014–2023	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Difference	+43,214	+15,554	+78	+47	+116,444	+951
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	−36	−36	0	0	0	0
Difference	−36	−36	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	−5,970	−8,211	−22,567	−21,667	−1,298,202	−1,291,946
Current Level	+23,031	+23,031	0	0	0	0
Difference	+29,001	+31,242	+22,567	+21,667	+1,298,202	+1,291,946

TABLE 3 - DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 -- COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF JUNE. 17, 2013 (Figures in Millions)[1]

	302(b) allocations (H. Rept. 112-465)		302(b) for GWOT		Current status as of June 20, 2013		Current status GWOT		Current status less 302(b)		Current status GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,405	22,759	0	0	20,531	22,910	0	0	+1,126	+151	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	51,129	62,853	0	0	50,210	62,708	0	0	-919	-145	0	0
Defense	519,220	573,770	88,480	48,420	517,632	572,413	87,226	48,044	-1,588	-1,357	-1,254	-376
Energy and Water Development	32,098	40,682	0	0	36,744	41,350	0	0	+4,646	+668	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	21,150	23,939	0	0	21,453	24,370	0	0	+303	+431	0	0
Homeland Security	44,598	45,194	0	0	51,385	46,785	254	203	+6,787	+1,591	+254	+203
Interior, Environment	28,000	31,058	0	0	29,827	31,583	0	0	+1,827	+525	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	150,002	162,699	0	0	157,355	167,544	0	0	+7,353	+4,845	0	0
Legislative Branch	4,289	4,381	0	0	4,284	4,315	0	0	-5	-66	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	71,747	79,069	0	2	71,930	79,400	0	2	+183	+331	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	40,132	48,569	8,245	2,454	42,093	49,660	11,203	3,510	+1,961	+1,091	+2,958	+1,056
Transportation, HUD	51,606	115,161	0	0	51,817	115,117	0	0	+211	-44	0	0
Full Committee Allowance	2	0	0	249	0	0	0	0	-2	0	0	-249
Total	1,033,377	1,210,134	96,725	51,125	1,055,261	1,218,155	98,683	51,759	+21,883	+8,021	+1,958	+634

Comparison 302(a) and Total Appropriations[1]	BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation	1,033,377	1,210,134	96,725	51,125
Total Appropriations	1,055,261	1,218,155	98,683	51,759
302(a) Allocation vs. Total Appropriations	+21,884	+8,021	+1,958	+634

Memorandum:	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0	0	224	72	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0	0	363	97	0	0	0	0
Defense	0	0	88	42	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0	1,889	327	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0	811	430	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	5,481	274	6,693	283	11,779	1,453	0	0
Interior, Environment	0	0	1,443	153	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0	0	827	108	0	0	483	430
Legislative Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0	0	261	24	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD	0	0	29,070	588	0	0	0	0
Totals	5,481	274	41,669	2,124	11,779	1,453	483	430

[1]Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

TABLE 3 - DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 -- COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF JUNE. 17, 2013 (Figures in Millions)[1]

	302(b) allocations (H. Rept. 112-465)		302(b) for GWOT		Current status as of June 20, 2013		Current status GWOT		Current status less 302(b)		Current status GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,450	22,451	0	0	12	7,126	0	0	-19,438	-15,325	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	46,845	58,390	0	0	0	22,270	0	0	-46,845	-36,120	0	0
Defense	512,522	543,698	85,769	46,707	40	210,885	0	0	-512,482	-332,813	-85,769	-46,707
Energy and Water Development	30,426	34,922	0	0	0	19,492	0	0	-30,426	-15,430	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	16,966	18,648	0	0	78	5,811	0	0	-16,888	-12,837	0	0
Homeland Security	44,619	45,983	0	0	44,617	45,961	0	0	-2	-22	0	0
Interior, Environment	24,278	26,728	0	0	0	12,537	0	0	-24,278	-14,191	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	121,797	135,306	0	0	24,642	104,421	0	0	-97,155	-30,885	0	0
Legislative Branch	4,124	4,102	0	0	0	700	0	0	-4,124	-3,402	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	73,320	76,206	0	0	73,320	76,204	0	0	0	-2	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	34,103	40,021	6,520	1,303	0	27,023	0	0	-34,103	-12,998	-6,520	-1,303
Transportation, HUD	44,100	111,501	0	0	4,400	80,334	0	0	-39,700	-31,167	0	0
Full Committee Allowance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	972,550	1,117,956	92,289	48,010	147,109	612,764	0	0	-825,441	-505,192	-92,289	-48,010

Comparison 302(a) and Total Appropriations[1]	BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation	972,550	1,117,956	92,289	48,010
Total Appropriations	147,109	612,764	0	0
302(a) Allocation vs. Total Appropriations	- 825,441	-505,192	- 92,289	- 48,010

Memorandum:	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	5,626	281	0	0	5,626	281	0	0
Interior, Environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislative Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	5,626	281	0	0	5,626	281	0	0

[1]Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

TABLE 4—2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF JUNE 17, 2013

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

Section 601 (d) (1) Limits	2,015
Appropriate Level	55,634
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Department of Veterans Affairs	
Medical Services	0
Medical Support and Compliance	0
Medical Facilities	0
Subtotal, enacted advances [1]	0
Section 601 (d) (2) Limits	2015
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement Programs	0
Special Education	0
Career, Technical and Adult Education	0

TABLE 4—2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF JUNE 17, 2013—Continued

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

Tenant-based Rental Assistance	0
Project-based Rental Assistance	0
Subtotal, enacted advances [1]	0
Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations [2]	2,015
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445
Total, enacted advances [1]	445

1. Line items may not add to total due to rounding.
2. Funds were appropriated in Public Law 113–6.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2013 budget and is current through June 17, 2013. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 112, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013, as revised and approved by the House of Representatives.

Since my last letter dated January 23, 2013, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2013:

- Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–2);
- Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6); and
- Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–9).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2013 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH JUNE 17, 2013
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted a/			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,293,339
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,869,081	1,818,079	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	553,169	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-729,799	-729,799	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,139,282	1,641,449	2,293,339
Enacted Legislation:			
Authorizing Legislation			
Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-121)	0	0	1
Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112-141)	8,795	9,439	2,291
Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (P.L. 112-144)	-16	-16	0
Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-154)	-36	-36	0
An act to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act...and to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff schedule...for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes (P.L. 112-163)	0	0	-59
FDA User Fees Corrections Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-193)	0	-195	0
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112-239)	-33	-16	0
American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-240)	57,428	49,804	-279,700
Medicare IVIG Access and Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-242)	3	3	0
An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that accounts in Thrift Savings Fund are subject to certain Federal tax levies (P.L. 112-267)	0	0	1
An act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113-1)	5,250	5,250	0
Total, Authorizing Legislation	71,391	64,233	-277,466
Appropriations Legislation			
Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (P.L. 112-175) b/	423	423	0
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2) c/	8,840	1,479	0
Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-6)	1,867,246	1,426,973	0
Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-9)	0	203	0
Total, Appropriations Legislation	1,876,509	1,429,078	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,947,900	1,493,311	-277,466
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	-79,619	-77,056	0
Total Current Level d/	3,007,563	3,057,704	2,015,873
Total House Resolution e/	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,089,540
Current Level Over House Resolution	213,715	166,115	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	73,667
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2013-2022:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	28,846,212
House Resolution f/	n.a.	n.a.	28,957,333
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	111,121

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

Continued

FISCAL YEAR 2013 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH JUNE 17, 2013

Continued

(In millions of dollars)

a. Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues and were cleared by the Congress in 2012, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013 (H. Con. Res. 112): the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-95), the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-96) and an act to apply the countervailing duty provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 to nonmarket economy countries, and for other purposes (P.L. 112-99).

b. Sections 140(b) and 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 provided $423 million for fire suppression activities, available until expended.

c. Pursuant to Section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2013, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013	41,667	2,122	n.a.

d. For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

e. Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 112, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original House Resolution	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,293,339
Revisions:			
For the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012	0	0	-203,799
Revised House Resolution	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,089,540

f. Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2013-2022 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 112, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2014 budget and is current through June 17, 2013. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as revised and approved by the House of Representatives.

This is CBO's first current level report for fiscal year 2014.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH JUNE 17, 2013
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted a/			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,310,972
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,848,718	1,778,493	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	504,662	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-707,692	-707,792	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,141,026	1,575,363	2,310,972
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	747,760	731,333	0
Total Current Level b/	1,888,786	2,306,696	2,310,972
Total House Resolution	2,760,943	2,811,260	2,310,972
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	872,157	504,564	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2014-2023:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,089,081
House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	31,089,081
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

a. Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 (H. Con. Res. 25): an act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the FEMA for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113-1) the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2), the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-5), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-6), and the Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-9).

b. For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 26, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1959. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William J. Troy, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1960. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Willie J. Williams, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1961. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Charles J. Leiding, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1962. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a certification of the budget for fiscal year 2014 and the future-years defense program (FYDP) for fiscal years 2014-2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1963. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Standby Mode and Off Mode for Microwave Ovens [Docket Number: EERE-2011-BT-STD-0048] (RIN: 1904-AC07) received June 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1964. A letter from the Chairwoman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1965. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Price Analysis Techniques [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2012-018; Item VI; Docket 2012-0018, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM27) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1966. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Terms of Service and Open-Ended Indemnification, and Unenforceability of Unauthorized Obligations [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2013-005; Item V; Docket 2013-0005, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM45) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1967. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Interagency Acquisitions: Compliance by Nondefense Agencies with Defense Procurement Requirements [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2012-010; Item IV; Docket 2012-0010, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM36) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1968. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; System for Award Management Name Change, Phase 1 Implementation [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2012-033; Item III; Docket 2012-0033, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM51) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1969. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contracting Officer's Representative [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2013-004; Item II; Docket 2013-0004, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM52) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1970. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contracting with Women-owned Small Business Concerns [FAC 2005-67; FAR Case 2013-010; Item VII; Docket 2013-0010, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM59) received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1971. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-67; Introduction [Docket: FAR 2013-0076, Sequence 3] received June 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1972. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 37 [Docket No.: 121004518-3398-01] (RIN: 0648-BC66) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1973. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Big Skate in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC673) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1974. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Texas Closure [Docket No.: 940846-4348] (RIN: 0648-XC683) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1975. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3418-02] (RIN: 0648-XC687) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1976. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC675) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1977. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Restrictions and Observer Requirements in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2013-2014 [Docket No.: 130104011-3456-02] (RIN: 0648-BC87) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1978. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Indoor Tanning Services; Excise Taxes [TD 9621] (RIN: 1545-BJ40) received June 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1171. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations' access to Federal surplus personal property (Rept. 113–126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1233. A bill to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113–127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1234. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113–128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 1871. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline; with an amendment (Rept. 113–129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1405. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the

Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include an appeals form in any notice of decision issued for the denial of a benefit sought; with amendments (Rept. 113–130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 274. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1613) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2231) to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to increase energy exploration and production on the Outer Continental Shelf, provide for equitable revenue sharing for all coastal States, implement the reorganization of the functions of the former Minerals Management Service into distinct and separate agencies, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2410) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from June 29, 2013, through July 5, 2013; and for other purposes. (Rept. 113–131). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of cancer care planning and coordination under the Medicare program; 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. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 2478. A bill to repeal a limitation on Federal procurement of certain fuels; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 2480. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard to reduce injuries to patients, nurses, and all other health care workers by establishing a safe patient handling, mobility, and injury prevention standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. FLORES:

H.R. 2481. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify and improve the election requirements for the receipt of educational assistance under the Post 9/11 Educational Assistance program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2482. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2483. A bill to affirm the religious freedom of taxpayers who are conscientiously opposed to participation in war, to provide that the income, estate, or gift tax payments of such taxpayers be used for nonmilitary purposes, to create the Religious Freedom Peace Tax Fund to receive such tax payments, to improve revenue collection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERA (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2484. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2485. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend programs assisting homeless veterans and other veterans with special needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. FARR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 2486. A bill to permanently prohibit oil and gas leasing off the coast of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2487. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate rules requiring an Internet merchant to disclose the use of personal information in establishing or changing a price, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 2488. A bill to expand the Wild Rogue Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to make additional wild and scenic river designations in the Rogue River area, to provide additional protections for Rogue River tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 2489. A bill to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 2490. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 2491. A bill to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild or recreation rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 2492. A bill to restrict funds related to escalating United States military involvement in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COLE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 2493. A bill to amend chapter 329 of title 49, United States Code, to ensure that new vehicles enable fuel competition so as to reduce the strategic importance of oil to the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2494. A bill to restrict funds related to escalating United States military involvement in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 2495. A bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2496. A bill to prohibit the deployment of United States Armed Forces in support of a United Nations or mutual security treaty military operation absent express prior statutory authorization from Congress for such deployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2497. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 2498. A bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 2499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion from gross income for employer-provided health coverage for employees' spouses and

dependent children to coverage provided to other eligible designated beneficiaries of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HALL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 2500. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize payments for ambulatory surgical centers under the Medicare program, 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. ROONEY (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2501. A bill to authorize assistance to conduct military or paramilitary operations in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the energy credit for certain property under construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 2503. A bill to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds to provide military assistance to opposition forces in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution encouraging peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 273. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should nominate a qualified and independent individual for the position of Inspector General of the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors to be confirmed by the Senate without delay; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORBES:

H. Res. 275. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the funds made available for the cost of the President's trip to Africa instead be used to compensate those who have been placed on an administrative furlough as a result of sequestration; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H. Res. 276. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Science Week and the biennial USA Science & Engineering Festival in Washington, D.C., and inviting State and local governments to recognize the last week in April as a National Science Week; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

61. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 memorializing the President and the Congress to enact appropriate legislation that would reauthorize the federal Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

62. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 69 urging the Congress to classify emergency medical services providers as its other first responders; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

63. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 1 urging the Secretary of Agriculture to declare the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and adjacent national forest lands to be a Natural Resources Disaster Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

64. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 62 expressing the rejection of the application of the death penalty by the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

65. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, relative to Senate Resolution No. 24 supporting an amendment to the constitution to provide that corporations are not entitled to the entirety of protections or rights of natural persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

66. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 124 applauding Tennessee's judges for creating the existing veteran's treatment courts and veterans' court documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2477.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 2478.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United State Constitution which provides Congress with the power to "provide for...the general Welfare of the United States" and in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress the power to "... make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution...all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or, on in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2479.

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

Article 1, sec. 8, cl. 3 (commerce clause), & cl. 18 (necessary and proper clause); Section 1 of the 14th Amendment (due process and equal protection clauses), and section 5 of the 14th Amendment (enforcement).

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2480.

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

U.S. Const., Art. I, Sec. 8

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2481.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2482.

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. LEWIS:

H.R. 2483.

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. BERA:

H.R. 2484.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2485.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 2486.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2487.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2488.

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

Article I, Section 8, 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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2489.

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

Article I, Section 8, 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2490.

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 1, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2491.

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

Article I, Section 8, 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. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 2492.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2493.

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

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 2494.

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

clause 7, section 9, Article I;

clause 11, section 8, Article I

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 2495.

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

Article I, Section 8, providing for the common defense.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2496.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to declare war.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2497.

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. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2498.

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

The ability to regulate interstate commerce and with foreign Nations pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 includes the power to regulate commodity prices, practices affecting them and the trading or donation of the commodities to impoverished nations. In addition, the Congress has the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 which includes the power to promote the development of Rural America through research and extension of credit.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2499.

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

Clause I of Section VIII of Article I: ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States''

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2500.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 2501.

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

Article I, section 8, ''to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;''

and ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2502.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 2503.

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

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be issued from time to time.''

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 11 ''Congress has the Power to . . . declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 35: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 148: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 176: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 274: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 301: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 303: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 328: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 332: Mr. HIMES and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 339: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 376: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 379: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 451: Mr. RADEL and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 460: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 508: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 548: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 575: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 611: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 621: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 641: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 647: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 655: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 664: Mr. POCAN and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 685: Mr. COSTA and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 690: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 693: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 708: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 712: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 715: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 717: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 719: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 721: Mr. KILMER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 752: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 755: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 805: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 820: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 828: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 833: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 842: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 846: Mr. KIND, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 850: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 855: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 904: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 920: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 946: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 961: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 984: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1008: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1014: Mr. CARTER and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1020: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1024: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1030: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1074: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1077: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1130: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1148: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 1179: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1188: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1199: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. MENG, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1201: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1205: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1250: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1255: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1276: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1309: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1317: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1330: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1351: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1384: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1386: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1409: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1414: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 1418: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1424: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1426: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1428: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1430: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1465: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 1507: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1508: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1557: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1563: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 1579: Mr. FARR and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1595: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1599: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1623: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1630: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1661: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1666: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1690: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1692: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1696: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1717: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1726: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1739: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1771: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1779: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1781: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1783: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1787: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1792: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1814: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1816: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1825: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1827: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1830: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1845: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1851: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1877: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1882: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1893: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 1897: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1908: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 1915: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1916: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1918: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1920: Mr. COSTA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1933: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1962: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1971: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1998: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2002: Ms. MENG and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2009: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. NUGENT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2026: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2043: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2053: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2059: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2070: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2093: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BARR, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2094: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SESSIONS, and, Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2150: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2224: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2252: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2288: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2289: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2308: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2310: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FARR, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2328: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2329: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2332: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2347: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2355: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2368: Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2375: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2385: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 2389: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H.R. 2403: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2408: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2429: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. YODER, Mr. RADEL, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 2446: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 2449: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 2453: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2456: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2457: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KIND, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2472: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2473: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2475: Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. REED.
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 30: Ms. SPEIER.
H. Res. 100: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 109: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H. Res. 123: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 131: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. SINEMA.
H. Res. 188: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H. Res. 190: Ms. BASS.
H. Res. 222: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. GRANGER.
H. Res. 227: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H. Res. 249: Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 250: Mr. OLSON.
H. Res. 272: Mr. COBLE.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative GRIJALVA, or a designee, to H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1213: Mr. POCAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

31. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Town of North Berwick, relative to a Resolution memorializing the Congress to recognize the importance of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter to Maine, the United States, and our allies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

32. Also, a petition of the Town of Stoney Point, New York, relative to a Resolution urging the Federal Emergency Management Agency to expedite the release of advisory base flood elevations for Rockland County; to the Committee on Financial Services.

33. Also, a petition of the Blount County Board of Commissioners, Tennessee, relative to Resolution No. 13-05-008 calling upon the elected officials to join in the affirmation of the rights of our citizens under the 2nd Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

34. Also, a petition of New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs of GFWC, New Jersey, relative to an Emergency Resolution urging the President and the Congress to enact legislation regarding gun control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.