United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 16, 2013 No. 101

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,
July 16, 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.

BENGHAZI INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, Deuteronomy 16:20 tells us:

Justice, justice shalt thou pursue.

As we quietly mark the 10-month anniversary of the Benghazi terrorist attacks last week, I know many people wondered if there will ever be any clear resolution to this investigation, let alone justice.

There are less than 3 weeks remaining before the Congress departs for the August recess. When we return in September, we will be only 2 days away from the 1-year anniversary of the Benghazi attacks. This looming anniversary should stand as a stark reminder of the many unanswered questions that remain about what actually happened that night and how the administration chose to respond or not respond to the Americans under assault during that 8-hour period.

That is why, over the next 3 weeks, I will be coming to the floor regularly to remind the American people about the key questions that remain to be answered. I will also be sending a series of letters to the State Department, the Defense Department, and the CIA formally requesting responses to some of these questions. While I am skeptical the administration will be forthcoming with answers, I do hope that these questions will underscore, for the Congress and the American people, the woefully incomplete status of the Benghazi investigation.

I have long been concerned that the current investigative strategy would not yield the necessary answers. That is why, for the last 8 months, I have advocated creating a bipartisan select committee to thoroughly investigate the Benghazi attacks. My bill, H. Res. 36, has 160 cosponsors, as well as the support of many family members of the Benghazi victims, the Special Operations community, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, which represent the Diplomatic Security agents who were at the consulate in Benghazi.

Perhaps the most telling sign of the incomplete state of the Benghazi investigation is the fact that not one of the survivors of the Benghazi attack from the consulate or the annex has publicly testified before Congress. Despite nearly a full year of multiple committee investigations, not one witness has been brought before a committee to publicly testify under oath about what happened that night.

Instead of learning the details of the attack and the U.S. response in public hearings, the American people may instead read about it in one of the books that have been announced in recent weeks. It is clear that the survivors from the consulate and the annex have worked with authors on two separate books that are scheduled to be published over the next year.

The first, ''Under Fire: The Untold Story of the Attack in Benghazi,'' describes in vivid, minute-by-minute detail the assault on the U.S. consulate, according to an excerpt that was published in Vanity Fair magazine this month. This excerpt contains important new information about the level of sophistication of the attack and how the terrorists apparently had detailed inside knowledge of the American consulate. It also noted that each of the terrorists' vehicles flew the ''black flag of jihad.'' The report makes clear this attack was the result of careful planning and intelligence-gathering by the terrorists, not some spontaneous attack on a target of opportunity.

A second, $3 million book deal, scheduled for publication in 2014, was announced last month with four unnamed U.S. security contractors who were based at the annex and responded to the attacks that night. I suspect, given the critical role played by the contractors in responding to the consulate attack and later in defending the annex, that these individuals have important information that deserves to be heard by the Congress and by the American people. I also wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether any of the $3 million they're earning from the book deal will be shared with Ty Woods' widow and child or the parents of Glen Doherty, who did so much to save our Americans.

I can't help but ask why the Congress has not asked—or subpoenaed—these individuals to testify before the House committees that have been investigating this over the past year. If

Printed on recycled paper.

these questions are not answered, the American people will never know what took place in Benghazi.

THE FARM BILL AND POLLINATORS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Last week's farm bill debacle in the House of Representatives highlighted a fundamental disconnect. My friends in the Republican majority felt that nutrition for poor people was not a priority because they were concerned about increasing government dependence for lower-income Americans.

Yes, there are more people receiving SNAP, or what we used to call food stamp benefits, because that's how the system is supposed to work. After our Nation suffered a near collapse of the economy, and with a much larger population of over 313 million people, we would expect that, in the face of persistent unemployment and job loss, more people would be on food stamps. We want them to get this assistance. It helps those families and it helps the economy.

Yet, by the same action, my friends passed the most expensive farm bill provisions in our Nation's history. Just like the direct payment program, which gave 75 percent of the payments to 10 percent of all farmers, the new price targets and crop insurance programs manipulate the market, concentrate wealth in the hands of the few, and fail to implement any basic reforms such as means testing and payment limits. The irony was not lost on many who watched the price tag go up and the benefits be concentrated in the hands of those who need it the least.

The bill lacked meaningful reform. The long overdue elimination of direct payments was coupled with a lavish increase in a new entitlement, shallow loss provisions of crop insurance. It locked in the currently high commodity prices as a threshold going forward. There were additional direct payments for cotton and a refusal to reform egregious sugar provisions. Subsidies for wealthy farmers are supported over innovation, research, and conservation. The bill lavished support on those that needed it the least, while stripping out nutrition support through the SNAP program, because they didn't want to foster dependence, all while a blind eye was turned to abuses in the lavish crop insurance program where fraud is 50 percent higher than in the maligned SNAP, or food stamp program.

I am hopeful that if this bill goes on to conference, we'll be able to reduce the costs, provide adequate support by reinstituting nutrition programs, and address long overdue reform for crop insurance.

At the same time, there would be some provisions that could actually bring people together. For years, I've been working in areas of protecting the pollinators. There are 250,000 little species that pollinate our food and help create $200 billion worth of food crops worldwide. One in every three forks of foods that we eat is due to pollination, as well as the flowers we enjoy, fruits, chocolate, and even tequila. Many of these things depend on these humble workers. Yet we've watched real threats to the critical habitat for pollinators. I'm hopeful that we can add a simple, nonpartisan provision that will make a difference for these protections.

Neonicotinoids are insecticides which have been linked to large bee die-offs. In one instance, it happened to 50,000 bees in Oregon last week. These insecticides have been banned for 2 years in Europe. I'm hopeful that as the farm bill goes forward, we can address putting a temporary ban on their sale here in the United States, taking a deeper dive on the impact they have on pollinators and, indeed, on the entire food chain for this very persistent substance that has the potential of affecting the impact not just of the health of bees but of our families as well. I'm also hopeful that we'll have a farm bill that can include low- or no-cost provisions like pollinating protection to bring people together to strengthen agriculture. These are vital parts of nature and of our food chain.

In the past, the farm bill wasn't a partisan battlefield. If we can focus on providing help for people who need it the most, rather than lavish subsidies for people that need it the least, and focus on innovation, conservation, and, yes, pollinator protection, things like this can strengthen our food supply, save money, protect the environment, and maybe enable us to make some progress in an area so far that looks embarrassingly remote.

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 11 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.

We ask discernment for the Members of this people's House, that they might judge anew their adherence to principle, conviction, and commitment, lest they slide uncharitably toward an inability to listen to one another and work cooperatively to solve the important issues of our day.

Give them the generosity of heart, and the courage of true leadership, to work toward a common solution, which might call for compromise, even sacrifice on both sides. We pray that their work results not in solutions where some are winners and some losers, but where all Americans know in their hearts that we are winners.

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 North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the whole number of the House is 434.

JOBS REPORT MISLEADING

(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, according to Investor's Business Daily:

> From the media to Wall Street, June's jobs report is being spun as a major positive, a sign the economy is back on track. Maybe the pundits should look at the actual numbers, which are abysmal. At June's pace of 195,000 new jobs a month, it will take 11 months to get back to where we were in 2007. It's even worse when you consider all of the net addition to June jobs—repeat, all—were part time. The underemployment rate shot up from 13.8 to 14.3 percent. This isn't a solid jobs report. It's a crisis.

House Republicans have passed legislation to promote jobs. Building the Keystone pipeline alone can create nearly 200,000 jobs. In the Midlands of South Carolina, the earthmover tires made by Michelin Corporation are shipped to Alberta, Canada, for oil sand recovery. At 12 feet high and $60,000 for each tire, there are over 300 jobs in

Lexington, with another 300 persons building engines for Alberta at MTU in Graniteville of Aiken County.

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

Happy 40th birthday today, South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson.

THE OBAMACARE TRAIN WRECK

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, building a stronger economy for all Americans is our top priority here in the House. That's why we're working to simplify the Tax Code, expand energy production, and hold the administration accountable for abuses at agencies like the IRS. It's why, while Senate Democrats have done nothing, the House has passed a bipartisan plan to make college more affordable. And it's why we'll vote tomorrow to make sure that families and individuals get the same break from ObamaCare that the President wants for big businesses.

Over the weekend, the Democratic leader in the Senate said the President's health care law ''has been wonderful'' for our country. Are you kidding me? If ObamaCare is so wonderful, why are health care prices exploding? Why are millions of Americans getting kicked out of their plans? Why are so many workers losing their jobs or getting their hours cut?

The law isn't wonderful. It's a train wreck. You know it, I know it, and the American people know it. Even the President knows it. That's why he proposed delaying his mandate on employers.

But it's unfair to protect big businesses without giving the same relief to American families and small businesses. The bills by Congressman TIM GRIFFIN and TODD YOUNG will address this problem by delaying both the employer mandate and the individual mandate. I hope Democrats and Republicans alike will vote to do what's fair and protect all Americans from this disastrous law.

OBAMACARE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, employers need more than a 1-year delay of ObamaCare's economic train wreck. The President's flawed legislation must be repealed in its entirety.

ObamaCare is already increasing health care costs, depressing hiring, and destroying full-time work. Waiting a year to implement some of its confusing, wrongheaded policies will not stop the damage or provide job creators with the certainty they need to figure out whether they can afford to keep their employees. That will come only when ObamaCare is replaced by competitive, patient-centered health care reforms.

The American people and the American economy deserve better than excuses for unworkable laws. They deserve health care policies that are transparent, responsive, and focused on them. This week, House Republicans will take action to protect every American—individuals, families, and those who manage or work with businesses—from the President's costly broken law. If the employer mandate is being delayed, so should the individual mandate. It's basic fairness. It's fairness for all.

WEST, TEXAS

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 3-month anniversary of the fertilizer plant explosion in West, Texas. This catastrophic event injured hundreds, took 15 lives, and cost tens of millions of dollars in damage. Since that tragic day, the State of Texas and the entire community of West have been working tirelessly to rebuild and to recover.

FEMA originally denied Texas Governor Rick Perry's request for a major disaster declaration. Since then, the Governor has filed an appeal for the President to reconsider this decision. I am pleased to be joined by a substantial bipartisan majority of the Texas congressional delegation as we urge the President to support this appeal on behalf of the citizens of West and McLennan County.

It is our hope that the President honors the commitment he made on April 25—to help the citizens of West recover, rebuild, and reclaim their community. We must help ease the burdens this community continues to face through the recovery process.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Americans keep the community of West in their prayers. God bless America.

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE MANDATE DELAYS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, some of the Affordable Care Act's oldest and strongest supporters are now coming out against the bill. Yesterday, the three largest unions in the country wrote a letter to Speaker PELOSI and Leader REID and said that the President's health care takeover would ''destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.'' Their concern—my concern—is that the employer mandate will force small businesses to move their employees to part time in an effort to avoid additional expenses.

While I wish they had realized this before spending so much time and so much money on getting the law passed, at this point I couldn't agree with them more.

This week, it is very important that we pass the bills to delay the individual mandate and delay the employer mandate for a year. This will give us time to consider how to keep the Affordable Care Act from destroying our economy.

To quote the union's letter:

> Time is running out. We have a problem. You need to fix it. The unintended consequences of the Affordable Care Act are severe.

Further quoting:

> We can no longer stand silent in the face of the elements of the Affordable Care Act that will destroy the very health care and well-being of millions of hardworking Americans.

By passing these two bills this week, we will take an important step in minimizing the damage from the Affordable Care Act.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JULY 16, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 16, 2013 at 1:25 p.m.:

Appointments:
World War I Centennial Commission
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 13101 of the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) Act (P.L. 111–5), I hereby reappoint Mr. Paul Egerman of Weston, Massachusetts to the HIT Policy Committee for a term of three years.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) 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.

SMALL AIRPLANE REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1848) to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1848

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) A healthy small aircraft industry is integral to economic growth and to maintaining an effective transportation infrastructure for communities and nations around the world.

(2) Small aircraft comprise nearly 90 percent of FAA type certified general aviation aircraft.

(3) General aviation provides for the cultivation of a workforce of engineers, manufacturing and maintenance professionals, and pilots, who secure the Nation's economic success and defense.

(4) General aviation contributes to well-paying manufacturing and technology jobs in the United States, and these products are exported in great numbers, providing a positive trade balance.

(5) Technology developed and proven in general aviation aids in the success and safety of all sectors of aviation and scientific competence.

(6) The average small airplane in the United States is now 40 years old and the regulatory barriers to bringing new designs to market are resulting in a lack of innovation and investment in small airplane design.

(7) Over the past decade, the United States has typically lost 10,000 active private pilots per year, partially due to a lack of cost-effective, new small airplanes.

(8) General aviation safety can be improved by modernizing and revamping the regulations for this sector to clear the path for technology adoption and cost-effective means to retrofit the existing fleet with new safety technologies.

SEC. 3. FAA SAFETY AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS FOR GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FAA SAFETY AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS FOR GENERAL AVIATION.—The Administrator shall advance the safety and continued development of small airplanes by reorganizing the certification requirements applicable to small airplanes to streamline the approval of safety advancements.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator shall issue a final rule based on the FAA's Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee (established in August 2011) by December 31, 2015. The final rule shall meet the following objectives of the Part 23 Committee:

(1) Create a regulatory regime for small airplanes that will improve safety and decrease certification costs.

(2) Set broad, outcome-driven safety objectives that will spur innovation and technology adoption.

(3) Replace current, prescriptive requirements contained in FAA rules with performance-based regulations.

(4) Use FAA-accepted consensus standards to clarify how the part 23 safety objectives may be met by specific designs and technologies.

(c) CONSENSUS-BASED STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall use acceptable consensus-based standards whenever possible in the spirit of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 3701 note), while continuing traditional methods for meeting part 23.

(d) SAFETY COOPERATION.—The Administrator shall lead the effort to improve general aviation safety by working with leading aviation regulators to assist them in adopting a complementary regulatory approach for small airplanes.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(2) CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—The term ''consensus standards'' means standards developed by voluntary organizations which plan, develop, establish, or coordinate voluntary standards using agreed-upon procedures, both domestic and international. These standards include provisions requiring that owners of relevant intellectual property agree to make that intellectual property available on a nondiscriminatory, royalty-free or reasonable-royalty basis to all interested parties. These bodies have the attributes of openness, balance of interest, due process, an appeals process, and consensus.

(3) FAA.—The term ''FAA'' means the Federal Aviation Administration.

(4) GENERAL AVIATION.—The term ''general aviation'' means all aviation activities other than scheduled commercial airline operations and military aviation.

(5) PART 23.—The term ''part 23'' means part 23 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(6) SMALL AIRPLANE.—The term ''small airplane'' means FAA type certificated airplanes that meet the parameters of part 23 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. 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. 1848.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1848, the Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013.

I'd like to commend my colleague, Congressman MIKE POMPEO, for introducing this bill, along with Congressmen DAN LIPINSKI, SAM GRAVES, RICHARD NOLAN, and TODD ROKITA.

I will insert into the RECORD a letter of support for H.R. 1848 from the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Experimental Aircraft Association, General Aviation Manufacturers Association, National Air Transportation Association, and National Business Aviation Association, as well as a separate letter of support from the National Air Traffic Controllers Association.

Mr. Speaker, we're considering H.R. 1848 today because general aviation is vital to our country. The general aviation industry includes nearly 600,000 pilots, employs 1.3 million people, and contributes approximately $150 billion annually to the U.S. economy. In fact, the general aviation industry is one of the few remaining U.S. manufacturing industries that provide a trade surplus for the U.S., and it has a presence in every one of our 435 Congressional districts.

However, over the last several decades, the general aviation industry has experienced unique challenges, including a steady decline in new pilots, flight activity, and the sale of new aircraft. In part, these challenges are due to overly prescriptive and outdated certification processes, which greatly increase the costs of bringing new products to market and, ultimately, increase the costs for consumers.

The bill before us is intended to address these challenges by streamlining the certification process for small airplanes, making it more efficient and effective, while also protecting the important safety oversight function of the FAA.

The goal is to improve safety at a fraction of the cost. For example, the leading cause of fatalities in general aviation is due to ''loss of control.'' There are several existing technologies available to mitigate loss of control, such as an angle of attack indicator. However, in an FAA-certified airplane, the purchase and installation of this equipment is about $5,000; whereas, the exact same piece of equipment in a noncertified experimental airplane is about $800. So right now, the FAA's complicated and costly small airplane certification process provides a disincentive to certify new airplanes and safety equipment. This is just one example of how the Small Airplane Revitalization Act will improve safety at a fraction of the cost.

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

AOPA, EAA, GAMA, NATA, NBAA,

July 9, 2013.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: We write in support of the Small Aircraft Revitalization Act (H.R. 1848). We urge you

to support passage of the measure when it is marked up by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on Wednesday, July 10, 2013.

H.R. 1848 directs the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to modernize and revamp the regulatory structure for small, certified aircraft—commonly referred to as Part 23 Aircraft—by December 31, 2015. This legislation will help industry and FAA develop and adopt more effective, consensus based compliance standards that will spur manufacturers' investment in new aircraft designs and help put critical lifesaving equipment into the existing fleet of airplanes. This will improve safety and also revitalize the lighter end of general aviation which has faced significant challenges in recent years.

H.R. 1848 is based on the recommendations of a recently completed FAA Aviation Rulemaking Committee (ARC). The ARC developed these recommendations over an eighteen month period with input from over 150 government and industry experts from around the world. The FAA and the general aviation community have identified implementation of these recommendations as key to improving general aviation safety.

H.R. 1848 has broad, bipartisan support and merits favorable consideration by members of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Thank you in advance for your consideration of the Small Aircraft Revitalization Act.

Sincerely,

Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA), Experimental Aircraft Association (EAA), General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA), National Air Transportation Association (NATA), National Business Aviation Association (NBAA).

NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION (NATCA),
Washington, DC, July 9, 2013.

Good Afternoon.

NATCA supports H.R. 1848, the Small Aircraft Revitalization Act which is scheduled for mark up tomorrow by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. H.R. 1848 is based on the recommendations of a recently completed Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Aviation Rule-making Committee (ARC).

We support H.R. 1848 and thank you in advance for your consideration.

JOSE L. CEBALLOS,
Director, Government Affairs.

Ms. TITUS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1848, the Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013. H.R. 1848 would require the Federal Aviation Administration to update its part 23 small airplane design regulations by December 31, 2015.

Last week, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee ordered H.R. 1848 reported favorably to the House by a voice vote.

In June, an FAA-chartered Part 23 Aviation Rulemaking Committee, or ARC, submitted its comprehensive report with recommendations for rewriting and reorganizing part 23 to the agency. Representatives from the FAA, international regulatory agencies, aircraft manufacturers, general aviation pilot groups, and labor unions all participated in the ARC. Its work followed a 2009 FAA report on the Small Airplane Certification Process and fulfilled requirements in section 312 of the FAA reauthorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the Part 23 ARC, the agency's most recent comprehensive review of part 23 was almost 30 years ago, in 1984. Part 23 has not kept up with the times. These regulations are prescriptive in nature, often written to address out-of-date technologies. As a result, they are creating cost barriers for certifying new airplanes and retrofitting older aircraft with new safety-enhancing modifications. The need to improve the process for retrofitting older aircraft is particularly urgent, given the 40-year-old average age of the U.S. general aviation fleet. Small airplane manufacturers and part suppliers across the country are limited in their ability to innovate with new technology because of these outdated regulations. This bill will allow these manufacturers to innovate more quickly and bring more safety technology online.

H.R. 1848 will fast-track the Part 23 ARC's work by requiring the FAA to draft a new regulation that emphasizes performance-based safety objectives. These new regulations make the retrofit of new technology more straightforward and also remove barriers to bringing new, safer airplane designs to market. It will help small business, and I urge support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker,I yield such time as he may consume to our colleague from the Fourth District of Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the general aviation industry and ask my fellow Members to support the Small Aircraft Revitalization Act. This commonsense, broadly bipartisan regulatory reform bill will spur economic growth, improve aviation safety, and help strengthen the health of the lighter, entry-level segment of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, there is no better reason to support this legislation than it saves lives and improves lives. Think about that. We can do both in one fell swoop.

Let's first talk about how the bill improves lives. I represent Wichita, Kansas. It is the Air Capital of the World. It is home to Cessna and Learjet and Beechcraft and dozens and dozens and dozens of suppliers to those great aviation businesses with such great aviation histories. It's the home of the National Institute for Aviation Research and the National Center for Aviation Training.

There are engineers, machinists, researchers, flight instructors, fixed base operators, among others, that all depend on a healthy general aviation industry. And then there are the operators in the industry and general aviation. This vital productivity tool for both small and large companies is critically important.

Sixteen years ago, I joined the Kansas general aviation industry, building a business with three of my colleagues, founding a company called Thayer Aerospace, a machine shop in Wichita, Kansas. We made parts for the thriving aircraft industry, but the downturn in 2008 was a tremendous blow to Wichita, in particular, and general aviation, more generally. We experienced thousands and thousands of layoffs and dramatic downsizing all across the region. The downturn exacerbated the unique challenges that the lighter, entry-level segment of general aviation had been experiencing over the past several decades.

Today, the average general aviation airplane is 40 years old. That means most of the new aircraft were built in the 1960s and 1970s, with designs of that same vintage. Current general aviation production represents less than 2 percent of the existing fleet.

We've had an over 10,000-person-per-year decline in active private pilots over this last decade. The steady decline in new pilots, flight activity, and the sales of new small general aviation airplanes that result from that are indicators of significant problems in the industry.

To tackle this problem, this bill, the Small Aircraft Revitalization Act, requires the FAA to implement the FAA's part 23 certification process and modernize it no later than 2015. The FAA Part 23 Reorganization Aviation Rulemaking Committee (ARC), composed of aviation authorities and industry representatives from around the world, has worked over the last 18 months to create a regulatory environment that will contribute to revitalizing the health and safety of new and existing airplanes.

These changes will remove lots and lots of barriers and it will improve lives. Let me tell you how it will save lives.

The gentleman from Wisconsin talked about safety and innovation being retarded by the absence of a streamlined regulatory process. He spoke of this example of ''loss of control.'' That creates more than three times the cause of aviation accidents than any other single cause.

Since the dawn of aviation, we've taught pilots how to avoid that; but because they remain a significant safety problem, there's tremendous interest in technology and interventions to resolve it. And yet today's part 23 makes that more difficult. By putting these technologies into the new and existing fleet, it's widely believed that the safety of light general aviation aircraft could see dramatic improvements.

We need to cut this red tape. It will create savings for sure, but, more importantly, it will save lives. This is a commonsense and important reform.

America's general aviation industry is not asking for a single handout, not one subsidy. It's simply asking for a streamlined set of regulations that will permit them to get their airplanes, their designs to market more quickly, and still doing so safely.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman LOBIONDO for their support, and my original cosponsors, Mr.

NOLAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. ROKITA, and all the folks of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on both sides of the aisle that have allowed this bill to get this far and make it to the floor.

I urge support of all of my colleagues this evening and hope we'll have a unanimous vote on behalf of this bill.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to thank Representative POMPEO for sponsoring this important legislation. And of course, thanks to our Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL and to both my Democratic and Republican colleagues on the committee for bringing this Small Aircraft Revitalization Act to the floor of the Congress in such an expeditious and bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, by streamlining and modernizing the rules and regulations that govern our small aircraft industry, we'll be encouraging the investment necessary to generate thousands of new American jobs.

□ 1715

What this legislation does, in effect, is put together a regulatory regime that will be specifically tailored for the small aircraft industry that will allow the industry to develop performance and outcome-based ways of achieving important safety standards. It allows them to put together consensus regulations that are developed by industry, government regulators, and private nonprofit associations, and enables the industry to unleash technologies of the future, creating jobs.

I'm so proud of Cirrus Aircraft in my district in Duluth, Minnesota. They've developed a parachute that is attached to the airplane and, like a skydiver, if the airplane stalls in the sky, you can pull a ripcord and parachute the plane down to safety.

These are the kinds of technologies that have the potential to be released through this legislation. What it does, in short, is enable the designers, engineers, manufacturers, creators, and skilled workers to release all their brilliance, creating the best, safest airplane technologies going forward into the future.

So I applaud the committee and my colleagues in Congress for bringing this forward in such an expeditious manner, and I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the 25th District of Texas, Representative ROGER WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the general aviation industry is a vital part of the economy in Texas' 25th District. Between the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport and Austin-Bergstrom Airport, there are dozens of smaller regional airports.

Passing H.R. 1848 is not only important to those in general aviation, it is vital. As my colleagues have mentioned, this industry includes nearly 600,000 pilots, employs 1.3 million people, and contributes approximately $150 billion annually to the U.S. economy. But because the current regulations are overly strict and dated, our economy and workforce is struggling.

General aviation fosters a robust workforce of engineers, manufacturers, maintenance professionals, and pilots, and it is within the FAA's power to ensure the success and sustainability of this important industry. They can do this by modernizing the regulatory requirements to improve safety, decrease cost, and set new standards for compliance in testing, just as H.R. 1848 requires.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a small businessman. I can tell you this is good for jobs, it's good for the economy, and, most importantly, it's good for America.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1848, the Small Airplane Revitalization Act of 2013. This bill improves safety, lowers costs, and stimulates private sector innovation, all while cutting red tape.

We need to do everything we can to keep our economy growing. For the last year and a half, representatives from the Federal Aviation Administration and the aviation industry have worked together to make recommendations for regulations that will keep us safe in the sky and grow our economy back on the ground. This bill adopts those recommendations.

I'm proud to stand with the bipartisan group of Congressmen who have helped bring this bill to the floor today, including Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NOLAN, and my cochair of the General Aviation Task Force, Mr. GRAVES. This bill follows in the tradition of the General Aviation Caucus in the House to work together in a bipartisan fashion. That's the way things should be done around here, and this bill is proof that good things can happen when Republicans and Democrats work together.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to reiterate that this bill is about good government, about creating a regulatory environment that improves safety at a fraction of the cost, and ultimately about helping to revitalize an American industry.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important legislation that will get the FAA out of the way for small aircraft owners and manufactures.

In my home state of Florida, general aviation is a booming industry. We have 130 public-use airports, nearly 52,000 pilots, and more than 25,000 general aviation aircraft. Southwest Florida, my home, is an especially popular area for small aircraft. Anyone flying into the Fort Myers airport, over the beautiful beaches and the big blue Gulf—can appreciate why so many retired Air Force and airline pilots move to Florida and continue to take to the skies.

Unfortunately, the burdens placed on small aircraft manufacturers and owners stop them from enjoying flying. When government bureaucrats become more focused on their own job security than the safety of pilots, it is time for a change. This important legislation will save pilots money and time while ensuring safety in our skies and it deserves your support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1848, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. POMPEO. 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.

DOUGLAS A. MUNRO COAST GUARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2611) to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building'', and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2611

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia shall be known and designated as the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2611.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, H.R. 2611, would designate the United States Coast Guard headquarters in Washington, D.C., as the Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building.

Douglas Munro was born in Vancouver, Canada, of American parents on October 11, 1919, and grew up in Washington State. He attended the Central Washington College of Education for a year and left to enlist in the United States Coast Guard in 1939. He served the country during World War II, rising to the rank of signalman first class.

Douglas Munro was killed in action at Guadalcanal on September 27, 1942, shielding 500 United States marines from enemy fire during an evacuation. He volunteered to head the boats for the evacuation, and he placed himself and his boats as cover for the last marine to leave. During this time, Douglas Munro was fatally wounded. Reportedly, he remained conscious long enough to say four words: ''Did they get off?''

Douglas Munro was awarded the Medal of Honor and the Purple Heart. The bravery and sacrifice of Douglas Munro saved hundreds of marines, and he should be honored and remembered. I think it's appropriate to ensure that he will always be remembered by naming the United States Coast Guard headquarters in his honor.

Therefore, I support the passage of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

The timing on this bill could not be more appropriate. Later this month, we will cut the ribbon for the new Coast Guard building, the first building the Coast Guard has ever owned.

Next month, Coast Guard employees will begin moving into the building located on the old Saint Elizabeths Hospital campus in southeast Washington, D.C. It is only fitting that the Coast Guard should be moving into a building named for one of their own, Signalman First Class Douglas Albert Munro. Signalman First Class Munro is the U.S. Coast Guard's only Medal of Honor recipient. The Coast Guard specifically requested that I write this bill in time for the opening of the Coast Guard headquarters.

I want to express my appreciation to my good friends on the other side for promptly passing this bill in committee last week and then seeing to it that it got to the floor this week.

Munro died heroically on Point Cruz, Guadalcanal, after succeeding in his volunteer assignment to evacuate a detachment of marines that had been overwhelmed by the enemy. Signalman First Class Munro had an outstanding record as an enlisted man and was promoted rapidly through the various ratings to a signalman first class. In addition to being a Medal of Honor recipient, Signalman First Class Munro was also posthumously awarded the Purple Heart Medal and was eligible for the American Defense Service Medal, the Asiatic-Pacific Area Campaign Medal, and the World War II Victory Medal. He, indeed, was a hero.

Signalman First Class Munro is an excellent example of the commitment to service and bravery that our men and women of the Coast Guard still provide today, much of it here at home. It is an honor to be the lead sponsor of this bill to name the building in honor of a true American hero.

The new Coast Guard headquarters building that would be named for Signalman First Class Douglas A. Munro will be a 1.1-million-square-foot building and will house up to 3,700 members of the U.S. Coast Guard and civilian employees. This building, which will be the first office building completed for the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation, will mark the first time that a Federal agency will be located east of the Anacostia River.

I believe Signalman First Class Douglas A. Munro's outstanding service to his country and his unique status as the only member of the U.S. Coast Guard to win the Medal of Honor ensures that it is particularly fitting to name the new U.S. Coast Guard headquarters the Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that we honor Signalman First Class Munro by naming a first class, extraordinary, state-of-the-art building after him. But in honoring Signalman First Class Munro, I think we also honor members of the Coast Guard. These are, to coin a cliche, real unsung heroes in our society. They are the men and women who save men and women and children every year right here in our country as part of their duties here. In a real sense, when we name this building for the only Medal of Honor winner, I think it will make Americans understand there are many heroes of the Coast Guard who also serve them every day of every year.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2611.

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. PETRI. 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.

AVAILABILITY OF PIPELINE SAFETY REGULATORY DOCUMENTS

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2576) to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2576

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

SECTION 1. AVAILABILITY OF PIPELINE SAFETY REGULATORY DOCUMENTS.

Section 60102(p) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''1 year'' and inserting ''3 years'';

(2) by striking ''guidance or''; and

(3) by striking '', on an Internet Web site''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1730

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. 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. 2576.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us, H.R. 2576. This bill is a correction of an unintended consequence of the bipartisan Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011. It is sponsored by Chairman DENHAM of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, along with full committee Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, and subcommittee Ranking Member BROWN.

Last Congress, section 24 of the Pipeline Safety Act included a good-faith provision intended to make the pipeline safety regulations and guidance of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials

Safety Administration, or PHMSA, more transparent. It did so by requiring any document or portion thereof incorporated by reference into the new regulations and guidance of PHMSA to be made available free of charge on the Internet. In so doing, however, an unintended consequence of this language was created that, contrary to the intent of Congress, has adversely impacted the ability of PHMSA to move forward with its regulatory agenda by placing practical barriers on PHMSA's ability to rely on the state-of-the-art technical standards written by standards developing organizations, referred to as SDOs. This bill simply corrects this unintended outcome and preserves the intellectual property rights of these organizations while still meeting the goals of a transparent government with free access to standards for noncommercial purposes.

Specifically, the bill allows for standards to be made free of charge but strikes ''on an Internet Web site,'' which allows PHMSA and SDOs more leeway to comply with the law. It also gives industry and PHMSA extra time to comply by making it effective 3 years from enactment instead of 1 year.

Finally, the bill limits the applicability of the provision to only pipeline safety organizations. I believe that this bipartisan technical correction will provide PHMSA with the flexibility needed to continue to fully leverage its partnership with standards developing organizations and save the government money by not requiring PHMSA to develop its own technical standards for rulemaking.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: I write concerning H.R. 2576, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be reported out of your Committee on July 10, 2013. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 2576 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is being done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, and the Committee will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and ask at a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2576 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R 2576, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be reported out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 10, 2013. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting floor consideration of this legislation.

I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this legislation, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction and will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H. R. 2576 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

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

On January 3, 2012, President Obama signed into law the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011. Section 24 of that act states that, effective January 3, 2013, the Secretary of Transportation may not issue ''guidance or a regulation that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public free of charge or on an Internet Web site.''

Then, in the last Congress, the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a number of hearings on pipeline safety, one of which highlighted a current regulation that required pipeline operators to develop and implement public education and awareness programs. The regulation did not explain what should be contained in the education programs, however. Instead, it pointed readers to an industry-developed standard. But in order to read the standard, you had to pay the drafters more than $1,000. If you're a small community, $1,000 is a lot of money for access to just one of many pipeline safety standards.

I and many of my colleagues have concerns about the Federal Government issuing a regulation that requires whoever wants to read it—particularly local communities, first responders, and private citizens—to have to purchase it from a private association. Fortunately, the 2011 act resolved this situation.

Following enactment of section 24, DOT held a public workshop and Webcast with more than 70 industry, safety, and government representatives present to discuss options for implementing the new law. Nearly 200 other entities participated in the Webcast. Additional comments were provided through the Federal Register notice, including by the Small Business Administration, which noted many concerns of small businesses with the continued use of incorporation by reference.

Since the workshop, several standards development organizations have agreed in writing to electronically post on the Internet all of the consensus standards that the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration incorporates by reference into the Federal pipeline safety regulations. Those include ASTM International, the Manufacturers Standardization Society, the Gas Technology Institute, NACE International, the National Fire Protection Association, the American Petroleum Institute, the American Gas Association. I will include their letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also will insert letters from the Pipeline Safety Trust, Dakota Rural Action, and Columbia law professor Peter Strauss expressing the need for public availability of the standards in the RECORD.

Unfortunately, some organizations have expressed concerns about posting their standards on the Internet. This has in turn held up progress of several important safety rulemakings that were mandated in the 2011 pipeline law. So in the spirit of bipartisanship, and not wanting to hold up the rulemaking process, I believe the law should be modified to provide DOT with additional time to implement it and with additional flexibility to determine how best to make the standards widely available to the public. I believe that, even with these changes that are in the law, the law will continue to address the transparency and openness concerns of the safety community.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2013.

Re incorporation by reference of voluntary consensus standards for pipeline safety regulations.

Mr. JAMES THOMAS,
President, ASTM International,
West Conshocken, PA.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: As you know, the practice of incorporating voluntary consensus standards allows pipeline operators to use the most current industry technologies, materials, and management practices available on today's market. New or updated standards often further innovation and increase the use of new technologies that improve the safety and operations of pipelines and pipeline facilities.

On January 3, 2012, President Obama signed into law the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–90) (the Act). Section 24 of the Act states that, effective January 3, 2013, PHMSA may not issue ''guidance or a regulation that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site.''

In support of Section 24 of the Act, we thank ASTM International (ASTM) for agreeing to electronically post on the Internet all ASTM consensus standards that PHMSA incorporates by reference into the

federal pipeline safety regulations after January 3, 2013. It has also agreed to post on the Internet any updated, revised, or new ASTM consensus standards that PHMSA proposes during rulemaking to incorporate by reference. While ASTM has discretion in how they accomplish this objective, it has agreed that, at a minimum, these voluntary consensus standards will be: Electronically posted on an Internet Web site; Available to the public; and Free of charge.

ASTM has agreed to notify PHMSA immediately if it is no longer able or capable of meeting the above minimum posting requirements. We request that you also notify us if any standards are removed from your electronic archives, if you have such an archives. The voluntary consensus standards developed by ASTM play a critical role in safeguarding pipeline safety, and PHMSA is tremendously appreciative of the constructive role ASTM is playing in ensuring their continued use in the federal pipeline safety regulations.

After you review the terms of this agreement, please sign below and return a copy to PHMSA. If you have questions, please contact Mike Israni at 202–366–4571.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. WIESE,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2013.

Re incorporation by reference of voluntary consensus standards for pipeline safety regulations.

Mr. ROBERT O'NEILL,
Executive Director, Manufacturers Standardization society,
Vienna, VA.

DEAR MR. O'NEILL: As you know, the practice of incorporating voluntary consensus standards allows pipeline operators to use the most current industry technologies, materials, and management practices available on today's market. New or updated standards often further innovation and increase the use of new technologies that improve the safety and operations of pipelines and pipeline facilities.

On January 3, 2012, President Obama signed into law the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–90) (the Act). Section 24 of the Act states that, effective January 3, 2013, PHMSA may not issue ''guidance or a regulation that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site.''

In support of Section 24 of the Act, we thank the Manufacturers Standardization Society (MSS) for agreeing to electronically post on the Internet all MSS consensus standards that PHMSA incorporates by reference into the federal pipeline safety regulations after January 3, 2013. It has also agreed to post on the Internet any updated, revised, or new MSS consensus standards that PHMSA proposes during rulemaking to incorporate by reference. While MSS has discretion in how they accomplish this objective, it has agreed that, at a minimum, these voluntary consensus standards will be: Electronically posted on an Internet Web site; Available to the public; and Free of charge.

MSS has agreed to notify PHMSA immediately if it is no longer able or capable of meeting the above minimum posting requirements. We request that you also notify us if any standards are removed from your electronic archives, if you have such an archives. The voluntary consensus standards developed by MSS play a critical role in safeguarding pipeline safety, and PHMSA is tremendously appreciative of the constructive role MSS is playing in ensuring their continued use in the federal pipeline safety regulations.

After you review the terms of this agreement, please sign below and return a copy to PHMSA. If you have questions, please contact Mike Israni at 202–366–4571.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. WIESE ,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2013.

Re incorporation by reference of voluntary consensus standards for pipeline safety regulations.

Mr. EDDIE JOHNSTON,
Managing Director, Gas Technology Institute,
Des Plaines, IL.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: As you know, the practice of incorporating voluntary consensus standards allows pipeline operators to use the most current industry technologies, materials, and management practices available on today's market. New or updated standards often further innovation and increase the use of new technologies that improve the safety and operations of pipelines and pipeline facilities.

On January 3, 2012, President Obama signed into law the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–90) (the Act). Section 24 of the Act states that, effective January 3, 2013, PHMSA may not issue ''guidance or a regulation that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site.''

In support of Section 24 of the Act, we thank the Gas Technology Institute (GT1) for agreeing to electronically post on the Internet all GTI consensus standards that PHMSA incorporates by reference into the federal pipeline safety regulations after January 3, 2013. It has also agreed to post on the Internet any updated, revised, or new GTI consensus standards that PHMSA proposes during rulemaking to incorporate by reference. While GTI has discretion in how they accomplish this objective, it has agreed that, at a minimum, these voluntary consensus standards will be: Electronically posted on an Internet Web site; Available to the public; and Free of charge.

GTI has agreed to notify PHMSA immediately if it is no longer able or capable of meeting the above minimum posting requirements. We request that you also notify us if any standards are removed from your electronic archives, if you have such an archives. The voluntary consensus standards developed by GTI play a critical role in safeguarding pipeline safety, and PHMSA is tremendously appreciative of the constructive role GTI is playing in ensuring their continued use in the federal pipeline safety regulations.

After you review the terms of this agreement, please sign below and return a copy to PHMSA. If you have questions, please contact Mike Israni at 202–366–4571.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. WIESE,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2013.

Re incorporation by reference of voluntary consensus standards for pipeline safety regulations.

Ms. HELENA SEELINGER,
Senior Director, NACE International,
Houston, TX.

DEAR MS. SEELINGER: As you know, the practice of incorporating voluntary consensus standards allows pipeline operators to use the most current industry technologies, materials, and management practices available on today's market. New or updated standards often further innovation and increase the use of new technologies that improve the safety and operations of pipelines and pipeline facilities.

On January 3, 2012, President Obama signed into law the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–90) (the Act). Section 24 of the Act states that, effective January 3, 2013, PHMSA may not issue ''guidance or a regulation that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site.''

In support of Section 24 of the Act, we thank NACE International (NACE) for agreeing to electronically post on the Internet all NACE consensus standards that PHMSA incorporates by reference into the federal pipeline safety regulations after January 3, 2013. It has also agreed to post on the Internet any updated, revised, or new NACE consensus standards that PHMSA proposes during rulemaking to incorporate by reference. While NACE has discretion in how they accomplish this objective, it has agreed that, at a minimum, these voluntary consensus standards will be: Electronically posted on an Internet Web site; Available to the public; and Free of charge.

NACE has agreed to notify PHMSA immediately if it is no longer able or capable of meeting the above minimum posting requirements. We request that you also notify us if any standards are removed from your electronic archives, if you have such an archives. The voluntary consensus standards developed by NACE play a critical role in safeguarding pipeline safety, and PHMSA is tremendously appreciative of the constructive role NACE is playing in ensuring their continued use in the federal pipeline safety regulations.

After you review the terms of this agreement, please sign below and return a copy to PHMSA. If you have questions, please contact Mike Israni at 202–366–4571.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. WEISE,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

NACE INTERNATIONAL,
THE CORROSION SOCIETY,
Houston, TX, March 13, 2013.

Mr. JEFFREY D. WIESE,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety, U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR JEFF: Thank you for your letter received on March 4, 2013, seeking agreement by NACE International on action to be taken in concurrence with the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (PL. 112–90), Section 24.

NACE International agrees with the action requested in the letter, with a proviso that PHMSA will notify NACE International prior to issuing proposed rulemaking that

references NACE standards. This proviso is made in response to the statement that NACE ''. . . has also agreed to post on the Internet any updated, revised, or new NACE consensus standards that PHMSA proposes during rulemaking . . .'' NACE has many standards available to NACE members, but publicly posts only standards that are referenced by PHMSA. To ensure that NACE proactively posts the NACE standards covered in our agreement, NACE personnel would need to know of their IBR status from PHMSA.

Jeff, thank you for your service to pipeline safety.

Kind regards,

HELENA SEELINGER,
Sr. Director, Membership Services, Public Affairs, & Standards.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2013.

Re incorporation by reference of voluntary consensus standards for pipeline safety regulations.

Mr. JAMES SHANNON,
President, National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA.

DEAR MR. SHANNON: As you know, the practice of incorporating voluntary consensus standards allows pipeline operators to use the most current industry technologies, materials, and management practices available on today's market. New or updated standards often further innovation and increase the use of new technologies that improve the safety and operations of pipelines and pipeline facilities.

On January 3, 2012, President Obama signed into law the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–90) (the Act). Section 24 of the Act states that, effective January 3, 2013, PHMSA may not issue ''guidance or a regulation that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site.''

In support of Section 24 of the Act, we thank the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) for agreeing to electronically post on the Internet all NFPA consensus standards that PHMSA incorporates by reference into the federal pipeline safety regulations after January 3, 2013. It has also agreed to post on the Internet any updated, revised, or new NFPA consensus standards that PHMSA proposes during rulemaking to incorporate by reference. While NFPA has discretion in how they accomplish this objective, it has agreed that, at a minimum, these voluntary consensus standards will be: Electronically posted on an Internet Web site; Available to the public; and Free of charge.

NFPA has agreed to notify PHMSA immediately if it is no longer able or capable of meeting the above minimum posting requirements. We request that you also notify us if any standards are removed from your electronic archives, if you have such an archives. The voluntary consensus standards developed by NFPA play a critical role in safeguarding pipeline safety, and PHMSA is tremendously appreciative of the constructive role NFPA is playing in ensuring their continued use in the federal pipeline safety regulations.

After you review the terms of this agreement, please sign below and return a copy to PHMSA. If you have questions, please contact Mike Israni at 202–366–4571.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. WIESE,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

ENERGY API,
STANDARDS DEPARTMENT,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2013.

Re incorporation by reference of voluntary consensus standards for pipeline safety regulations.

Mr. JEFFREY D. WIESE,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety, U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. WIESE: Thank you for your March 4, 2013 letter regarding incorporation by reference of voluntary consensus standards for pipeline safety regulations. As you know, API made the decision in the fall of 2010, well before the passage of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011, to place all of API's Government-cited and safety-standards on API's website for free public viewing. This site can be found at http://www.api.org/publications. It is our understanding that this action fully meets the intent of the Act.

It is API's policy to maintain this website and to include on this website any API consensus standards that PHMSA proposes during formal rulemaking to incorporate by reference into Federal regulations, to ensure that all users of the website have access to API's most up to date best industry practices.

Again, thank you for your letter of March 4, 2013, and please let me know if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

DAVID MILLER.
Director, Standards.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2013.

Re incorporation by reference of voluntary consensus standards for pipeline safety regulations.

Ms. CHRISTINA SAMES,
Vice President, Operations and Engineering, American Gas Association, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. SAMES: As you know, the practice of incorporating voluntary consensus standards allows pipeline operators to use the most current industry technologies, materials, and management practices available on today's market. New or updated standards often further innovation and increase the use of new technologies that improve the safety and operations of pipelines and pipeline facilities.

On January 3, 2012, President Obama signed into law the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–90) (the Act). Section 24 of the Act states that, effective January 3, 2013, PHMSA may not issue ''guidance or a regulation that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site.''

In support of Section 24 of the Act, we thank the American Gas Association (AGA) for agreeing to electronically post on the Internet all AGA consensus standards that PHMSA incorporates by reference into the federal pipeline safety regulations after January 3, 2013. It has also agreed to post on the Internet any updated, revised, or new AGA consensus standards that PHMSA proposes during rulemaking to incorporate by reference. While AGA has discretion in how they accomplish this objective, it has agreed that, at a minimum, these voluntary consensus standards will be: Electronically posted on an Internet Web site; Available to the public; and Free of charge.

AGA has agreed to notify PHMSA immediately if it is no longer able or capable of meeting the above minimum posting requirements. We request that you also notify us if any standards are removed from your electronic archives, if you have such an archives. The voluntary consensus standards developed by AGA play a critical role in safeguarding pipeline safety, and PHMSA is tremendously appreciative of the constructive role AGA is playing in ensuring their continued use in the federal pipeline safety regulations.

After you review the terms of this agreement, please sign below and return a copy to PliMSA. If you have questions, please contact Mike Israni at 202–366–4571.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. WIESE,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2576.

This bill represents a commonsense technical fix to section 24 of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011.

The changes made by H.R. 2576 will provide the Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration with the flexibility necessary to find a balanced solution between the use of standards incorporated by reference in its safety regulations and the need to increase transparency and access to those standards.

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 requires federal agencies to use voluntary consensus standards developed by the private sector as part of any federal regulation rather than allow the agencies to create their own government specific standards.

This law created a foundation for a public-private partnership that has been tremendously beneficial. It has saved the federal government money by drawing on the vast technical expertise of the private sector and by creating ''buy-in'' from the parties who will ultimately be regulated—increasing compliance and lessening the cost of enforcement.

While this partnership is extremely valuable and should not be weakened in anyway, it is also important that the public have access to these standards, especially if they are going make their way into a regulation.

I believe there is a middle ground to be found here. In fact, the Administrative Conference of the United States offers a number of recommendations that federal agencies should consider.

One such recommendation is that federal agencies should work with standards development organizations to make their copyrighted materials reasonably available to interested parties during the rulemaking process. This could be accomplished by posting a read-only copy of the standard online for a limited period of time.

The bottom line is DOT needs to find a path forward so that the safety of the nation's pipelines is not eroded and the most up-to-date standards are utilized. H.R. 2576 provides DOT with the flexibility to find that path. I urge my colleagues to support HR. 2576.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when I was Chair of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials, I held a number of hearings on pipeline safety, one of which highlighted an American Petroleum Institute-developed (API) standard which was incorporated by reference in a pipeline education and awareness regulation. But in order to comprehend the regulation, interested parties had to obtain the API standard, which cost more than $1,000. One thousand dollars is a lot of money, particularly for small communities, local emergency responders, and pipeline safety advocates, for just one of the many pipeline safety standards referenced in regulations issued by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA).

Fortunately, Congress resolved the situation in the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011. Section 24 of the Act prohibited the Secretary of Transportation, effective January 3, 2013, from issuing "guidance or a regulation that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site."

Since enactment of the legislation, all but one organization has agreed in writing to electronically post on the Internet all of their consensus standards that PHMSA incorporates by reference into the federal pipeline safety regulations, including:

ASTM International; The Manufacturers Standardization Society; The Gas Technology Institute; NACE International; The National Fire Protection Association; The American Petroleum Institute; The American Gas Association.

Many other organizations have submitted letters to PHMSA expressing the need for public availability of the standards. I ask unanimous consent that the letters from the Pipeline Safety Trust, Dakota Rural Action, and Columbia Law Professor Peter Strauss be included in today's RECORD.

One organization, however, has expressed concern about posting their standards on the Internet. This has, in turn, held up progress of several important safety rulemakings that were mandated in the 2011 pipeline law.

So in an effort to move these important rulemakings forward, I believe the law should be modified to provide DOT with additional time to implement it and with additional flexibility to determine how best to make the standards widely available to the public.

I believe that even with these changes the law will continue to address the transparency and openness concerns of the safety community.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2576.

PIPELINE SAFETY TRUST,
Bellingham, WA, July 15, 2013.

Hon. CORRINE BROWN,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Ms. Brown: We would like to thank the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee and the Energy & Commerce Committee for their efforts during the passage of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (the 2011 Act) to ensure that the public can actually freely read all the regulations that Congress mandates and that PHMSA then creates through the rulemaking process that could impact public safety and the health of the environment. A review of the Code of Federal Regulations under which PHMSA operates finds the following numbers of incorporated standards:

STANDARDS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE IN 49 CFR PARTS 192, 193, 195

(As of 6/9/2010)

CFR Part	Topic	Standards*
192	Natural and Other Gas	39
193	Liquefied Natural Gas	8
195	Hazardous Liquids	38
Total		85

*Note: Some standards may be incorporated by reference in more than one CFR Part.

Before passage of the Act most all of the 85 standards that had been incorporated into the rules had to be purchased if a member of the public wanted to know what the regulations required. PHMSA has estimated the cost to purchase a set of these standards to be between $8,500–$9,500.

The 2011 Act took the important step of ensuring public access to these standards by requiring that they be "made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site." This made good sense since web-based access is the most convenient and cost effective way for the government to share important information with the public.

Unfortunately, what was not fully realized at the time this provision was passed, was the financial difficulties it could pose to some of the standard developing organizations that have created a business model based on selling such standards back to the regulated industries and the public. This created an uncomfortable conflict between what was right in terms of public access and transparency, and how to continue to encourage private standards to be created and updated.

In the end all the standard developing organizations but one, ASME, found a way to meet the obligations of the Act. We thank these organizations for working hard to provide public access to their standards and the associated understanding and trust in the system. Unfortunately, to date ASME has been unwilling to move forward to provide transparency to their standards like all the other organizations have been willing to do. This refusal on ASME's part has caused many important pending rules to be potentially put on hold since they contain ASME standards, which PHMSA cannot make available without ASME's support and assistance. That brings us to where we are today, extending the implementation period for this important transparency issues from 1 to 3 years to allow PHMSA to release pending rules and find a way to make all these standards "available free of charge" to the public.

We hope that all the standard developing organizations that have designed ways to freely share their standards don't take this delay as a sign of a lack of commitment to this effort and remove their standards from public access. We also hope that ASME and PHMSA will continue their discussions to find a way to truly make these important parts of the federal regulations easily and freely available to the public.

We note that in H.R. 2576 the requirement that these standards be made available "on an Internet Web site" has been removed. This may not be a significant change as long as PHMSA fulfills the continuing Congressional intent that these standards be "made available to the public, free of charge." Clearly "free of charge" means exactly what it says, that a requester incurs no expense in obtaining any incorporated standard. In no way can the current PHMSA rule, as spelled out in 49 CFR 192. 7 and 195.3, of requiring people who want to review a standard to travel to the PHMSA office in Washington DC be considered "free of charge" at no cost to the requester.

Again, we thank you for your efforts to encourage public access and transparency regarding the regulations that are meant to protect their safety and the health of our shared environment.

Sincerely,

CARL WEIMER,
Executive Director.

DAKOTA RURAL ACTION,
WESTERN ORG. OF RESOURCE COUNCILS,
July 11, 2012.

Re Docket ID PHMSA–2012–0142: implementing incorporation by reference (IBR) requirements of section 24

We regretfully are not able to attend the public workshop on July 13 due to expenses of travel. We request that you consider these comments as you would comments submitted in person.

We the undersigned organizations are writing to urge you to oppose any weakening or repeal of Section 24 of H.R. 2845, the "Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty and Job Creation Act of 2011." Section 24 assures that future agency pipeline safety rules that incorporate standards by reference will require that those standards be made publically available for free on the Internet.

Western Organization of Resource Councils (WORC) is a regional network of seven grassroots community organizations with 10,000 members and 38 local chapters: including Dakota Rural Action in South Dakota, the Dakota Resource Council in North Dakota, and the Northern Plains Resource Council in Montana, which have members affected by the Keystone I pipeline and the proposed Keystone XL pipeline.

Dakota Rural Action is a grassroots family agriculture and conservation group that organizes South Dakotans to protect our family farmers and ranchers, natural resources and unique way of life. We are a member group of WORC and represent over 950 South Dakotans across the state. Many of our members in South Dakota have been directly impacted by numerous pipeline projects, with anticipation of more being constructed.

Representing the public interest, we strive to create a more fair and open government. Secret laws, or a government that only allows access to laws by a segment of the public able to pay for it, goes in direct opposition to the values of a participatory democracy. Congress has repeatedly recognized the need for public access to information with the Administrative Procedures Act, the Federal Register Act, the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act, the Electronic Freedom of Information Act, and, most recently, with Section 24 of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty and Job Creation Act of 2011.

As of June 2010 there were 85 standards referenced in 46 CFR 192, 193, 195. For a citizen to have access to these referenced standards they would have to pay private organizations upwards of $2,000. These associated costs are an insurmountable burden for an average citizen, making it practically impossible for the public to knowledgeably comment in a rulemaking proceeding, or to propose changes to regulations that already incorporate referenced standards.

There is no reasonable excuse for failing to provide standards and supporting information that are part of existing or proposed regulations implementing federal law at no charge to the public. The fact that these standards were developed by private associations of companies subject to the laws and regulations in question does not entitle the regulated industry or any private entity serving that industry to profit from exclusive access to information and language meant to protect public health and safety.

Anything short of full implementation of Section 24 of the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty and Job Creation Act of 2011 would amount to deliberate action by PHMSA to block public participation in our government, directly contradicting the principles and values of access and transparency of the Administration and expressed by Congress in enacting section 24.

MEREDITH REDLIN,
Chair, Dakota Rural Action.
LANA SANGMEISTER,
Chair, Western Organization of Resource Councils.

COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL,
New York, NY, July 12, 2012.

Re PHMSA workshop in incorporation by reference.

GENTLEFOLK: I appreciate the opportunity to file these comments in support of your workshop. If I may very briefly summarize their gist, there are three important propositions I would impress on you:

A sharp distinction should be drawn between Standards Development Organization (SDO) standards that are genuinely ''technical'' in character and those that, like the API standards on public hazard warnings, have a policy character that draws their force from normative conclusions, not technical expertise, and may serve to promote-industrial interests.

It is important to distinguish as well between SDOs that are professionally centered and broadly representative of the areas for which they develop standards, and those that, like API, are industrial associations or, like Underwriters Laboratories, businesses with an economic stake in the use of their standards beyond supporting standards development and publication—as by providing necessary testing or certification services.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, one should distinguish between standards that are converted into legal obligations by the fact of their incorporation, and standards that are simply identified in guidance or regulations as one means, but not the exclusive and necessary means, by which independently stated regulatory requirements can be met. While the statute your workshop is concerned with addresses guidance documents as well as legal obligations, the rationale for requiring free public access to the former is much weaker. Once agency action has made conformity to a standard mandatory, it is no longer a voluntary consensus standard. Law is not properly subject to copyright; but guidance is not law. Perhaps ways can be found to achieve the effect of guidance yet that will not require SDOs to surrender their understandable interest in finding financial support for their standards-development activities through the sale of copyright-protected standards serving that role, and thus remaining voluntary consensus standards.

The problem of incorporation by reference of standards development organization voluntary standards into federal regulatory materials has attracted significant attention in recent months. It was the subject of a major study by the Administrative Conference of the United States, resulting in recommendations drawing on an extensive study made by Emily Bremer, a staff attorney. Subsequently, on behalf of myself and others, I filed a petition for rulemaking on the subject with the Office of Federal Register. When OFR published this petition in the Federal Register with requests for comments, an FDMS docket of more than 160 items resulted. Subsequently, OMB held a workshop with NIST and sought commentary on possible revision of its circular A–119; an FDMS docket of more than 60 items resulted. A major new book thoroughly explores the practice of standard-setting, with emphasis on implications for international trade but attention as well to the ways in which American practice differs from that of European nations.

From all these materials, a number of propositions fairly clearly emerge:

The creation of voluntary consensus standards had its origin in considerations quite independent of governmental regulation, and they remain a necessary element of today's market economies, permitting market participants to deal confidently with one another. They are extremely valuable for this reason. This reality is dominant, and is independent of governmental use of standards for regulatory purposes. Indeed, it appears that the great bulk of voluntary consensus standards are not incorporated into law, as such, and for them no issue whatever of inhibition on copyright arises. To the extent SDO viability depends on the sale of these standards, it remains untroubled. The SDO commentary in the two FDMS dockets just mentioned consistently obscures this reality. It is written as if every standard SDOs produce is threatened by the proposition that those that are incorporated as law should be publicly available to those affected.

By influencing the markets for affected goods, those who participate in the setting of standards, may gain significant competitive advantages over those who do not. This is particularly true for non-consensus standards and for industry-centered, corporate-membership standards-generating organizations like the American Petroleum Institute, whose membership is more than 500 oil and natural gas companies. Industrial standard-setters like API may be contrasted to, say, ASME—which has 125,000 members and no corporate members—or the many other SDOs having tens of thousands of individual, professional members. For the latter, the issue of possibly gaining a competitive advantage is rarely present. It is more likely that the interests of small businesses that will need to adhere to the standards adopted will be represented and heard. Gaining competitive advantage may also be the result for an individual business, such as Underwriters Laboratories, whose testing and certifying subsidiaries may profit from the conversion of UL's preferred standards into legal obligations.

European standards organizations are typically organized along hierarchical lines, both national (the British Standards Institute) and European (CEN, CENELEC), so that on any given matter, only one standard will emerge. Their processes for generating standards involve wide participation by all interested groups—even to the extent that the participation of socially important but resource-poor groups may be subsidized. European technical standards are typically framed as independent of the regulations to which they relate, and are not in themselves legally binding. Since they only serve to define one assured method for establishing regulatory compliance, not an exclusive method, they merely create a presumption that one complying with them has complied with the substantive norms of the regulation. Although showing that one has met the standard is usually the more efficient path to demonstrating regulatory compliance, citizens remain free to prove their compliance in a different way.

The pattern of standard setting in the United States is ''decentralized and characterized by extensive competition among many standard-setting bodies, operating with little government oversight and no public financial support. . . . [It] comprises some 300 trade associations, 130 professional and scientific societies, 40 general membership organizations, and at least 150 consortia which together have set more than 50,000 standards. . . . Spurred by competition, these organizations have developed numerous standards of the highest technical quality, but the fragmentation also . . . results in conflicting standards and hence poor interoperability . . .

''The shift of rulemaking to the international level turns this fragmentation into a problem for the effectiveness of American interests in the global market place. Coordination and cooperation do not arise spontaneously among competing standard-setters, and . . . [there is] a long tradition of keeping government at arms' length. . . . In the absence of government control or any other central monitoring and coordinating agent, the American system for product standardization is characterized by extreme pluralism and contestation. . . . ANSI remains a weak institution, even though it formally is the sole representative of U.S. interests in international standards organizations. . . . Private U.S. standards organizations, which derive 50 to 80 percent of their income from the sale of their proprietary standards documents . . . fear that a more centralized system would rob them of these revenues and eclipse their power and autonomy. . . . ''Rather than reach out to community interests, as European standards organizations do ''as a prerequisite for genuine openness and due process. . . . most American standards organizations contend that willingness to pay is the best measure of interest in the process and see no need for financial assistance,'' and in some contexts the sum that must be paid—even by federal agencies wishing to participate—is quite high. Some American standard-setters, the American Petroleum Institute, for example, clearly present themselves as industry representatives. This is not too problematic for standards that serve only to govern technical issues important to relations among industrial participants needing a confident basis for their dealing. Yet acceptance of industry representatives as standard-setters is questionable in matters that are not technical in nature and also involve public interests, such as pipeline hazard warnings or impositions on small businesses who are the necessary customers of the industry.

Competition benefits the users of standards only if adherence to them is not mandatory. One way in which a standards organization can defeat its competitors under the American system, and obtain a monopoly over standards (and their sale) is by having them incorporated by reference, not as one means for regulatory compliance (as in Europe) but as binding law, that must be complied with and can result in sanctions if departed from. With that monopoly, too, the standards organization acquires the power to charge a non-market price. The legislation that is the subject of this hearing resulted from the exercise of just that power. One of the comments in response to our petition to the Office of Federal Register for rulemaking reports that another standards association was charging two-and-a-half times as much for a standard that had been incorporated as law, as for its subsequent standard on the same matter, that had not yet been substituted for the first by amendatory rulemaking. Over half the incorporated standards in CFR predate 1995. Since SDOs uniformly update their standards on a relatively short cycle, most if not all of these earlier, still incorporated standards will presumptively have been replaced by the issuing SDO. Yet, if they are still law, they remain mandatory. Sale of outdated but still compulsory standards may improve the SDO's

bottom line, but it cannot rationally be ascribed to the business model for sustaining fresh standards development.

Commercial advantage also inheres in standards generated by businesses that profit from compliance determinations. On the Comm2000 website where Underwriters Laboratories offers its standards for sale, its Standard for Manual Signaling Boxes for Fire Alarm Systems, 52 pages long in all, costs $502 in hard-copy and $402 for a use-restricted pdf version; $998 ($798) purchases a three year subscription that includes revisions, interpretations, etc. However, the text of this standard incorporates by reference five other UL standards, whose purchase would add five times these amounts (as each of these referenced standards is identically priced). And even this would not complete the picture; one of these five referenced standards (746C, Standard for Polymeric Materials—Use in Electrical Equipment Evaluations) itself references 27 unique others, whose individual prices are often hundreds of dollars higher—for a total cost well in excess of $10,000. Standards in the libraries of professional engineering SDOs are more likely to sell in the $50 range. Comments in the FDMS dockets tend to assert that all standards are sold at reasonable prices, without giving concrete details. Neither OFR nor the incorporating agency exercises control over the reasonableness of price at the moment of incorporation. And, once incorporation has occurred, any opportunity for price control by the OFR or the incorporating agency vanishes. Of course, if standards were treated merely as guidance, not law, market forces would operate as one control; and agencies could more freely remove a standard from its compliance guidance if persuaded its price had become unreasonable—either in general, or in its application to vulnerable small businesses.

This last point suggests the appropriateness of turning to what is arguably the most objectionable feature of the statute that is the subject of this workshop: it applies equally to standards treated as guidance identifying a satisfactory but not mandatory means of complying with an independently stated regulatory obligation, and to standards incorporated in a manner that makes them the law itself—mandatory obligations in and of themselves. In my judgment, these two situations are quite different, both in law and in their implications for agency efficiency and effective regulation.

SDO standards converted into law—a mandatory obligation—by the manner of their incorporation suffer all the possible deficits mentioned above

They end the competition among American voluntary consensus standard-setters that is identified by many as a particular strength of our system in relation to others.

Correspondingly, they confer monopoly pricing power on the SDO whose standard has been converted from a voluntary consensus standard into an involuntary, mandatory obligation.

They significantly limit agency capacity to respond to new developments, since changing a mandatory standard set by rule will require fresh rulemaking, with its procedural costs and obstacles. That this occurs in practice may be seen in the simple fact that over half of incorporated standards are more than seventeen years old—some, indeed, no longer ''available'' in any form, reasonably or not.

The income streams resulting from law-forced purchases of mandatory but outdated standards may be convenient for the SDOs receiving them, but bear no relationship either to sound industrial practice (adherence to the contemporary standard should be preferable) or to the SDO business model for supporting the continuing development of standards.

Law is not subject to copyright. The Copyright Office knows this; it has been hornbook American law from the inception. The arguments here are most eloquently made in the FDMS docket comments of the ABA Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice, and would be tedious to repeat at length. Moreover, this proposition is wholly independent of the policy concerns SDOs raise to argue that it should not be the case. It simply is the case and the consequence is that if an agency has converted a voluntary consensus standard into a legal obligation, it cannot fail to inform the public what is its legal obligation. (SDOs should perhaps for this reason resist agencies' conversion of voluntary standards into legal obligations; and the question whether the agency must compensate the SDO for doing so is an open one. Some argue that the benefit to the SDO from the imprimatur of incorporation will exceed any detriment to its bottom line—incorporations typically involves only part of the standard involved, and most businesses will wish to purchase the standards in their full, convenient form. Moreover, incorporated standards make up only a fraction of an SDO's armamentarium.) When Minnesota enacted the Uniform Commercial Code, the ALI (its drafter) retained its copyright for purposes of selling the UCC as such, but Minnesota was obliged to make its new code public, and was not obliged to pay ALI when it did so.

When an agency proposes incorporation by reference that will create legal obligations, it is strongly arguable that it must at that time make the standard proposed to be incorporated available to commenters in the rulemaking process. Contemporary administrative law caselaw and Executive Order 12,866 each impose transparency standards more demanding than might appear from the simple text of 5 U.S.C. §553. One cannot comment on a standard whose content is unknown. As the Pipeline Safety Trust observed in its FDMS comments, ''incorporating standards by reference, the way it is done now, has turned notice and comment rulemaking into a caricature of what it was intended to be.''

Since agency guidance of means by which one might successfully comply with independently stated regulatory obligations is not law, an agency's identification of a standard as one such means leaves interested parties an option whether to refer to the standard or not. It creates no legal obligation to reveal the contents of the standard used as guidance, and the SDO' s copyright is secure. It is of course also possible that there will be other identifiable means of regulatory compliance—the reputed strength of the American SDO process—so that recognition of the SDO's copyright in relation to the guidance given creates no monopoly power.

Use of standards as guidance also permits ready upgrading of the guidance as soon as standards are revised; the troubling problem of outdated standards enduring as legal obligations (because fresh rulemaking has not been undertaken) need not arise.

It is, then, regrettable that the statute you are discussing draws no distinction between incorporation by reference as mandatory obligation, and its use to provide guidance. The most useful result of your workshop, in my judgment, would be to push hard for the recognition of this distinction—by interpretation of your statutory obligations, if that seems possible, or by working for amendment. But I can find no fault with, and much reason to support, the obligation PHMSA has been placed under to assure free public access, both at the stage of proposal and at the stage of adoption, to standards whose incorporation by reference is used to create legal obligations. The effect of that use of incorporation is to transfer lawmaking into private hands that operate in secret; and ''delegations of public power to private hands [undermine] the capacity to govern.''

Respectfully submitted,

PETER L. STRAUSS,
Betts Professor of Law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2576.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 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. HULTGREN) 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. 2576, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 1848, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 2611, by the yeas and nays.

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

AVAILABILITY OF PIPELINE SAFETY REGULATORY DOCUMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2576) to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes, 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 Wisconsin (Mr.

PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

YEAS—405

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

NAYS—2

Dingell
Shea-Porter

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
Buchanan
Campbell
Clay
DeFazio
Deutch
Engel
Fudge
Green, Al
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kingston
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rohrabacher
Smith (MO)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1858

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

Messrs. PASTOR of Arizona, DESANTIS, WOODALL, and HUIZENGA of Michigan 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.

SMALL AIRPLANE REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1848) to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

YEAS—411

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
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 (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Buchanan
Campbell
Clay
DeFazio
Deutch
Engel
Fudge
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Kelly (IL)
Kingston
Luetkemeyer
Marino
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rohrabacher
Smith (MO)
Wasserman Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1905

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOUGLAS A. MUNRO COAST GUARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2611) to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building'', and for other purposes, 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 Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) 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 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

YEAS—411

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

NOT VOTING—22

Buchanan
Campbell
Clay
Crawford
DeFazio
Deutch
Engel
Fudge
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Kelly (IL)
Kingston
Luetkemeyer
Marino
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Rohrabacher
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1914

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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1962

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) from H.R. 1962.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2359

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of Mr. BISHOP of Utah removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2359.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2319

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 2319.

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

There was no objection.

ARMANDO TORRES

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a marine who desperately needs our help. Corporal Armando Torres was kidnapped in Mexico more than 2 months ago. Minimal attention here in the U.S. and in Mexico has allowed Armando's kidnappers to think that we've given up. They are wrong. The United States does not give up and does not leave one of our own behind. The kidnapping of a United States citizen and a marine will not be tolerated. Armando served our country honorably, and now it is our duty to serve him well now.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the bond between marines can never be broken. In the coming days, marines here in the House will come together on this floor for their brother. I invite all Members to join us and show that we will not rest until we bring Armando home.

RECOGNIZING WATERVLIET ARSENAL ON ITS 200TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Watervliet Arsenal, which celebrated its 200th anniversary on July 14.

Watervliet is the Nation's oldest, continuously operated arsenal, having begun its manufacturing of military hardware during the War of 1812.

For 200 years, the arsenal has produced critical weapons, parts and material that have been indispensable to our Nation's defense. Earlier this year, the Secretary of the Army recognized the arsenal's high quality and essential work by designating it as a Center of Industrial and Technological Excellence.

The Army's Benet Laboratories, renowned for its research and development and work with advanced materials and composites, is also located at the facility. Let me offer a special congratulations to the arsenal's employees, who, despite senseless sequestration-related furloughs, continue to provide manufacturing, engineering, and quality assurance for our Nation's cannons and mortars. They have developed skills and expertise over the course of decades, many coming from families that have worked at the arsenal for generations, pouring their talents into this powerful success story. They are truly the lifeblood of the Watervliet community and the Greater Capital Region of upstate New York.

AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will debate H.R. 2667, the Authority for Mandate Delay Act. This bill will delay enforcement of the ObamaCare mandate—employers with 50 full-time employees who do not offer government-approved coverage must pay a $2,000 fine annually for an employee. On July 2, the administration announced a delay. And while their authority to unilaterally change the law is questionable, the mandate remains a problem.

Earlier today, an employer in Pennsylvania told me that in order to address compliance costs, the employer would opt to close 1 day a week. This is not rhetoric.

In May of 2012, 71 Fortune 100 companies responded to a House Ways and Means survey. They estimated savings up to $28.6 billion in 2014 by eliminating coverage for their 5.9 million employees, paying the $2,000 annual fine. This would impact more than 10.2 million employees and dependents.

It appears that the administration has begun to understand that the employer mandate provides a perverse incentive for companies to drop their employees from health plans that are otherwise working.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2667.

ERIC ''WITH'' HOLDER—FAST AND FURIOUS—AND ANOTHER VICTIM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at a House Judiciary hearing, Eric ''With'' Holder, the Attorney General, admitted to me that more people were going to die because of Operation Fast and Furious. That's the Justice Department and ATF gunrunning scheme that sent hundreds of U.S. automatic weapons to criminal drug cartels in Mexico.

Recently, Mexican Police Chief Lucio Rosales Astorga of Hostotipaquillo, Mexico, was ambushed and gunned down by assassins as he was driving his son to school. His wife and two bodyguards were also shot. The automatic weapon used to shoot him was a Fast and Furious gun smuggled to Mexico by the U.S. Government. Reportedly, over 200 Mexican nationals have been killed by Fast and Furious weapons.

American guns are at the side of these puddles of blood. Chief Astorga's son will be fatherless because of this government's recklessness. Meanwhile, Attorney General Eric ''With'' Holder keeps stonewalling justice and withholding information on this gunrunning scheme.

Mr. Speaker, somebody needs to go to jail. And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING MRS. VIOLET B. HANNA ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my sincerest congratulations and happy birthday wishes to Mrs. Violet B. Hanna, who will be celebrating her 100th birthday on July 23.

Born in Los Angeles on July 23, 1913, to Albert Wogatzke and Ella Bussjaeger, Violet is the oldest daughter of nine children. She married William Hanna on August 6, 1936. She lovingly raised a family of two children, has seven grandchildren, and six great-grandchildren. She has enjoyed wonderful health all of her life. She was raised on a farm, was a straight A student, and was so devoted to family that after graduating from high school, she gave up a full scholarship to Occidental College to start working in L.A. to support the rest of her family in Imperial Valley.

Violet has witnessed momentous changes in our Nation's history. Her life reflects a contribution to that history. I hope her century of memories brings much pride and joy to herself and family members.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Violet on this remarkable milestone. I wish her a special day shared in the company of her family and friends, and all the best in the years ahead.

AMERICAN ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this week in history we celebrate the achievement of Neil Armstrong's Moon landing in 1969, a shining example of American innovation and perseverance.

In conquering space, America sent a message to the world that we can achieve any task that we set our mind to. Today, 40 years later, we as Americans face similar challenges, not on the

surface of the Moon, but around our Nation. Our generation is tasked with recapturing the American spirit that put a man on the Moon by saying ''yes'' to American ingenuity in the 21st century. In that vein, Mr. Speaker, we as lawmakers must enact legislation that makes that goal a reality—things like enacting commonsense laws like the Made in America Act, which fosters a new era for American manufacturing and protects American jobs, or, once and for all, declaring energy independence for our Nation.

Now is our moment to honor the accomplishment and legacy of the Moon landing by ensuring continued success and independence of America for generations to come.

TRAYVON MARTIN

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. As a mother and an American, I am well aware that this Nation is a nation of laws. And our system of justice speaks, and the reason why we are a democracy is because we adhere to that. But I'm proud of my constituents and others in Houston, Texas, who saw the need to petition and to be able to join the family of Trayvon Martin in praying to petition their Federal Government. That is America, Mr. Speaker—that all Americans have a right to come and petition their government.

Thank you for being peaceful. Thank you for being prayerful. Thank you for being ready to speak in tones seeking justice, but doing it in a way that is respectful of our system, and ready to be able to achieve what your desires are through continuing to pray and be peaceful. In Houston, Texas, that is what occurred. And I want to say thank you for that peace and that respect of the dignity and democracy that America is, and the respect for Trayvon Martin's family.

TRAYVON MARTIN

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Trayvon Martin, a young constituent of mine that lived only blocks away from me, was brutally murdered in Sanford, Florida.

I know within my heart and will always know that things should have been different. But I accept the law. I was one of the loudest voices calling for a fair trial for Trayvon after he was profiled racially. He was followed, he was harassed, and he was shot in the heart.

On Sunday, in Miami-Dade County, all of the churches held prayer services. All of the churches prayed for the Martin and Fulton families. All of us are so saddened because we have lost our son, our son Trayvon, who was only 16 years old. He had only been 17 for 2 weeks.

God bless our justice system, that they will see that it should not end here. We must make sure that justice prevails for Trayvon Martin.

□ 1930

WE ALL ARE ONE

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am a mother of five biological children and of 23 wonderful foster children. My heart is broken, as my colleague's heart is broken, over any teenager whose life is taken away from them.

But I believe without a shadow of a doubt that it doesn't matter the color of a person's skin in the United States when it comes to justice. Lady Justice has a blindfold over her eyes because justice is colorblind. Justice shouldn't look at the color of our skin or our ethnicity or our financial background.

Facts have to be recognized as facts. Law has to be recognized as law. No matter if we are White or Black or Hispanic or Asian, whatever our background, justice must be served. That's why we need to stand up and stand up for justice in this country, not have justice that is separate for Blacks or separate for Hispanics or separate for Whites. We all need to be one under our law.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we are here to talk about something that is a rather important subject. Immigration has helped make us the greatest Nation in the world, and we want that to continue. We do not ever want our borders closed; we want them secured.

Here to help in this conversation is my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), to whom I yield such time as he may consume.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I believe the problem is simple: we need to secure our borders first. You wouldn't replace your carpet at home if you still had a hole in the roof.

When you take that position, the question you are usually asked by people who support open borders is: Well, what do you want to do about the 11 million people who are here illegally?

I usually answer that question with another question: What do you want to do with the 22 million Americans who couldn't find work this morning when they woke up? What do you want to do about the legal immigrants who came to America for an opportunity, with the opportunity that America promises for those who come here for a better life? What do you want to do about the high school dropout who has to wash dishes and may lose their job? Where do they go? What do you want to do about the single mom who works three jobs just to put food on the table so she could feed her family? What happens to her?

Why when we talk about immigration reform is it always about the 11 million illegal immigrants who came here knowingly breaking America's laws? What about the legal Americans? What about the American workers? Where is their voice in this debate? Who's speaking for them?

When it comes down to immigration reform, I believe the answer is simple: let's secure America's borders first and protect America's workers.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania's comments.

It is interesting, and it really is heartbreaking, when you see so many people, like all of the masses that were here in Washington, to protest over the ObamaCare bill. Anyway, it is rather dramatic. The unions are now coming out. Of course union leaders were all for ObamaCare. Many of us said back at the time: Do you know what, when the union members find out what the union leaders have done to them in supporting ObamaCare, they are going to be exceedingly upset.

Now when you look at the results of ObamaCare forcing so many people to part-time work—as my friend from Pennsylvania was alluding to, people now have been relegated to part-time work—they may lose that. When you combine the devastation of ObamaCare and people that are losing their jobs and are being forced to part-time work and now having to do more than one part-time job with less benefits, and then you add on it the Senate bill, especially for African Americans here, it is absolutely devastating. It is a devastating one-two punch to the gut of America when you look at the Senate bill and how many Americans will be really troubled to find employment.

We have other people that are here that also wish to be heard. I yield such time as he may consume to my friend from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I want to thank my friend, LOUIE GOHMERT—Judge Gohmert—for having this hour together speaking on this important subject. My friend also is my neighbor. Our districts neighbor one another.

We have constituents who see this issue, I think, very consistently, that is, that when we poll them, when we talk to our constituents, they are very clear on the issue of immigration. They say first and foremost, Congressman FLEMING, whatever you do, do what Congress and the Presidents have not been willing to do, and that is secure the border and put internal security in that will prevent the visa overstays that are 40 percent of those.

We have two lingering questions on the whole issue of immigration:

One is, is immigration good for America? I would suggest to you that immigration has been good for America. All of our Forefathers, they were immigrants. They came here with the idea that they would receive religious liberty, they would receive opportunity when it comes to the economy, and they were quite willing and happy to contribute to that.

But do you know what, there was no safety net. You had to dig it out of the land yourself. Over the years, particularly by the mid-60s, this Nation began to develop a very, very steep safety net program, now 80 different welfare programs.

This has been looked at very closely by the Heritage Foundation. What they tell us is that by having open borders, such as what we have now and will have in the future if we were to pass something like the Senate amnesty bill, that the cost to Americans would go up. One study I recently read said that for every household that receives amnesty, it is going to cost the hardworking taxpayers of America $12,433.

So I would suggest to you that immigration can be a good thing for the economy—not open-border immigration, not illegal immigration, but legal immigration. What do I mean by that? That means that we allow a guest-worker program where people can come in and work our farms, work our trees. I have a lot of that in my district. But also the high end, the STEM workers—the scientists, technology people, engineering, math—where they can contribute so much to our country. Physicians coming from Asia, so many of those can do many good things.

The other thing is trust. We have a trust deficit in this country right now. I've spoken about it before. We have the Dodd-Frank Act, which is barely implemented even after 3 years. Much of it probably will never be implemented. We have ObamaCare, which is about 3 years old. Much of it can't be implemented. We have a President who couldn't get Cap and Trade passed, so he's trying to pass regulations to do that. We have a President who couldn't get the DREAM Act passed, so he rolled out a regulation to make it occur as an end run around Congress. We have a President who has tried to convert the NLRB from a very balanced board to really manage labor unions and their relationship with management to a very pro-union political tool for government.

So when we have a situation like that, what we really have is a President that picks and chooses the laws that he wants to enforce and he wants to obey and he wants to acknowledge and ignore the rest. By passing all of these massive comprehensive bills that Senators and Members of Congress don't even read before they are passed, all we are doing is offering a smorgasbord to the President that he can pluck just the parts that he wants, and he could add some more if he chooses to do that.

Well, that makes him no longer a President. That makes him a ruler, and that is not the kind of government we have. We have a balance between three branches of government. That's the way our Founding Fathers determined it to be, and that's the way it should be today.

I join my colleagues, I think, in this understanding, and that is that such legislation that passes from this House, or from the Senate for that matter, if in fact it creates an open border, a porous border, or in any way creates amnesty or a pathway to citizenship and we have not dealt with and certified, made verifiable borders that are under secure control by our government, a sovereign government, and that we handle the visa overstay problems that we monitor and protect from that, if we have not done that, then we have not done our constitutional duties as Members of the House of Representatives.

I thank my friend so much. And my other friends—we are filled with Members here who are ready to talk on this issue passionately—I think you are going to hear a lot more from this group that's here tonight as we talk more about this issue.

I would just say, lastly, that we need to decide what is important for America first. We should determine what is good for the American citizens and the taxpayers. We certainly want to handle anybody who is here illegally in a humane way; but on the other hand, our first and most important responsibility is to the American citizens who are hardworking taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that it is not in order to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I appreciate very much my friend from Louisiana. We do border at our State lines there. We can be just the best of friends and never worry about somebody being moved into the other person's district for redistricting purposes. But I appreciate so much the perspective. As a person who spent his professional life and his training all geared toward helping others, administering to others, and addressing their needs, I appreciate that perspective of an excellent physician here.

At this time, I would also like to yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for pulling this together and for yielding.

I recognize the admonishment from the Speaker. I don't think, though, that we are constrained from raising objection when the President of the United States willfully violates his oath of office. It is not a personality issue; it is a constitutional issue.

I would direct, Mr. Speaker, the attention to article II, section 3, in the United States Constitution that says that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

I have pointed out to folks of less education than anybody in this room that that doesn't mean you execute the law in a fashion you give it the death penalty. What it really means instead is that you carry it out, you enforce the law.

I know that the President has taken an oath to do that, and he understands it. He gave a speech at a high school here in Washington, D.C. on March 28, 2011. When they asked him: Why don't you enact the DREAM Act by executive order, he said: I know you want me to do that, but I don't have the constitutional authority to do that. You've been studying the Constitution in high school and you know this: that the legislature, that's Congress, passes the laws; the President's job in the executive branch is to enforce the laws, and the judicial branch is to interpret the laws.

Well, that is pretty clean and concise, and it is appropriate to be coming from a former adjunct professor of law at the University of Chicago; but he forgot his own lesson, and he forgot his own lesson a number of times, not only with immigration, but No Child Left Behind—waived it. It is just a directive from the United States Congress signed by a previous President, and he waived No Child Left Behind.

How about welfare-to-work, that long battle that lasted about 2 years here and resulted in who-knows-how-many vetoes by Bill Clinton, but he finally signed it. There was not room in there for the President to waive the work side of welfare, but he did it anyway.

□ 1945

When it comes to the immigration law, the directive there is that, when law enforcement encounters people who are unlawfully present in the United States, they are compelled to place them in removal proceedings. They shall be placed. That's the law. It doesn't say ''may.'' We have had to now mount litigation against the President of the United States, in the name now of Janet Napolitano, to compel him by pleading to the court to keep his own oath of office.

All of this is about expanding the dependency class in America. This is about making government bigger. It is about what the end result is—higher taxes. It's about borrowing more money from the Chinese and the Saudis to run our government. The President got to the point where he didn't like his own law, ObamaCare, and announced in this pretty-hard-to-figure-out way—I wasn't actually watching the Web site of the second in command of the U.S. Treasurer when the announcement came out—that we're going to extend ObamaCare and the mandate on employers by another year. He has no constitutional authority to do that either. The ObamaCare legislation says that the employer mandate shall be enacted each month after December 31, 2013. It doesn't say ''may.'' It says ''shall.'' The only way

the President gets any of this authority that I've mentioned is by coming back to Congress and asking us to approve it.

Now, when you see the rule of law undermined, Mr. Speaker, and when you see that the lines between article I, the legislative branch, and article II, the executive branch, are willfully blurred by the President of the United States, it eventually brings out a constitutional crisis. In the middle of all this constitutional crisis, we have, according to the people who want to grant amnesty, 11 million people who are unlawfully present in the United States. The law refers to them as ''illegal aliens.'' The President has said, I will not enforce the law against them unless they have committed a felony or three mysterious misdemeanors.

They have pushed legislation in the United States Senate that says, really, this: other than those exceptions that I've mentioned—those who have committed felonies and have been caught at it, and I suppose if they would admit to it that would be another category in which they'd be disqualified—and other than those who have committed those mysterious misdemeanors, setting that aside, everybody who came to America before December 31, 2011, gets legalized, however they got here. Of course, especially if they arrived here illegally and if they overstayed their visas, they get legalized under the Senate Gang of Eight bill. Then, for those who would arrive after December 31, 2011, there is an implied promise that they have as much moral standing as the people who would receive the amnesty in the act of the law, so the implication powerfully is they also would receive their amnesty in their due time.

So that is the definition, Mr. Speaker, of perpetual amnesty—amnesty that goes on forever. We are still working on restoring the rule of law since Ronald Reagan's 1986 amnesty act. We are working to restore it. If this Gang of Eight bill is passed or if legalization passes this Congress, what that says is all of those years of seeking to restore immigration law after the '86 amnesty act are all wasted. All of that labor, all of that effort, all of that preaching on principle and going back to the constitutional core is all wasted if we legalize people here. It's also retroactive amnesty. Anybody who is here or anybody who could ever get here, other than those exceptions that I mentioned, gets the path to citizenship. Whether you make it one more step or one less step, it's the same thing. It's a path to citizenship.

''Amnesty.'' We should understand what it is. To grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and to reward them with the objective of their violations. That's ''amnesty.'' I will debate anyone at any time on amnesty. I'm ready to do that any time myself, and I've defined ''amnesty'' for a long time. The American people understand what it is even if they don't articulate it exactly the way that I suggested.

Not only is it perpetual amnesty for anybody who is here and for anybody who would come here, it's also retroactive amnesty, which means, of those folks who were deported in the past, the bill actually sends an invitation through the language in the law that says we didn't really mean it. We really didn't mean it. It's retroactive. Why don't you reapply and come to the United States. We'll put you in the same path as those other folks who jumped in ahead of the line and violated the law—committed the crime of crossing the border if they crossed it illegally or overstayed their visas—committed a violation of a civil misdemeanor, which is still serious. Then of those who worked here, most all of them, if they were unlawfully present in the United States and if they lawfully could not work in the United States, committed document fraud in order to pull that off. The bill also grants amnesty for those who committed document fraud, and it grants amnesty for those who knowingly and willfully hired people who are unlawfully present in the United States and legally can't work. That's the situation we're dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with the destruction of the rule of law at least with regard to immigration law. If we can't reconstruct respect for the rule of law in the years since 1986, how in the world would anybody think we could reconstruct the rule of law in the years since 2013? How could anybody think that because they want enforcement in the future that they have to sacrifice the rule of law today? How could they think that sacrificing the rule of law today doesn't mean that you've sacrificed the rule of law for the duration of the life of this Nation at least with regard to immigration? If you can make the argument that the rule of law can be set aside forever with regard to immigration, how then do you make the argument that there isn't some other sector of the law that has as much merit as those folks whom they're trying to get legalized now?

There isn't anybody under the bill in the Senate or under the amnesty provisions that have been proposed here in the House who isn't going to be put in front of the line of those people who are in a foreign country politely and respectfully waiting their turns. There are at least 5 million people in various visa categories who have respected American law, and they're waiting in their home countries for the opportunity to come into the United States. We need to respect them. We need to respect the millions of legal immigrants who have followed the law to come into the United States lawfully and to follow the path of citizenship lawfully.

I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of just last Friday when I was invited to speak before the State convention of the American Legion. They held it in Sioux City, Iowa. I was privileged to be there, and I gave a speech and talked about history and patriotism and those things that one would in that scenario. At the conclusion of this speech, I presented the medals to an American veteran who had not received the medals that he had earned. The certifications were not in order, and we had put those certifications back in order and had acquired all of his medals that he had had coming. We put them on a framework, and I presented them to this man. The man's name is—it's in the press in Sioux City now, I'm sure—Raul Macias.

He came into the United States from Mexico at age 22. He married an American and was nationalized as an American citizen. He joined the Army at age 31 and was deployed over into Germany as a cold warrior when we were lined up against the Soviet Union. At one point, he wandered across the border into East Germany and was picked up by those folks wearing those uniforms. Thankfully, they released him and let him come back. He served our country, and he served our country proudly and honorably.

After all of the words that I said on Friday and after I presented him the medals, I also presented him the microphone and said, This is your opportunity to speak. He said three words in his acceptance speech: ''Thank you, America.''

That's a man who did it the right way—the kind of people we need to respect by the millions in this country who did it the right way.

It's no respect to them if we destroy the rule of law. Legalization is destruction of the rule of law, and legalization is a path to citizenship. We must preserve, protect, defend, restore, and refurbish the rule of law with our immigration policy in the House. We are the last stop. We are the defense. We are the redoubt for the rule of law right here. I'm glad to count a lot of people in this Congress my friends. I'm glad to count those who stand for the rule of law as my closest friends.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I appreciate those observations so much, and it brings to mind our colleague from down in central Texas who is also a former district judge. He and I share that, but he was a district judge twice as long as I was.

So many people say, Well, you've got to have compassion. Despite the allegations from friends on the other side, we have compassionate Republicans, and our hearts break for people. For one thing, there are all of those people who are out of work who really want to work now, and we haven't created that environment—through ObamaCare, through the welfare state, through the problems with not respecting and adhering to the law when it comes to securing the border. The government has the obligation, from both a Biblical perspective and a secular perspective, of enforcing the law and of making sure the people within its boundaries

are protected who are lawfully there. That is the obligation.

Sometimes defendants would come before me as they'd come before Judge CARTER, from central Texas, during his days on the bench. They'd know you were a Christian, and they'd bring a big Bible and try to play on your senses—well, you've got to have compassion. I've got a big Bible here, and God has worked in my life, so now don't sentence me harshly. Judge CARTER had one gentleman come before him who said, Judge, I know you're a Christian, so you've got to have forgiveness, and you've got to forgive me. Judge CARTER replied, Sir, individually, I do forgive you, but the State of Texas sentences you to 20 years in prison.

There is a difference. Individually, you can have that compassion and should, but when you're acting as the government, people expect you to have respect for the law, adherence to the law, so that there is a country in which people can come and feel safe, at least reasonably so, and understand that the law is going to be applied across the board.

We have also been joined by our friend from Alabama. I am proud to have had him join Congress back 2½ years ago in the great sweep, so I yield to my friend Mr. BROOKS from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Thank you, Mr. GOHMERT.

I have a firm belief that, if the people understand the truth, then they'll make the right decision. There have been a number of arguments advanced by the other side on this immigration–illegal alien debate that are misleading at best, and I'm going to touch on a couple of them with your permission.

First and foremost, there is the argument advanced that our economy is going to do better, and, hence, Americans will do better. Half of that is right. Bear in mind that the Senate Gang of Eight bill legalizes, at a minimum, 11 million illegal aliens who are now present in the United States of America. Also bear in mind that, over the next decade, according to the Department of Homeland Security report, the Senate Gang of Eight bill will bring into America lawfully, roughly, 33 million foreigners who are not here presently. Now put those numbers together—11 million legalized plus 33 million to come in lawfully. That totals 44 million lawful workers added to the American workforce. That is out of 144 million total number of people who are employed in the United States economy, according to the June—last month—of 2013 Bureau of Labor Statistics.

If you look at these numbers—if you bring in 44 million people—of course America's gross national product and gross domestic product are going to increase, but the misleading part of it is this: that does not necessarily translate into a higher standard of living for Americans and foreigners who are lawfully in America. Let me explain.

The key is not the total GNP or GDP for our country. The key is the total GNP and GDP per capita. If our gross domestic product goes up a little bit but the population goes up a great amount, then we, individually—American families, individually—are now living under lower economic conditions. Stated differently, our standard of living has declined; and, in that vein, rather than just making an argument, I want to share some data that buttresses that argument.

The Congressional Budget Office, which has been rather kind in my judgment to its evaluation of the Senate Gang of Eight legislation, issued a report called ''The Economic Impact of S. 744.''

□ 2000

This report was issued just last month in June of 2013. I'm going to quote for the record parts of that report:

> S. 744 would lower per capita gross national product by seven-tenths of 1 percent in 2023.

So over the next 10-year period of time, rather than our GNP growing per capita and America doing better individually, it declines under this bill. It's not just stagnant, the kind of stagnation that we have suffered for the last 5 or 6 years or so. There is a decline in GNP per capita, which means that the amount of money each American household has to spend to take care of their daily needs goes down because of the Senate Gang of Eight bill, because it is both legalizing and admitting into our country a total of 44 million foreigners who are going to be seeking jobs that Americans already have or that Americans want.

Further in the report:

> Average wages for the entire labor force would be one-tenth of 1 percent lower in 2023'' because of Senate bill 744. By 2016, just 3 years from now, that would be four-tenths of a percent lower, where our wages again are going down.

Also notably, in another admission, S. 744 will ''slightly raise the unemployment rate through 2020.''

So not only do we have a suppression because of this amnesty, because of this open-borders nature of the Senate Gang of Eight bill of individual incomes, we also have more Americans who are unemployed, according to the Congressional Budget Office

I think that their numbers, quite frankly, are rather kind to the Gang of Eight bill. I think it's going to be much worse. In that vein, let me share some other data points. According to The Heritage Foundation report that was issued a few months ago:

> Unlawful immigration appears to depress the wages of low-skill U.S. born and lawful immigrant workers by 10 percent, or $2,300 per year. Unlawful immigration also drives many our most vulnerable U.S. foreign workers out of the labor force entirely.

That's a big number, a drop in wages of $2,300 per year for low-skill American born and lawful immigrant workers.

Here's another study, a 2009 study by the Pew Hispanic Center that concluded that there were 7.8 million illegal aliens who were holding jobs in America. Okay? Stated differently, that's 7.8 million job opportunities that Americans have lost. Why? Well, quite frankly, because illegal aliens are often willing to work under the table, get paid under the table; because illegal aliens are often willing to work for less than Americans are; quite frankly, because illegal aliens are often willing to look the other way with respect to the worker safety laws that we have imposed in order to protect our American workers from bodily harm. There were 7.8 million job opportunities that were lost. The Federation for American Immigration Reform thinks that number is low. They have it at 8.5 million job opportunities lost to American citizens, and that's today before the Gang of Eight bill gets implemented.

Harvard professor George Borjas found in a study released in April of 2013, again just a few months ago:

> Illegal immigration reduces the wage of native workers by an estimated $99- to $118 billion a year.

Let me read that again:

> Illegal immigration reduces the wage of native workers by an estimated $99- to $118 billion per year and generates a gain for businesses and other users of immigrants of $107- to $128 billion per year.

Is it any wonder the United States Chamber of Commerce is spending millions of dollars to try to induce America to go with the Gang of Eight bill that will legalize 11 million foreigners and add another 33 million foreigners over the next decade? They see profits coming from this increase in the size of the workforce, which in turn will decrease the wages that they pay not only to illegal aliens, but also to lawful immigrants, and also to American citizens. So that's where the United States Chamber of Commerce is coming from. They certainly have a financial interest.

Now I want to emphasize something. We should not be debating bringing in these mass numbers of foreigners into the American workforce in this kind of context. America currently suffers a 7.6 percent unemployment rate. Asian Americans suffer a 5 percent unemployment rate. White Americans suffer a 6.6 percent unemployment rate. Even worse, Hispanic Americans suffer a 9.1 percent unemployment rate. Even worse, African Americans suffer a 13.7 percent unemployment rate. And even worse, American teenagers suffer a 24 percent unemployment rate.

Does it make sense to anybody that when we have unemployment in so many different segments of our economy so high that we should legalize another 11 million workers and bring in an additional 33 million workers over the next decade to compete for jobs when Americans are having such a difficult time in this economy not only getting jobs, but getting quality jobs?

That having been said, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it is a myth that the

economy is going to become better because of this large importation and legalization of immigrants. Sure, America's GDP will go up, but that's not the issue. The issue is whether the quality of life for individual Americans goes up, and under this legislation, virtually every study I have seen, in fact, says that it goes down. That's one of the reasons why we have to stop this.

I've got one other myth that I would like to talk about. The whole premise of this immigration law debate is that the laws need dramatic changing, they aren't working. I would submit that that's not the case at all. The problem is not so much with our immigration laws. Sure, there's some tweaking that can be done in order to make sure that we admit into our country those individuals who have particular skill sets or educational levels or wealth that will enhance our economy. Sure, we can do that kind of tweaking. But it's a myth to say that we have 11 million illegal aliens in America because of our laws. That's not the case at all. We have 11 million illegal aliens in America, quite frankly, because the White House, the executive branch of our government, has absolutely refused to enforce the laws that are on the books. And I'm not talking about just this administration. I'm talking about 20 years of neglect by the White House and the executive branch.

Let me share some numbers with you on that point, and then I'll defer back to my good colleague, Mr. GOHMERT.

In 2011, the number of Border Patrol returns plus illegal aliens deported by court order was 715,495 individuals. That's an important point to note. Okay?

You've heard the myth that this administration deports more than any administration in history, or words to that effect. That's kind of true, but it's misleading because that's only half of the number that you need to look at. It's not just the deportations by order that you look at. It is also how many times has our Border Patrol caught individuals and returned them. So in 2011, we have roughly 715,000 Border Patrol returns plus deported by court order.

Let's go back to 2008, the last President before the current President. During that year, you put those two numbers together, and it was 1.1 million that the Border Patrol returned plus deported by court order. That's a big number—64 percent more returned than in 2011, the most recent year for which I have information.

A decade ago, it was again 1.1 million Border Patrol returns plus deported by court order—62 percent more than this administration in 2011. In 1993, two decades ago, 1,285,952 illegal aliens were returned pursuant to Border Patrol returns or deported by court order—80 percent more than in 2011. In 1983, it was 950,000—33 percent more than 2011. In 1973, four decades ago, it was 585,000. And in 1963, it was 77,000 Border Patrol returns plus deported by court order. And I want to note something about the gap between 1963 and 1973. You'll remember these welfare programs that got passed as a part of the Great Society program where America started paying foreigners to come into our country where they start accessing welfare benefits? I would submit that that is a huge incentive for why these individuals have come to America who previously would not have come here under illegal terms. But because we've got laws in place that pay and incentivize illegals to come here, that is, in fact, a major reason why they're here.

Nonetheless, the myth that the laws are the problem, is not it. It's a lack of enforcement of the laws on hand. And the myth that this administration has been really good at returning illegals, that's true only if you look at half of the problem. If you look at the whole problem, then, quite frankly, this administration in 2011 was doing far worse than previous administrations have done or as has been done in 2003, one decade ago, two decades ago, three decades ago, and four decades ago.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. Those were really amazing numbers that you provided, and we'll talk about those further.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield to my friend from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for such time as she may consume.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Representative LOUIS GOHMERT, and I also thank my colleagues who preceded me and all the marvelous comments they have given: Mr. BROOKS from Alabama and the statistics that he has just given and all the other stories.

I look at the context of this issue, Mr. Speaker, and the issue of dealing with the whole strata of illegal immigration. What are we talking about? There are so many aspects. One of those aspects, of course, is the issue of why in the world isn't America's border secure today? This is something that is incomprehensible to the American people because there is something that the American people should demand and that they have a right to expect, and it is that their country has a secure border at every level. Not only just at the point of entry, but for people who come into the United States on a lawful, legal visa. The American people have a right to expect that those people also will stay for the time that we have granted those people and that they will not overstay.

The one thing that we've learned, Mr. Speaker, is that 40 percent of the problem of illegal immigration, 40 percent—4 out of 10—people are overstaying their visas. That included some of the terrorists that were involved in the 9/11 bombing. That's why this is so important.

We aren't talking just about an academic exercise, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about a national security issue. We're also talking about an economic security issue. Because for those of us who are here on the floor this evening having this conversation, we were elected by the American people. We were elected by American citizens who have the privilege to vote in this country. We are elected by Americans, and we are here representing the interests of American citizens. And it is American citizens, Mr. Speaker, who have the obligation to pay for all of the programs that we fund here in this Chamber because our Constitution provides that all of the spending begins right here in the House of Representatives.

Spending is something we're pretty good at. We spend a lot in this House. As a matter of fact, it wasn't too long ago I was sworn in. I took the oath of office right here in this Chamber, and America was $8.67 trillion in debt, Mr. Speaker, on that January in 2007 when I took my oath of office.

We were horrified. How were we ever going to pay off $8.67 trillion in debt? 2007. Today that number has been running, and officially, according to our Treasury Department, it is something under $17 trillion. But that's kind of unusual because that number has actually stayed exactly the same, according our Treasury Department, for about 56 days running.

□ 2015

Of course we know that isn't true. We overspend by billions of dollars every day. The number is actually something pretty close to $17 trillion. So let's think about that: $8.67 trillion and, today, $17 trillion in debt. Why do I bring that up? Who cares about these numbers? They're so big, we can't even comprehend them. Well, I care. I'm a mother. I have five great children and 23 foster children, and parents across America are scared to death about the kind of America their children will inherit, because any fair-minded person realizes you can't spend more money than you take in, otherwise you go to the poor house and you declare bankruptcy. And we don't want our children in that position where they declare bankruptcy.

Maybe that explains part of the reason why we have 22 million people in this country today who are looking for full-time work, and they can't find it. Twenty-two million people looking for full-time work, and what are we doing here in Congress? The Senate can't wait to give amnesty to illegal aliens, so we'll have a minimum of 11 million immediately who'd have legalization status in this country; and we would have, as Mr. BROOKS said, up to 44 million people before long in this country.

So now what are those 22 million Americans supposed to do? Mr. Speaker, I say it is America first, and the interests of the American people first. The American people need jobs. They deserve jobs. It's Americans first that we need to think about. So we have unemployed. We have a terrible debt that's growing, and we have less than anemic economic growth.

One thing Mr. BROOKS mentioned, when President Obama took office in 2008, the average household income was somewhere around $55,000 a year. It was shocking to learn after 4 years in office, the average household is now looking at something like $50,000 a year. That's a tremendous loss in income for the average American. As Mr. BROOKS told us earlier, Mr. Speaker, about $1,300 a year is attributable in lost income strictly because wages are depressed because illegal aliens are working for less than the American people.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it's the American people first. It is American wages first. It is American benefit packages first. What in the world are we doing, Mr. Speaker, if we aren't thinking about how we can create more jobs for the American people first. And higher wages for the American people first. And more benefits for the American people first.

Why did the President 2 weeks ago have to unilaterally have a press conference, or release a press statement—that's apparently the way he governs these days—and say that his employer mandate for big businesses will have to be delayed a year? Why did he have to do that? Because he knows it simply doesn't work.

And yet if we have legalization for illegal aliens in the United States, we will see that very quickly we will have literally tens of millions of new people who'll have access to all of these benefits because it's not cheap, you see. Amnesty costs a fortune, you see. Because this year alone, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at $54 billion a year. Do illegal aliens pay taxes? Yes, they do. They pay sales taxes, gas taxes, various forms of taxes. But when you take what illegal aliens are paying into the U.S. Treasury versus the benefits that they take out, that means that American citizens have to cough up an extra $56 billion a year. It is a net drawdown on the U.S. Treasury. You see, it has consequences, Mr. Speaker, not only for the Treasury but for the American people, for my children, for Representative GOHMERT's children, and I dare say for your children as well, Mr. Speaker.

This is something we have to realize, that by year 13 of the bill that's already being considered in the United States Senate, it won't be $56 billion a year that illegal aliens are costing the U.S. Treasury. It will be over $100 billion a year. And when those illegal aliens come into retirement age, because you see the average age of an illegal alien is 34 years of age with less than a 10th grade education, by the time those illegal aliens come into their retirement years, it's not $56 billion a year that it will cost the taxpayers. It is adjusted for inflation, $150 billion a year because we're talking very expensive retirement packages.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, at the worst possible time when baby boomers like myself are getting to the point of drawing down the Social Security benefits that we earned and the Medicare benefits that we earned and accessing whether it's ObamaCare or the 80-other means-tested welfare programs, at the worst possible time, Mr. Speaker, this Chamber is looking at adding over 40 million new illegal aliens into the system to redistribute wealth from American citizens who worked hard and earned that money, to redistribute it to illegal aliens that we have given legalization status so that they can have Social Security and Medicare and ObamaCare and 80 different means-tested welfare programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you this: When we go from $8.6 trillion in debt to nearly $17 trillion in debt, we've doubled it in about 6, 7 years' time, and then you add in 40-some million new illegal aliens, you up the benefit package from ObamaCare, all while we're seeing increased levels of unemployment, we're seeing lower rates of increases in GDP, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how compassionate is that to American children that are born in this country? How compassionate is it when their wages have gone, the average household, has gone from $55,000 down to $50,000? How compassionate will it be, Mr. Speaker, when our children can't even afford to have a savings account anymore because they're scraping by and their wages are lowered and their benefits are lowered and the jobs are fewer and inflation is going sky high? How is that compassionate?

Because, you see, I remember, Mr. Speaker, that my parents left me a country that was better than the one that they inherited from their parents. And my grandparents, Mr. Speaker, inherited a better country than my great grandparents left for them, and so on and so forth going back in time.

You see, I can't fathom, Mr. Speaker, nor can I fathom that Mr. GOHMERT also would do anything that would leave less than a better country for the next generation because, you see, that's what this is about. We were sent here by the American people to be about America first and, Mr. Speaker, about our children first, and whether this America that they inherit will be a better America.

And that's why this discussion that Mr. GOHMERT brought to the country tonight is so vitally important, and we can't stand by and watch our country change forever and watch our children shortchanged. And so I'm going to yield back to the gentleman from Texas because he has profoundly put in front of the American people the issue that will structurally change our country forever. You see, Mr. Speaker, there's no going back once we go down this road. And I know I've heard the gentleman from Texas speak on this many times so eloquently. I thank the gentleman for all he has done.

Mr. GOHMERT. Those are wonderful points, and it brings back to mind what someone has said before. The example of being on an airplane, the instruction we're all given when you get on an airplane is if there's a loss of cabin pressure, you lose oxygen, then you must put your own mask on before you help others. Let's face it, America is struggling right now in a number of ways, but particularly economically. This is the worst recovery from any recession we've ever had, the longest, the poorest recovery from any recession. We're still struggling, having millions and millions of Americans out of work; and it's not because of a lack of compassion that we say we need to follow the law, we need to respect the law. It is out of respect for the rule of law, for this country. We're in a position as government, we have got to make sure that we follow our oath, that we do the best we can to make this country as strong as possible because we know there is no other country in the world that has as many people wanting to come visit or live in this country. This is number one in the world for people wanting to come visit or live.

But if we do not keep it viable, keep it strong, get the mask on, get the oxygen flowing again, get the patient strong again, then this is not going to be a place that others in the world are going to want to flee to as a refuge. It is very critical what we do here.

My friend from Minnesota brings up the point about taxes being paid. Congress some years back passed—and there are a couple of different kinds of child tax credits where actually if you're an American that's authorized to file income tax and you have a Social Security number, then you can claim those child tax credits. So we have people who are getting more money back because of the tax credit than they actually paid in, and Congress made clear you have to have a Social Security number in order to do that. But as I understand it, there were some people at the IRS who in between line dancing sessions had determined that, you know what, there's a lot of money out there by people who don't have Social Security numbers that if we got them to pay taxes, even though they're not legally here, if we got them to pay taxes, think about all the extra money that'll flow into the Treasury.

So why don't we, as a regulatory body, and we know Congress didn't authorize it, but why don't we just give them a tax ID number, even if they're illegally here, so they can be paying in all of the taxes to help the country. And an analysis earlier this year by different groups indicated that we may be, because the IRS authorized people to pay taxes into the system with tax ID numbers rather than Social Security numbers, we're probably paying out between $1 billion and $4 billion to people who are claiming child tax credits that are not authorized to claim those because they're illegally here.

We had newspaper reporters go out, people in the media, go out and do their own investigations and find a house here or a house there where a whole bunch of different people are

claiming that they live and that children are living there by the scores that aren't actually living there. And so it comes back and raises the issue, like Mr. BROOKS was pointing out and my friend, Mrs. BACHMANN, was pointing out that it doesn't necessarily follow that just because you give people legal status, all of a sudden you're going to be flooded with new tax dollars coming in.

I also want to point out there's this issue that keeps coming up about compassion. There is no more compassionate people in the world than the American people as a group. You'll find individuals extremely compassionate around the world. I've been in places where I'm deeply moved by how wonderful they are; but as a Nation of people, this is the most compassionate Nation in the history of the world. And individually, people in this Nation have done more to assist those suffering around the world, and it would seem to be the healthiest thing to do as a Nation, to make sure there is respect for our law, adherence to our important laws, and then make the country healthy.

Capital, we know—money, that is—investment money comes in. It flows, as the saying goes, capital is a coward. It flows into countries where it feels the safest. Make this country a strong country again economically so then we are able to go, as so many churches have, to Latin American countries, to countries around the world, and reach in and help them not by giving them a fish, as the old adage goes, but by teaching them to fish and providing them a means to have food and to make a living. That's a compassionate kind of thing.

There is no reason that Mexico should not be one of the top 10 or even top five economies in the world; and if we were the proper kind of neighbor, we would lure the hardest working Mexicans into America. We would help them have a strong, vibrant economy. But that will never happen until they have respect for and adherence to the law, and that means ending corruption. So it is critically important we live up to our oaths here. Some of us have even paid parking tickets we didn't owe because we had a Park policeman that didn't know the law.

□ 2030

It doesn't matter. The law is important to respect and to follow, and we cannot become a healthy Nation until we have that out of the Government of the United States.

We have a couple of minutes left, and I'd like to yield to my friend, Mrs. BACHMANN, to finish our time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I wanted to add on to the child care tax credits that you were speaking of.

There's also another redistribution of wealth item in the Tax Code. It's called the earned income tax credit. It's one of the largest redistribution of wealth programs that we have in the United States. We give away to people who are virtually paying no taxes under the Income Tax Code, income taxes, $70 billion a year. So people who aren't paying into the system now for income tax, they're receiving $70 billion a year. The estimate is that, after amnesty, once we grant amnesty to illegal aliens, we'll raise that to $80 billion a year. So we're going to increase the cost.

So what we're seeing happening, by granting amnesty to illegal aliens, we're importing a group of individuals who are tax consumers, revenue consumers out of the Treasury. And one thing that we need in this country are more people who are paying into the system, not people who are taking out of the system.

But bottom line, we need to have a country where America comes first, where the American people know that our borders are secured, that our laws will be upheld, and that the American people will come first.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2668, FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2667, AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY ACT

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–157) on the resolution (H. Res. 300) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2668) to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2667) to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). 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 to discuss this evening jobs, putting Americans back to work, building our foundation for economic growth.

For many, many days now, in fact, for more than 2 years, the Democrats in the House have been discussing a project which we call Make It In America. These are strategies that we're putting forth to develop more jobs in America, to rebuild our manufacturing industry, and to bring wealth back to the United States.

I would love to comment on the issues that I've heard earlier with just my colleagues on immigration, but I'll let that go. I would just say one thing. The last comment that was made about the earned income tax credit, I would remind my colleagues that that was a Ronald Reagan program. Take that for what you might.

Back to Make It In America. These are the basic issues. We talk about trade policy, fair trade policy, not giving away our opportunities; tax policy, to encourage manufacturing and jobs here in United States; energy policy, how we're going to renew our energy system, become energy independent, the role of clean fuels, the role of renewable fuels and gas; the labor market, education.

Perhaps the most important of all of these is a well-educated workforce. If we have that, many of these other issues would fall into place—the role of research in creating tomorrow's economy, tomorrow's businesses, the things that need to be made in the future.

But tonight we want to talk about, not the least on this, it just happens to be the lowest on this list, and that is infrastructure. It's one of those critical investments. It's the foundation upon which the economy grows or not. If we have a solid infrastructure—transportation systems, water systems, sanitation systems, communication systems, research facilities, educational facilities, that's all part of the infrastructure. Some of it is private; much of it is public investment. But this is one of the fundamental investments, along with these other issues here, that our economy has traditionally made over the years. And unfortunately, in the current situation, we seem to be falling off the power curve that created the foundation for the American economy upon which to grow.

So today, we're going to really focus on this infrastructure issue, not a new issue. Actually, George Washington, I think he was our first President, told his Cabinet Secretary, Treasury Secretary, to develop a plan to grow the economy, called, A Plan for Manufactures.

Alexander Hamilton came back to Washington with a plan. One of the many points that he raised and suggestions that Alexander Hamilton made was to create infrastructure. He said the Federal Government ought to build canals, ports, and roads, fundamental infrastructure upon which the American economy would grow. And those things were done right back at the very beginning of this country. So from the very earliest days, the Federal Government has been involved in building infrastructure.

Now, tonight, joining me are two of my colleagues, Mr. DELANEY from the great State of Maryland and Mr. CASTRO from Texas. They're going to talk about infrastructure. And I'd like now to turn to Mr. DELANEY, who has a proposal that, actually, the President of the United States suggested in his American Jobs Act program, a program that he put forth more than a year ago

that the Republican Congress has done nothing with. So Mr. DELANEY has picked up one of the suggestions that the President made, made it whole, and has presented legislation on an infrastructure bank.

Mr. DELANEY, please join us and tell us about how the infrastructure bank would work and what it would do for America.

Mr. DELANEY. I will do that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing us this time this evening.

And I want to thank my good friend and colleague from California for organizing our discussion here this evening and his work on Make It In America. It's important work, and it's work we, as a Congress, should be focused on.

I think my colleague from California knows that I'm very passionate about the infrastructure investments that we need to be making as a country. I, quite frankly, believe it's our number one domestic economic policy challenge and opportunity, and I say that for three reasons:

First, it is the easiest way to get Americans back to work with jobs that have a good standard of living, which should be one of our main focuses as a Congress.

Second, making a smart and significant investment in our infrastructure, in our road and transportation infrastructure, in our logistics, in our communications and in our energy and water infrastructure, making a smart and significant investment in this infrastructure will improve the overall competitiveness of the United States, which is the number one thing we should be focused on when we think about our future in the context of a global and technology-enabled world.

The third reason I favor infrastructure investments is because they pencil out; in other words, the data overwhelmingly suggests that an investment in infrastructure has a very, very good payback to the economy.

Just to put the infrastructure situation in this country in context, I want to cite a recent report done by the American Society of Civil Engineers; and they do a survey of our infrastructure every 2 years. The report recently came out and they provided us a grade. They actually grade each component of our infrastructure. Our cumulative grade as a country—and remember, this is the wealthiest, most successful country in the history of the world. Our cumulative grade for our infrastructure was a D-plus. And the civil engineers estimate that we have to make an investment of at least $2 trillion to $3 trillion to bring our infrastructure up to a grade that we deem successful—$2 trillion to $3 trillion.

In addition, there's an argument that the existing investments we make in infrastructure, even if they were to be increased, the programs that we have, the very, very important infrastructure programs we have as a country, like investing or making sure the highway trust fund is funded at the level that's appropriate and consistent with historical averages, even if we were to make these investments, which I clearly believe we should and I know my colleague from California believes we should, there's still a very strong argument, or the data would suggest, that we will continue to accumulate an infrastructure gap. In other words, the amount that we need to invest in our infrastructure to make us competitive will continue to grow. And so this is a very, very significant problem.

And to put this problem in further context, we need to remember that infrastructure is services and investments for the common good. They're public services, and they're historically made by governments, the Federal Government, the State governments and local governments.

And we all know that governments are under fiscal pressure right now. Both our Federal Government and our local governments are under pressure. So we need, as we think about investing in our infrastructure, to not just be funding the existing programs that we have up to the levels that they deserve to be funded at—and that should be a main priority of this Congress—but we also need to be thinking about new and creative and fiscally sensitive and sustainable ways of investing in our infrastructure across the long term.

Our infrastructure problem is a multidimensional problem, meaning there's lots of reasons we have this problem, so we need numerous tools to solve the problem. And one of those tools, I think, exists in legislation that's been filed that we led—it was filed several weeks ago in the Congress—that right now has 18 Republican and 18 Democratic cosponsors, so it's truly bipartisan legislation. We also have 25 groups that have supported the legislation, outside groups representing both parties typically in the terms of their orientation.

The Partnership to Build America Act creates the American infrastructure fund, which is designed to be a large-scale infrastructure financing capability that can finance many of the projects my colleague from California will talk about tonight, Mr. Speaker. But what's important about the American infrastructure fund is it's funded without any appropriations from the government. Instead, it's funded by providing corporations with an incentive to invest.

Under the Partnership to Build America Act, the American infrastructure fund is capitalized with $50 billion of capital. The capital comes from the fund selling bonds that are not guaranteed by the Federal Government. They are long-term, 50-year, and they pay a 1 percent interest rate, so they're very attractive, low-cost capital that, if put into the American infrastructure fund, will allow it to provide $750 billion of loan guarantees to local governments and direct loans, if necessary, to local governments—$750 billion of funding capacity.

Over a 50-year life, we expect that money to turn two to three times, and so that could be up to $2 trillion of financing without any appropriations from the Federal Government. The $50 billion that capitalizes the American infrastructure fund comes from selling these bonds not guaranteed by the Federal Government, 50-year bonds, 1 percent interest.

As an incentive to get companies to buy these bonds, we're proposing that they get a tax break on their ability to repatriate their overseas earnings.

We've all talked about the issue we have with our Tax Code and how it's created a situation where U.S. corporations are accumulating significant amounts of cash overseas. Under the American infrastructure fund, they have a way of bringing back up to 10 percent of that capital in a way that we know will create American jobs by investing in our infrastructure.

So we put forth the American infrastructure fund as a solution to the problems that my colleague from California is discussing, as an innovative financing solution to deal with the infrastructure problems that this country has, and to do it in a way that's additive to the existing programs that exist and can be done in a way that is fiscally responsible in light of the fiscal pressures that the country has.

So this is some of the work that we've been doing in our office to advance that important work that my friend from California is talking about this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DELANEY, that is a fascinating way of bringing capital to this program. California has numerous high-technology companies, Apple and many, many others. All of them come to us, representatives from California, and they complain about the repatriation. They'd like to bring those earnings from overseas back to the United States. They've got maybe $1 trillion sitting out there, if I recall the number. Maybe that's about—I don't know. Whatever the number is, a lot of dollars. They want to bring it back, but they don't want to pay the 35 percent corporate tax.

So you're suggesting that they could bring that back in a way that they wouldn't face that tax, but the money that came back would be—at least a portion of it would be used to finance this infrastructure bank.

Have I got this pretty much correct here?

Mr. DELANEY. That's right. And the estimates are up to almost $2 trillion of cash.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I understated it. Two trillion dollars sitting offshore.

Mr. DELANEY. Two trillion dollars. And that reflects a significant problem with our Tax Code, which we'll reserve for another session for discussion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That's this thing called taxes, number 2 up here.

Mr. DELANEY. Exactly, which is a long discussion.

But under the Partnership to Build America Act, the American infrastructure fund is capitalized by selling $50

billion of bonds, and we sell them to corporations; and they're not guaranteed by the Federal Government, so there's no taxpayer risk. For every dollar of those bonds the company buys, they can bring back a certain amount of their overseas earnings. We estimate that to be 4 to 1, but it's actually determined by an auction that will be done by the fund.

So if $50 billion of bonds are subscribed to by some of the companies in your State, some of the companies in my State, Maryland—because the district I represent, part of the district I represent, Montgomery County, Maryland, has the 270 transportation corridor that is filled with information technology companies and biotechnology companies very similar to the kind of companies that are in your district, so some of them may be from Maryland as well.

□ 2045

But if they buy $50 billion of bonds, then they can bring back $200 billion from overseas tax free.

The bonds, again, are nonguaranteed by the government, 50-year, 1 percent interest. So they're not an attractive investment. The ability to bring back that money tax free is the incentive for them to do it. They get to bring back money and invest it in our economy. We get $50 billion to capitalize a fund that could provide $2 trillion, provide the capital base to provide $2 trillion of financing over 50 years without any cost to the taxpayer.

So I think you summarized it perfectly.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think you did. I was trying to grasp the totality of it. It is a process in which now this is a piece of legislation; it's here in the House. I would hope that our colleagues on the Republican side that control the passage of legislation, even the taking up of legislation in committee, would look at this and go, oh, you mean we can actually build $200 million or $2 trillion of infrastructure over a 50-year period without any appropriation, with no taxpayer dollars, other than some amount that's foregone in the repatriation.

Very interesting, a very, very exciting proposal; and I would hope we take it up.

I am sure that there will be questions about, well, who gets the money, who decides which projects are going to be selected.

Mr. DELANEY. Right. Under our legislation, the States make the determination. The American Infrastructure Fund has to develop an allocation process that every State has an allocation based on their economic science.

Mr. GARAMENDI. California being the most populous State——

Mr. DELANEY. You would have the largest allocation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Oh, I like that already.

Mr. DELANEY. Yes, I knew you would enjoy that feature of the legislation.

But in all seriousness, we have good bipartisan support. I have 20 of my Republican colleagues on the bill with 20 Democratic colleagues; 18 are on it officially right now. We have received very constructive feedback from all of my colleagues. They have all worked to make the legislation better. We are looking forward to continue to build good bipartisan support. I think we both know that when the private sector and government work well together on economic challenges we get very good economic outcomes.

I want to thank you for giving me this time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. DELANEY, thank you very, very much. Obviously, Maryland is very well represented with some innovative thinking from their Representatives.

Infrastructure banks are not new. This is a new way of financing it, and a very exciting one. Thank you so very much for joining us this evening.

Mr. DELANEY. We all build on each other's ideas.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We will continue to work on this, and we will talk about it again in the future.

California is the most populous State. I didn't say ''popular,'' although I would certainly say that. Texas being the second biggest in geography.

We now have our new Representative from Texas joining us, Mr. CASTRO. Thank you so very, very much. Texas likes to talk about all the good things they are doing. One good thing they did was to send you here. So, Mr. CASTRO, please join us and talk to us about Texas and infrastructure.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. First of all, thank you, Congressman, for your leadership on this issue and on this legislation Make It In America. Thank you to Congressman DELANEY for all of the work that he's doing on infrastructure.

In Texas, infrastructure obviously is very important to us. We have a State that, obviously, is incredibly large in land mass, second only to Alaska. We have, for example, the most number of bridges of any State in the Nation, miles and miles of interstate highways and roads.

So I stand here tonight with you to reaffirm the point that we must never neglect our infrastructure of transportation; building out our roads, our highways, our waterways, our mass transit systems, making sure that Americans can get to where they want to go by air, by land, by sea. We must make sure that our infrastructure of transportation keeps up also and is competitive with that of places in Europe and in Asia, particularly for commercial purposes.

But also, Congressman, I wanted to point out that just as there is an infrastructure of transportation, there is in America another kind of infrastructure, and that is an infrastructure of opportunity that allows each of us to pursue our American Dreams. So, for example, just as there are streets and highways that help us get to where we want to go on the road, there is an infrastructure of opportunity in America that allows us to get to where we want to go in life. That infrastructure of opportunity would include, for example, great public schools and universities, a strong health care system in an economy that's built around well-paying jobs so that people can support themselves and their family members.

In fact, when we ask the question here in Congress: What is it that distinguishes America from among the nations of the world, I would argue that it is the fact that over the generations, Americans have come together to build out that infrastructure of opportunity that allows each of us, no matter our race, our class, where we come from, allows each of us to chase our American Dream.

I think all of us understand, and I think you would agree with me, I have never met any American who has asked for a guarantee of success in our Nation. Folks don't ask for a guarantee of success. What they ask for is the opportunity to pursue that success. So we must continue building not only the roads that we need and the highways, but also the great schools and universities, a strong health care system, and as you mentioned, with the American Jobs Act making sure that Americans can go to work and support themselves and their family.

I will just wrap up with this. There has been a lot of debate around here, and I know in the last hour there was, about immigration. There is a big debate about how to handle our immigration issue. That is a challenge and has been a challenge for this Congress.

But if you put aside the debate over what to do with folks who are here, whether it is visas or permanent legal residency, whatever it is, and we just ask ourselves, why is it for a few hundred years now that America has been the destination Nation for people from literally every corner of the Earth, why is that, I would argue it is because we have built up a place, a society of opportunity where people can pursue their dreams.

Congressman, I think you would agree with me, in all of the immigrants I've met, whether they came from Europe or Asia or Mexico or somewhere else, I've never heard anybody tell me that the reason they came to our country was because they were looking for the lowest corporate tax rate. People, in fact, come here because they are looking to be part of a system of opportunity that as Americans we have built up together. We must make sure, all of us in Congress, working as Republicans and Democrats united for our country, make sure that when somebody asks 50 years from now or 100 years from now, where is it on Earth that people want to be, that the answer is still ''the United States of America.'' We must build out the infrastructure of transportation and the infrastructure of opportunity to achieve that answer.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CASTRO, thank you so very, very much. Often, in fact,

I've talked about infrastructure in a physical way, that is, the physical features of roads and water systems. But your discussion of infrastructure being the infrastructure of opportunity, which does include those things, it also includes this one, which is education, a critical element in the process of education. If we are going to build infrastructure of opportunity, this is where opportunity starts for virtually everybody in this country: the opportunity to get a good education.

Part of that is the physical building itself. Obviously, it is the teachers, the way in which the subjects are taught, and access, access to not only K through 12, but also higher education. This is one of the things that when we talk about physical infrastructure, we need to talk about the classroom itself, about the facility, air-conditioning, as well as the communication systems, computers and other kinds of communication systems.

So the infrastructure of opportunity, what a wonderful theme, what a wonderful way of describing America and this discussion we've heard before we came on the floor about immigration. You could not be more correct.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman.

I would point out, for example, in Texas, we have our challenges. In California, for example, you have nine research universities, which are the top-tier universities. In New York, they have about seven. In Texas, we only have three right now, so we have a long way to go to catch up.

We are trying to catch up. In fact, there was a bit of good news. Governor Perry today signed a bill that would merge two schools, two colleges, two universities, in what is known as the Texas Valley in south Texas, and ultimately will create a medical school.

That is very important for a few reasons. I want to use real quick this example in the Texas Valley in south Texas along the Texas-Mexico border, which is often in conversation here in Congress. It is a place of about between 1 million and 1½ million folks, very hardworking people, wake up early in the morning, go to work, put in a hard day's work without complaint, and then go home to their families, often go home and say prayers of thanks to God for what He has given them.

In that area known as the Texas Valley, cities like Edinburg and McAllen and Weslaco and Brownsville, did you know that you still can't get a medical degree anywhere in that area, anywhere south of San Antonio, my hometown? You can drive the 4 hours between San Antonio and the Texas-Mexico border and not be able to get a medical degree. You can't get a law degree anywhere between San Antonio and the Texas-Mexico border. And there are only a handful of Ph.D. programs.

So when I speak of missing pieces, literally, of the infrastructure, to me the Texas Valley is one example of that. I know many folks like Congressman HINOJOSA, Congressman CUELLAR, Congressman VELA, they're working very hard to change those things; but those changes have been slow in coming.

I will also point out with regard to the infrastructure of transportation, which is part of the infrastructure of opportunity, something that is also missing. For example, when you try to drive—my fiancee is from a small town called Alton, Texas, right near Mission, a few miles from the Texas-Mexico border—when you drive from San Antonio down to the Valley, you drive those 4 hours or so and there is no continuous interstate highway that you can take without stopping in town after town.

So you can imagine what that means to a traveler, but even more so what it means for commercial enterprises, for our businesses that are trying to do trade, trying to get their goods to Mexico, or importing their goods from Mexico. Those things are very, very important; and we've got to continue to do this great work that you've been a leader on.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thought for a moment you were going to go into more detail about your own personal emotions as you stop in every one of these towns on your way to see your fiancee, but we'll let that go for another time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Well, I've got a story tomorrow. I think I'm going to join the folks about immigration on the immigration issue and what I've learned visiting those places.

Mr. GARAMENDI. There's much to learn about that. But, again, if you go back to our Make It In America agenda, these issues, the labor market and education, fit into that infrastructure of opportunity.

I've always said that if you're going to build an economy and have social justice, there are five things you must always do:

First, you must have the best education system in the world that's available to everybody so that they can climb that ladder, as you were saying earlier, that they have that opportunity;

Second, that you have a great research system, and we do. Actually, we have 10 campuses of the University of California. Some of the State universities are now picking up some of the research agenda also. But anyway, the research;

And then you need to make things coming out of that. That's the manufacturing. And that may be a computer program, or it could be an automobile. But you need to be making things, adding, creating value;

The infrastructure being the fourth;

And the fifth being you've got to be willing to change. You can't do what you did yesterday; you need to deal with things of tomorrow.

There are many other pieces to this. We talked a little bit about education here and the way it works.

This was a statistic that was given earlier. Mr. DELANEY went through this very quickly. But for every dollar you invest in the physical infrastructure, you are going to get back immediately about $1.57 as that money churns through the economy as the concrete is purchased, as it is put in place, men and women are doing that work, and then that churns back through the economy, actually giving great stimulation to the economy. Not our words. These are Mark Zandi's words, the chief economist of Moody's Analytics.

This is a very, very well-known thing. So if we want to really move the economy, we can take Mr. DELANEY's idea about an infrastructure bank, not an appropriation, invest and put people to work and give a boost to the economy; and in doing so, you also create better tax flow into the government.

The other thing, and this is something that I know Texas is working on, as is California, and that's rail transportation. If I recall correctly, Fort Worth is the headquarters of BNSF Railway. This is just a picture of a new Amtrak train that was manufactured in Sacramento. Part of the infrastructure investment that is now being made here in the Northeast Corridor between Washington and Boston, this new train is 100 percent American-made.

Back in the stimulus bill, about 80-some trains were proposed to be purchased, about a half a billion dollars, and they wrote into it ''must be American-made.'' So Siemens, a German company, came to Sacramento where they had a light rail shop, decided they could build a heavy-duty locomotive and make it 100 percent American-made.

□ 2100

So this one is now being tested—the first model out—and there will be some 80 of these on the Northeast corridor, increasing the speed, the movement, the transportation system. For all of America, rail transportation—light rail, heavy rail, and even high-speed rail—are ways in which we move our physical transportation, and if we cause those products to be made in America, we also increase our manufacturing base. Again, it's part of the American program of making it in America by using infrastructure.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I think you're absolutely right on that. For example, Congressman GARAMENDI, last week, San Antonio received word that, in a year, our exports went up 33 percent. There was a 33 percent increase in exports.

Mr. GARAMENDI. From the city and region of San Antonio.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. In San Antonio. Coming from San Antonio. So these channels for getting our products to different markets are absolutely vital to continuing that success.

Mr. GARAMENDI. There are so many different things that we could talk about in this process.

This is a piece of legislation that, actually, I've introduced for the last couple of years. This particular piece of

legislation, H.R. 1524, says, if it's your tax money—the American taxpayers' money—then it ought to be used to purchase American-made equipment. That's exactly what happened with the earlier stimulus bill in the manufacturing of these locomotives in California, but there are some 200 different suppliers all around the Nation who are supplying that.

We can really boost the economy in the transportation system but also in the energy system—solar, wind. All of those are subsidized, as is oil and coal, with American taxpayer money, either with a tax credit or a subsidy or a direct payment, and if we said, Okay, but you must produce that product in America—as with the wind turbines, make them in America, as well as similarly with solar panels and other kinds of equipment. So these are all things that fit into this.

The theme that you hit on early on, I think, is so very, very important, and that is the infrastructure of opportunity. I really like that. I think that, as we go about our business here of passing laws or not, we ought to keep in mind that our task is to create that opportunity.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I think, Congressman, when we think about issues that come up here, issues that sometimes succumb to the gridlock that is Congress these days—for example, on the student loan issue—that's why it's so important that we make sure that we do right by students and not allow that student loan interest rate to double. In these tough economic times, it's hard enough for families to scrounge up the money to help send their kids to college and for the kids to work a job or two and go to class. They're often in this work-school tug-of-war where many of them work part-time or full-time and at the same time take their 15 hours or 12 hours to graduate in a decent number of years. The least that Congress can do is make sure that we set a student loan rate that is affordable and reasonable for the economic times that we live in.

Those things are not handouts. Those are investments to make sure that you've got a well-educated population. These are loans, after all. They're paying these back. It's also, I think, their government saying, Look, we're going to lend you this money at a decent rate—we're going to make sure it comes at a reasonable rate—and you're going to pay it back to us, but from that, we're going to get folks who are engineers, who are police officers and firefighters and doctors and all of the things that keep our society moving and keep this country the greatest Nation on Earth.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. CASTRO, you put that so very well. It's a critical investment that the American public makes in the next generation so that this economy can move forward.

There is also—we've been debating this on the floor—a bill that passed out of here that would set the student loan interest rate as a variable rate, much like a home mortgage variable rate. Watch out, as we know what happened with the variable rates that went on. It was interesting that that particular bill would actually create income, a large amount of income if I remember the numbers—some $30 billion over the next 10 years of income. So it was like wait a minute. Are we really just doing this to get the money back or are we looking at this as a profit center? I think it was a serious mistake, first, to do a variable interest rate. That would move it up, quite possibly, to more than what the doubling of the 3.4 percent would be to, maybe, 8, 9 percent, 10 percent. Bad idea—and it's looking at the problem incorrectly.

The way to look at it is just as you said. This is a way for the American public to make an investment in a student at a low-interest cost to the student but sufficient to repay the Federal Government, not as a profit center but as a repayment. There are some administrative costs to be sure. That's how we ought to look at this because it is a crucial investment, the most important investment of all—the educational investment.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I couldn't agree more.

Just personally, I started college in the fall of 1992—21 years ago now. In 1991 or 1992, my mom made less than $20,000, and she was getting ready to send two twin sons—of course I have my brother—off to Stanford University in northern California. You can imagine how daunting that was, but there is no way that my brother and I could have gone to college and graduated without student loans—without Perkins loans, without Stafford loans. It was the same thing for law school. So these are vital. I mean, that's just my own story. There are literally millions of stories like that across the country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And a very sound investment was made in you and your brother, who I believe is the mayor of San Antonio.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. That's right.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Indeed.

There is much to be said. I'm just going to share with you, and perhaps you have a similar situation from your own experience.

This weekend, I was back in my district in northern California, in Yuba City and Marysville. Now, the Feather River, which is one of the major rivers—tributaries—of the Sacramento River, goes right between these two towns, with Marysville on the east side and Yuba City on the west side. This is one of the most dangerous places in America. The Feather River and the Yuba River, which come together at that place, have a long history of deadly floods. What the citizens need there is the help of the Federal Government to complete the levee and enhance the levees around their communities.

We had a major debate here on the floor last week with the Energy and Water bill in which the Ryan budget—that is the Republican budget—was seen in its fullness for the first time. What that budget called for was a diminution—in fact, a very, very significant cut—in the infrastructure investment for the Army Corps of Engineers. The Army Corps of Engineers builds the levees, the locks and other major public works. Sequestration took $250 million of construction out of the Army Corps of Engineers, and right now construction projects that were scheduled are not taking place. In addition to that, the proposed budget in the actual appropriation bill even further reduced the money available to the Army Corps of Engineers to build the levees to protect communities all across the United States. At the very same time, money was shifted from the Corps of Engineers—from the levees and the things that are necessary to protect American citizens and others who are here from devastating floods—to build more nuclear weapons.

What in the world is that all about?

We've got 5,500 nuclear weapons now. The money was shifted. They all worked, and there is no way we would ever use all of them unless you want to end life on the Earth. Yet that was a priority issue—nuclear weapons versus levees to protect Americans. It is the wrong priority, but it is a fundamental example of the infrastructure needs and the wrongheaded priorities that sometimes find their way into legislation.

Unfortunately, that bill passed. That is the statement of the House of Representatives. Now, every Democrat voted against it, but it did pass the House. That now will go over to the Senate, and the Senate, I am sure, will never set that priority the same as this; but in a conference committee, we are now looking at a tug-of-war between nuclear weapons and levees to protect Americans. Hopefully, the levees will win. We'll see. That's one example.

When I went home this weekend, people asked me, ''What was that all about?'' I said, ''That was about bad priorities and an austerity budget working together.''

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. We know, of course, Congressman, that the sequester was taking a meat cleaver rather than trying to do real smart cuts, so I agree with you on that.

With respect to the work of the Army Corps of Engineers, the important work that they do, it is often felt in San Antonio and in Texas, of course, during everything that happened with Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans and all of the important work they had done around that. So you're right. I think that Americans expect that they will be in homes that are not going to flood and that there is going to be infrastructure in place to make sure that water doesn't come up and run them out of their homes and ruin their homes and their properties.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Also, without adequate levees, you clearly slow down economic development.

Now, not every city has a flood problem; although, certainly, in the great Midwest, you see this in all of the cities along the Missouri and the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. So, in that entire huge basin, which is more than 60 percent of the United States, there are serious flood issues. This extends—and certainly we see it on the east coast—to Superstorm Sandy, and you mentioned Katrina. All across this Nation the issue of flood protection is critical.

In my own district, Sacramento, there is a portion of Sacramento that, I think, is now rated as the most dangerous city in the United States. It is the Natomas area of Sacramento. With the rebuilding of the levees in New Orleans, I think now Natomas, Sacramento, is rated as the most dangerous. We are talking about a flood situation that could occur, because the levees are substandard, in which the river would break. We have floods in the winter, so the water temperatures are in the 45- to 50-degree temperatures. If that were to break, the inundation would be immediate, and it would be 20 feet. The survival time is measured in minutes, not in hours. When that water hits you, you get hypothermia and you're dead.

So it is an extreme problem. We need to rebuild those levees. The community is taxing itself to a fare-thee-well to do it, but the Federal Government is backing away from its previous commitment. The rest of the story is that the economic development potential in that community is stifled. It's not just housing. It's all kinds of economic development, as the Sacramento International Airport is in that area.

With the lack of money to build the levees, human life is at risk—several tens of thousands of people—and economic development. So these things come together—infrastructure being the foundation upon which the economy grows and, in some cases, certainly in the case of levees, upon which people's lives depend.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. You make an important point about neglect of that infrastructure, not only with levees and with waterways, but you and I are both aware, as is the country, of the tragic examples over the last several years—in Minnesota, for example, in the bridge collapse, and more recently in Washington, I believe, in that bridge collapse. Those are lessons to this Congress that we cannot neglect our infrastructure. It is vital. I mentioned Texas. By that same report that Congressman DELANEY mentioned, we have about 1,300 bridges that have been declared functionally obsolete. That's 1,300 functionally obsolete bridges in Texas. That's one in six. So those are things that we've got to attend to here.

It also begs the point: whether it's building out the infrastructure of transportation or building out the infrastructure of opportunity, that doesn't happen by itself. It doesn't happen by accident. It doesn't happen by luck. The United States Government and the Congress must make those smart investments. We must continue to make those investments if we are going to be the land of opportunity not just 5 years from now or 20 years from now but 50 and 100 years from now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think it's about time for us to wrap up, but I want to engage the public. I don't know how many people are watching C–SPAN this evening. I would like to think there are some 300 million, but I suspect that's overstating it a ways.

I would ask the public to comment to you and me about their infrastructure in their communities. What do they need in their communities? How do they think it could be financed? As to Mr. DELANEY's proposal for an infrastructure bank based upon the repatriation of foreign earnings, does that make sense?

□ 2115

Does it make sense to do what the President said, which is to appropriate $50 billion right now to build infrastructure? There are many different alternatives.

But I'd love to hear from the public, and here's how they can do it. I'm going to use yours down here too. Stay in touch, stay informed, stay connected. You can go to Facebook.com/RepGaramendi or RepCastro. Either way, RepGaramendi, RepCastro. Twitter: Twitter.com/RepGaramendi or RepCastro. Or you can go to our Web site, Garamendi.house.gov.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Well, my Twitter, the House one, that's right. It should probably be JCastro.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think there's more than one Castro. There's only one Garamendi around. So probably JCastro.house.gov. That's the Web site, and they can get in touch that way and keep informed.

So I welcome people. If anybody out there is watching this discussion about infrastructure, how it can be financed, why it's important, what it means for economic development, education, what it means for social justice and opportunity—if you like the theme, the infrastructure of opportunity, you can contact me and I'll pass it on to Mr. CASTRO, or you can go directly to JCastro@house.gov or Facebook.com/RepGaramendi, RepCastro.

I want to thank you, Mr. CASTRO and Mr. DELANEY, for joining me this evening.

Next week we'll take up one of the other issues that we have. We'll probably talk next week about energy and how we can improve the energy situation to meet the climate change.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

Mr. GARAMENDI. I do have one more thing that I really must do before I close down, and that is talk about geothermal energy and one of the communities I represent, Lake County.

We have a critical natural resource opportunity in this Nation, and it's beneath the soil, beneath the ground. It happens to be the heat of the Earth. It finds its way to the surface in many places around the world, and it certainly does in my district in Lake County.

That heat comes from the geothermal, and it is an extraordinary natural resource and it is clean energy. It's one of the most abundant natural resources that can be found anywhere, and it's often overlooked. It has the ability to become one of the key future sources of energy. We'll talk about it much more next week.

But I do want to talk about its use here in the United States. It is environmentally friendly. Dry steam and flash geothermal plants emit just 5 percent of the carbon dioxide and less than 1 percent of the nitrous oxide of traditional fossil fuel coal-powered plants. The binary geothermal installation emissions are near zero. More importantly, geothermal energy is cost effective.

Over the last two decades, the cost of generating geothermal power has decreased by 25 percent. Additionally, geothermal can be produced domestically. In California, the Imperial Valley, the Lake County area, are two of the most used geothermal resources. Nevada has enormous resources, and there are many other places within the United States. And it can be sent—the same resource is available in many parts of the world. So we as a world and certainly as a State and Nation ought to be moving more aggressively to harness our geothermal resources.

It's also a good jobs place, creating more than $117 million in annual wealth in the geothermal region of Sonoma, Mendocino, and Lake Counties.

It's also a tax source. Lake County and Samoa County receive over $11 million in annual tax revenues directly from the geyser's geothermal field. And Lake County has saved millions of dollars in the disposal cost by funneling 8 million gallons of wastewater back into the ground for the harnessing of geothermal resources.

So I draw the attention tonight of the Nation to the potential of geothermal and the success that it's had in my district in Lake County and in my neighboring county of Sonoma.

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

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we want to have a conversation about immigration and immigration reform because we recognize that in 1986, when Congress and the President came together for immigration reform, it didn't work. It didn't work for immigrants; it didn't work for our border; and it didn't work for America. Just recently, we've seen that our Senate

has come forward with proposed legislation, and that too doesn't work. It's a proposal that doesn't secure our border. It's a proposal that won't work long term for America.

We're here to address the problems that we face in this country with real solutions that work for people and work for our country. We're here to say that we're with you. If you want to work hard and you want to contribute to our American economy, we're with you. If you want to obey our laws and if you want a shot at our free enterprise system, we're with you. If you believe that America has a right to secure her borders, to know who's coming in and out of our country, we're with you. If you want to pay taxes and pledge allegiance to America, we're with you. And if you want your shot at the American Dream, we're with you.

We're a party that looks at the big problems in our country, and we come out with big solutions to fix those problems. We're not a party of ''no.'' We are a party of solutions. That's why I'm honored to be here tonight with a few of my fellow colleagues to talk about the solutions in regard to immigration, solutions that are going to work. And that' why I'm honored right now to yield to the gentleman from Illinois for his thoughts on immigration.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for organizing the time and bringing us all together. This is an important discussion.

When I think back to somebody who's a big hero of mine, Ronald Reagan, I think back to the eighties, of course, and I think of what Ronald Reagan talked about. He discussed America as a shining city on a hill, a city that everybody around the globe looks at and says ''I want to live there.'' Or they look at the United States and say, ''that is a country that I want my country to look like.'' That's frankly the Republican Party.

And I understand that over the last few years, the Republican Party hasn't necessarily done a great job of messaging that. That's our fault. But I look at somebody like Ronald Reagan, and I look at the vision he has put out for America and I say, You know what? That is the Republican party that I joined. That's the Republican party that I believe in, the party that believes that a kid in the inner city of Chicago should have the same opportunity as a kid raised in the best suburbs of Chicago. That's what we believe.

So when we talk about this really controversial issue of immigration—you have Americans on both sides of the issue, and Americans that have gotten ginned up on either side of this issue that are speaking to this with anger—I think something we have to do as a Nation and something that I think we need to do here right now is to say, Let's have this conversation about immigration, but let's do it in a way where we can discuss what America wants to be and what America is about and how to give most people around the world the opportunity to be in America.

I think most Americans would agree that the first thing we have to do is ensure that we have a safe border, not only just because of the idea of immigration and ensuring that we have a system that works for everybody, but because—look, on a porous border you have an opportunity for terrorists to come through with weapons that we don't want in the United States of America. We've seen in our schools—I visited a place called Rosecrance the other day in Rockford, Illinois, that has teenagers that are suffering from drug addiction. Do you know what the cheapest drug they can get a hold of is now? You'd think maybe marijuana, right? It's actually heroin. Do you know where most of the heroin is coming through? It's coming through the border of Mexico.

So I think when we talk about border security, we're not talking about it in an angry way. We're just saying as a sovereign Nation, we have a right to determine our immigration policy, and you can't determine immigration policy with a porous border. Once we do that, once we have honest border security and we're honest with the American people, then we have to have this discussion about how do we passionately and compassionately deal with folks that want the American way, as well.

That's a conversation I'm looking forward to having tonight over the next few minutes. And as we move on, I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, a great Member of Congress, Mr. CORY GARDNER.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, we're all together on the same issue tonight on the House floor as we discuss the important issue of immigration inform. Many of us elected in 2010 and elected in 2012, we came to Congress because we wanted to find ways to make America work, to get this country working again, to find ways to get government out of the way and create an economy that's strong and growing so people can find the jobs that they want to help feed their families, to send their kids to school without putting themselves into bankruptcy, and to make sure that we do indeed have a better tomorrow than we do today.

So it is starting with those fundamental beliefs that we all came here to achieve, to build a stronger country, to make life work for the American families, that we recognize a Nation of immigrants, a Nation that provides an opportunity for people around the world, that beacon of hope to be a place for families to succeed, to achieve their dreams about the American Dream and indeed the American spirit.

So it is through those very values of compassion for the poor, compassion for people who want to build a stronger Nation here at home, and the fairness that we know we can do it with to build a system of laws that will stand strong not just for 1 year or 10 years or 20 years, but moving forward beyond that, a system of laws that we know will make sure that people who want to be a great part of a healthy American economy indeed have that very opportunity.

Tonight, as we kick off a discussion on immigration and we join people around the country who have differing opinions, as the gentleman from Illinois recognized, differing opinions on what to do, how to do it, when to do it, recognizing, though, that indeed we must do something to address a system that is broken in a way that meets those objectives of American values: compassion, fairness, and maintaining the rule of law in this country.

I look forward to our conversation tonight, and I look forward to solutions for the American people that we can all be proud of, knowing that this is not going to be an easy task, but one that we will address with all due and necessary urgency.

We are joined tonight by our colleague from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. I thank my colleague, Mr. Speaker. It's an honor to be here tonight.

I'm a new Member of Congress. I was elected just last year. I ran for Congress the first time I had ever run for office because I want to come up here and fight for people, because there are folks back home that are frustrated, they feel like their government is not being responsive to their needs. So I'm here to represent them and be a voice for those people.

I think of the homebuilder in Monroe, North Carolina, who told me he's just struggling to keep his head above water and he'll take any kind of work just to keep his crew intact so he can keep them together. He'll do remodeling work or anything. He's not even worried about profit so much as being able to keep afloat.

I think about the families across the Eighth District of North Carolina who are looking to us for solutions. That's why I'm here tonight to join this conversation, to talk about immigration reform. The key to immigration reform, as far as I'm concerned is, we've got to look at compassion and we've got to look at fairness.

When it comes to fairness, we are a Nation of immigrants, but we're also a Nation of laws. So we've got to make sure we're enforcing the law in this country and we're respecting the rule of law when we're looking at making changes to immigration policy.

We also need to look with compassion on those who have come here to the United States seeking that American Dream when we try to determine what we're going to do going down the road.

But I think the key to this is the approach we're taking here in the House

of Representatives. The Senate has passed an immigration bill. It's a bill that was cobbled together behind closed doors. It was a bill that in my opinion went too far too fast. We're taking a much more thoughtful approach here in the House. We're going to go through the committee process. We're going to bring legislation to the floor so that we can debate these key issues affecting immigration as single issues and let the American people take part in this conversation and tell us what they think about issues like border security.

Now, the key to immigration reform in my opinion is we've got to secure the borders first, and any legislation that we pass out of this Chamber, any agreement we make with the Senate on immigration, we've got to have a trigger so that no other pieces of this immigration puzzle fall into place until we've got that border secure. So we're going to work hard to make sure that's part of our solution.

There are actually five pieces of legislation that have already passed out of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees. I serve on the Homeland Security Committee. We passed the Border Security Results Act of 2013.

□ 2130

What this does is it requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy to secure the border. What a radical concept: let's actually have a plan. And so what we're saying in the House is: give us a plan. We want the Department of Homeland Security to work with the border sheriffs to come up with a plan to secure that border and come back to Congress and say, here's what we need. Here's the sections where we need fences. Here's the other types of technology, whether it be drones or other types of technological monitoring. These are the pieces of the puzzle we need to secure the border.

And a key to this is we have to have a metrics so we can measure whether the border is secure or not. Currently, we know the numerator, but we don't know the denominator. We know how many folks we're stopping coming across the border, but we don't know how many we aren't rounding up. And if you talk to any of the border sheriffs, you'll know that we're not anywhere close to being secure. So that's a key component of this legislation.

I look forward to talking more about some of the legislation that came out of the Judiciary Committee, some of the pieces of this immigration reform puzzle that we need to discuss.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for your statements and everybody here for your statements. I am a member of the International Guard. Just 2½ months ago, I actually did missions on the border between Mexico and Texas. I fly a reconnaissance airplane, and the goal was to look for folks who had crossed illegally. In most cases, we were looking 60 miles into Texas. We were finding dozens of people. Each time we would look somewhere, we'd catch 60 to 100 a night.

I felt bad for the folks who were hunkered down, who had crossed the border that were told by some coyote that they paid their entire life's saving to, told by some coyote that ushered them over that once you step foot in America, you'll be just fine. And then they realize that the journey actually begins. What you'd see in many cases was the Border Patrol, who do very tough, hard work, would apprehend most of these folks. In some cases, a couple of them would scatter, and they'd be left alone. They'd be left 15 miles away from the nearest town, with no water, with no food, and with no idea where to go.

I think of that, and I think of the administration saying the border is already secure. I think what that leads to is there is an epic lack of trust in Washington right now. That's why actually the four of us came to Washington, because we recognize there's a huge lack of trust in D.C.

So this idea that we're going to say from on high in Washington, we're going to just deem the border secure at some point, when the administration has already deemed it secure, is I think where the lack of trust is and why there's so much emotion tied into this. I think this is a beginning step in having a great discussion about how to actually tackle this problem in a way that both sides can agree with and that is fair to the American people and to folks who want to live the American life.

Mr. DUFFY. It is that very point. It is that lack of trust with the American people and Washington, D.C. That's why we want to go through a step-by-step approach, analyzing immigration and immigration reform.

The gentleman from North Carolina said we're here to fight for people. We're here to fix a broken system, and we're here to make it work. We want to have a reform bill that is going to actually be fair—be fair to those who have come to participate in our economy, but be fair to people who are Americans that say we are a country of laws, and we also are a country of immigrants.

I think the key first step is border security. We have to debate, negotiate, discuss what does border security mean. Once we agree on what border security is, and once we secure the border, we can go to the next phase, which is to say we have millions of people who have come into our country, what's the fair way to treat them. In my opinion, and I am open to hearing feedback from all kinds of people as we have this conversation and debate, I haven't dug my heels in. But, number one, we have to say, do you get to go to the head of the line and become a U.S. citizen when you've come here without documentation? I don't know that that's the first step after border security. But what I do think we have to say is if you've come here and you've participated in our economy, we can offer some kind of legal status, a legal status that isn't citizenship, but it's a legal status that says we're not going to arrest you in the middle of the night. We're not going to separate you from your grandparents or your kids. You can stay in our country because the border is secure. We're not going to have to address this problem 10 years from now or 20 years from now or 25 years from now. We've addressed the border, which means that we've addressed the inflow of people coming to our country illegally.

When that happens, we can offer those without documentation a status that says you can stay here and you can work; but if you want to become a citizen, you're going to have to get to the back of the line. You don't get a special pathway into the front of the line. You can go to the back and you can become a citizen, but you can stay here legally. And by staying here legally, you can pay your taxes, but that doesn't mean you can vote. And it also doesn't mean that you can collect off the entitlement system that we have here in America.

I think as we have that conversation with those who are here without documentation and those who care about the laws in America, we can have a conversation that actually works for everybody and everybody can agree to. I look forward to that conversation, on finding a pathway and a consensus forward that works for everybody.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Wisconsin brought up a great point, and that is the issue of a step-by-step process. That is exactly what the House is undertaking. There are at least four bills right now that are working their way through the Judiciary Committee, dealing with everything from an E-Verify system that can actually work and be used by employers around this country to know that they are hiring people who are legally eligible for employment in this country. But we also have the opportunity to address one of the other concerns that I hear at town meetings and in private conversations in grocery stores across my district, and that's so many people who say, Do we need to do anything other than just enforcing existing laws? Do we really need new laws?

We have to give serious consideration to that question because the answer is, yes, we do need immigration reform. Because of the 11 million people in this country who we believe are undocumented today, 42 percent of them are here, they came here legally, entered the country legally, but overstayed their visa. So how do we reform the visa system to actually make it work so we know the integrity of the process is what it needs to be?

How do we create a system for those in agriculture to know that they have

a workforce that is readily available to harvest that fall's crops? Or if you're a dairy farmer, there's no one season for a dairy farmer, it's year round, so the availability of a workforce with the skills that they need, but the certainty that they need. It's those laws that we have to reform to enforce and rebuild the trust of the American people in a step-by-step process. Because if we do this, we can actually create a system of laws that avoids the mistakes of the 1986 law through enforcement first, border security first, and making sure then that we deal with the situation at hand and the people who do want to be a part of a healthy American economy.

Mr. HUDSON. I appreciate my colleague pointing out some of the legislation that the Judiciary Committee has already passed because I think it is important to understand that the House of Representatives is taking a different approach when it comes to immigration reform. So we passed the Border Security Results Act out of Homeland Security. We have also passed the Legal Workforce Act, which is the bill that reforms the E-Verify system, which gives us a much more workable E-Verify program, that gives our employers the certainty and the assurance that they can verify the citizenship of potential employees.

The second piece of legislation that came out of the Judiciary Committee already is the Skills Visa Act. This has to do with what's called the H–1B visas. These are for your high-skilled workers. These are for folks in math, science, and technology who may come to the United States to go to university to learn these skills and get on this career path, but then they don't have a visa to stay here. Most industrialized nations in the world, 80 percent of the visas they give out are based on work skills and needs of the workforce. Here in the United States, it's about 12 percent of the visas we give out. We have a lottery to give out visas; and to me, that's ridiculous. We need to reform the system so we're giving out visas to the type of people that we want to attract to this country. So the Skills Visa Act is legislation we're considering here in the House that will do that.

The third piece of legislation is called the SAFE Act. One of the issues we've talked about, we have to enforce the rule of law. Frankly, we don't have enough Federal agents enforcing the law. So what we need to do is empower States and municipalities, local governments that want to enforce the immigration law to be able to do that. That's what the SAFE Act does.

And then the fourth piece is the agriculture guest worker, AG Act. That is a critical piece for our economy. There are at least 11 million undocumented workers here in this country that we know of. Many of those folks don't want citizenship. What they want is the ability to work here legally. If we have an ag worker program that actually works, this is the H–2A program. Frankly, when I'm home, and I go home every weekend and meet with our local folks and I see farmers across our my district, I ask them, How many of you are using H–2A program? You'd be amazed how few use the program, because it's not workable.

And so as my colleague from Colorado asked the question that he hears at town hall meetings, Do we really need to do immigration reform, yes, we do. We can't just secure the border with a fence and technology if we still have that attraction, that need for illegal workers to fill jobs in this country. We've got to have a pathway to bring in legal workers, whether it's in agriculture or home-building, or some of the more high-skilled types of jobs. We need a legal pathway to fill those positions; otherwise there's going to be this tug of illegals that will continue to happen.

So we can build a 10-foot wall, but someone is going to invent an 11-foot ladder. So it has to be a comprehensive approach. That's why we need the ag guest worker program, as well. So as you can see, we in the House are looking at this step by step. We are looking at what are the actual problems so we can address them in a very thoughtful way so that we aren't just rushing to get a big bill, as was once said by a former Speaker of this House, Let's pass this bill so we know what's in it. Well, we don't want to make that mistake again. We don't need a big, huge, comprehensive bill. We need to look at these issues in a very thoughtful, comprehensive way.

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina's comments. And you look around at immigrants that come to America, why do they come? They've come for the American Dream. They've come for a better life for themselves. They've come for a better life for their children. They've come to the land of opportunity because they want that opportunity. They want to work hard.

I'm from Wisconsin. Many people may not want to recognize this, but if you look at our dairy farms around Wisconsin, there are a lot of immigrants who have come here without documentation that work on our farms. And it's hard, tough work; and they do it because they want an opportunity.

I travel around and do a lot of town halls, and I know my colleagues do town halls and coffees. I would ask the gentlemen from Colorado and Illinois what you guys hear in your town halls, what people think about immigration and the problems and the solutions you face in your communities.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. The conversations I hear are from all angles. So whether it's from somebody whose family came here when they were very young—I know of an instance of a young woman who came into this country with her family when she was a baby. She has gone to school in the same class, same school system for 12 years, eventually graduating as a senior, number one in her class. She was brought here as a child. When she asked me about what we were going to do, I said, Your situation is an example of why we need immigration reform, so have secure borders and we know the laws are being enforced and to avoid putting you in this situation.

Years later, that conversation is repeating. We don't have the reform yet, and we are still looking for that reform. And how many years have to go by before we can actually say we have secured the border, we are enforcing the law? And we know in 10, 20, 30 years, the visa program is solved, the E-Verify system is working. That labor needs, whether it is housing construction, agriculture, are being met in a system that encourages compliance with the law as part of a healthy American economy instead of an underground or a way that does it in a lawbreaking fashion.

I will tell you one other story. There's a doctor in the eastern plains of Colorado who was here with all of his proper documentation. Unfortunately, his mother was ill and he needed to leave the country or was hoping to leave the country to say good-bye to her. But under our system of laws, if he left this Nation, he couldn't come back. The only doctor in the county, but he couldn't go away to say goodbye to his mom because he couldn't return. We need some common sense.

Mr. DUFFY. That's a powerful story.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. That's a great story. I just had a town hall meeting in Rockford, Illinois, yesterday. You get folks from all ends of the political spectrum. That is the great thing about our democracy is we can have that respectful conversation.

You have everything from folks who say, Look, all you have to do is enforce existing laws, put more people on the border. Then you have a lot of people who say, Hey, we need to not have any more border enforcement and just allow everybody here to become U.S. citizens.

I think the answer is, frankly, in the middle of that. When you talk to folks, and it doesn't matter if they're on the right or left or somewhere in between, everybody has a heart. Everybody cares about people. And when you talk about the fact, as Mr. GARDNER mentioned, there are people here who are 5 years old, through no fault of their own, sometimes 12 years old, or now they're getting ready to go to college and they realize they're not here legally, this is something we ought to have a lot of compassion for and understand.

□ 2145

And I think we've got to take some of the anger out of it on all sides of the aisle and just have a grown-up discussion and say, What do we have to do to fix the problem here? What do we have to do to fix the issue? Because, frankly,

I don't know how long I'll be in politics, but I don't ever want to have to address this again. And I think that's the thing. And that's what I hear at my town hall meetings is, you know, when you really get past kind of the initial arguments, folks say, We just really don't trust Washington, but, unfortunately, you're the ones that have to solve this problem.

Mr. DUFFY. And I hear similar things, and that's why people say, Take it slow. Talk about it. Talk to us.

Let's do what's right. Let's do what works for the very people that you talked about. Some call them the Dreamers, people who are here at 17 years old or 14 years old and know no other country, but they're here. They're part of our communities, our society, and our schools. Let's do what's right by them, but also let's do what's right for our next generation by securing this border.

I want to talk about just one story. I have a good friend back in Ashland, Wisconsin. He came here legally, but it goes to the work ethic of those who come for opportunity and the American Dream.

It's Bah Lee. He owns a nail shop in Ashland, Wisconsin, and he was raised in an orphanage in Vietnam. And the sister nuns, as he tells the story, saved money in the orphanage and they sent him to America. And he couldn't speak the language, and I think he was in Texas where he got a job in a fast-food restaurant.

And from fast-food, he got a job as a painter. And all the painters got mad at him because he was such a fast painter and they were, like, Slow down. You're making us all look bad. He said, No, I'm here to paint. In very short order he was the highest-paid painter; doesn't speak the language very well, from Vietnam, but man, could he paint.

He saved money, sent money back to the sister nuns in Vietnam to help the orphanage but saved money himself, and he opened up a nail salon. And after that nail salon, another nail salon, and he sold them and he built them and he sold them.

Eventually, he said, I don't like the hot weather anymore, so he moved up to northern Wisconsin, where he bought a building on Main Street, Ashland; right? And he opened up California Nails.

And during the day, Lee does nails, and at night—it's an old 1900 building. It was barren up there. He built five apartments, by himself, at night, in the upstairs of his office building. And then in the downstairs, which was not the nicest location and smelled, he ripped it out and built new apartments downstairs.

But a guy that worked all day and all night for his shot at the American Dream, helping his people back at home, but helping our community, showing what immigrants do to make America better. And it's that story, which is the American story, that I'm fighting for, to have a system that actually works for people who are here legally and people who want a shot at what we have to offer.

And with that, I yield back to the gentleman from North Carolina for his comments on what he hears in his town halls on where we need to go with regard to immigration reform.

Mr. HUDSON. I appreciate that. And I think it's many of the same things.

First of all, people don't trust Washington to actually address this problem. We've got a pretty bad track record here in the Congress.

I think the other thing, though, I hear from my farmers, from my homebuilders, that they need labor, and we've got to have a legal pathway to get that done. And so we've just got to do it in a way that's fair and respects the rule of law.

If any of you would like to close, I believe we're getting near the end of our time.

Mr. DUFFY. For a few more moments, I'm going to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Well, thank you. And as we do wrap up our time, I just want to say thank you to those paying attention today and to my fellow Members here.

This is an important issue. This is the very beginning of a long discussion that we need to have because this is too important to get wrong. This is too important to rush, because America's the greatest country in the world and this is something we ought not ever forget. And in the process of doing that, we ought to remember that we're an America that many of us come from immigrants and an America that, frankly, is proud of where we've come from.

So with that, I want to thank the fellow Members of Congress here with me to talk about this. And this is the very beginning of, I'm sure, a long discussion about where we go from here.

Mr. DUFFY. I know our time is short, and I appreciate the discussion, and I'm about to yield back to the Speaker. And we may have a few more minutes we can actually continue this discussion tonight, but my time is done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) for 10 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman, the Speaker, for the additional time to continue this conversation, and thank you as well to Members for this opportunity to discuss what is truly one of the biggest issues this Congress, this Nation faces.

I recently was talking to a reporter back home about the immigration debate taking place. They were asking about the Senate bill, asking about what the House was doing. And they said, Well, aren't you acting with speed? Do you feel no urgency?

And my response was, Don't mistake the issue of speed with urgency, because I think the House feels every bit as urgent as this issue truly is and truly deserves the attention of how urgent the matter is before all of us. But because of that, because of the urgency to do it right, it is going to take time, a deliberative process through this body to make sure that we create that step-by-step opportunity for the people who are here legally, for people who want to come into this Nation legally, to create the border security, the border enforcement, and then to have answers for every person in this Nation. And so as we create this process, this debate, as it moves forward, every bit as urgent as any other American before us, any other person who's desiring to be a part of this country, the urgency that we all feel to make sure that this happens.

And so to the gentleman from Illinois or Wisconsin or North Carolina, thank you.

I yield to anyone who wishes to continue tonight.

Mr. HUDSON. Well, I'm happy to jump in. I thank my colleague from Colorado for giving us this opportunity.

I think the problem is just the general distrust in the way Washington does things, and you only have to look at the process we just went through to understand why; because any problem that we ever face as a Nation, Congress can solve it by very quickly passing a big piece of legislation with a great title and saying the problem is solved.

Unfortunately, in 1986, when we passed immigration reform it didn't solve the problem. It gave amnesty now with a promise of border security later that we never saw, and I believe that's the same thing that happened with the Senate bill. We very quickly put out a bill that has a great title, thousands of pages that I doubt many folks have even read, and saying the problem is now solved.

And then you immediately hear the pundits and the folks who talk on TV about what happens in Washington saying, Well, the House, since you aren't quickly moving a huge bill with a nice title, you don't care. But the truth is we do care, but we're here to represent the people of the United States of America that sent us here, and we're going to do this in a very thoughtful way, and we're going to do immigration reform the right way so that we don't have to do it again in another 20 years.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. The big picture of this is we're getting into a lot of the details we need to. But I want to just, as I give my last statement of the night, I just want to say this.

You know, America is the land of opportunity. America is growing at less, frankly, organically, with folks just

here, than we need to to continue to be a powerful economy in the world, so this is a discussion that we have to have. It is a discussion that is required if we're going to be, in 20, 30, 40, 50 years, the most powerful country in the world.

I don't have kids yet, but I sure hope when I do that my grandkids can live in a world where America is unchecked, the power in the world. They never have to worry about some of the problems that previous generations have had to worry about.

This reminds me, and as I've heard folks on, frankly, the other side of the aisle that have said many times, you know, they use very emotional statements to talk about what the Republican Party believes. I've heard us called the Party of No. I've heard us called, you know, taking food from the mouths of children, not caring about anybody but the rich. I've heard it all.

Look, I'll admit this in some cases, in many cases, the Republican Party has not done a good job of messaging. I remember seeing an ad on television where a pizza company talked about how they used to do it wrong and now they want to do it right.

Well, here's what we need do and here's what my passion is: to let the people know that, frankly, the Republican Party is the party of opportunity. We're the party that, as I mentioned earlier, believes that a kid born in the worst of circumstances should be able to pull himself out of those circumstances and be one of the most successful people in the world, including President of the United States if he or she wants to be. That's what we believe.

That's, when we go forward in this debate and any other debates, that's the message that I think is important to get out. Let's quit calling each other names. Let's quit trying to use cheap shots. Let's just have a grown-up discussion and say we both, all sides of the aisle, want a successful America; we just see how to get there differently. And let's have a discussion as adults, as Members of Congress, and, frankly, as Americans should have a discussion.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for all of us to stand strong, stand tall and lead, listen, communicate on this very important issue. And I know that's what we want to do here tonight is throw out ideas, but also prepare ourselves to listen to what our constituents want, what America wants and what's right for the country.

I hear some folks on my side of the aisle talk about if you pass a border security bill, you're going to go to conference with the Senate and you're going to adopt the Senate bill. We don't go to conference unless we agree to it. That's not going to happen. Let me be very clear. We're going to do a step-by-step approach and get a solution to immigration and then we'll talk about going to conference, if that's the pathway forward. But it's not one phase of the bill, then to Congress.

I've got others that say just enforce the current laws, and to those I would ask: How is that working for us? It's not working. We have to engage in this conversation and do what's right.

I've got one more story for you. There's a family that came from Mexico over to Arizona, and they had an opportunity to work in the mines in Superior, Arizona, hard work, tough work. They were Catholic. They raised a lot of kids on not a lot of money. But one of their kids, as he grew up, he learned how to make pinatas and sell those pinatas. He learned how to get fruit of the desert, chop it up, slice it, dice it, and sell it as a delicacy within his community, a little entrepreneur.

When he got older he had a shot to go work in the mines like his brothers, but instead he said, You know what? I want to serve my country. And he went into the military. He had a chance to serve under Ronald Reagan.

And he came from a party that's not mine, but he had a chance to serve under Ronald Reagan, and he had to see what a party of opportunity had to offer him and his community and his family. He changed his vote. He said, This is who's looking out for me. This is who's looking out for my opportunity, and this is who's going to look out for my children and my grandchildren.

He went on, got married to a woman in Spain who immigrated here legally, and they had four kids. And I was honored enough to meet their daughter and marry her and move her to northern Wisconsin from warm Arizona, where we now have six children together.

That's my wife's immigrant story, whose father came here as a first-generation American, who worked his heart out and has his shot at the American Dream. After the military, he became a schoolteacher, and now he works for a university. He's living the dream. His daughter is living the dream. All of us have those stories. My parents, my great-grandparents came from Ireland. We all have the story of an immigrant.

I'm here to say, let's open our hearts. Let's open our minds. Let's have a real discussion that works. But let's also first say secure the border so we don't deal with this again, and then do what's right by way of folks who have come here and want their shot at the American Dream.

Mr. GARDNER. That, Mr. Speaker, is the story of America. And I thank our colleagues for joining us tonight and look forward to this debate and look forward to hearing from you, the people of this country, as we enter this important conversation.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical-mandated recovery.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly a enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2289. An act to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchinson Spousal IRA.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 12, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 251. To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes.

H.R. 254. To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

H.R. 588. To provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 17, 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:

2251. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Additional Qualifying Renewable Fuel Pathways under the Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Final Rule Approving Renewable Fuel Pathways for Giant Reed (Arundo Donax) and Napier Grass (Pennisetum Purpureum) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0542; FRL-9822-7] (RIN: 2060-AR85) received July 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2252. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2253. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's fiscal year

2012 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2254. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, transmitting the 2012 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2255. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fairport Harbor Mardi Gras, Lake Erie, Fairport, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0417] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2256. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Coronado Fourth of July Fireworks, Glorietta Bay; Coronado, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0301] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2257. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ad Club's 100th Anniversary Gala Fireworks Display, Boston Inner Harbor, Boston, MA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0256] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2258. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Fourth of July Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port Charleston Zone, SC [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0415] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2259. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a letter reporting the FY 2012 expenditures from the Pershing Hall Revolving Fund for projects, activities, and facilities that support the mission of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2260. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary and Deputy Secretary, Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, transmitting Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Joint Executive Council Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Report, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 8111(f); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

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. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1848. A bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2576. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–152 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2611. A bill to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building', and for other purposes (Rept. 113–153). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 568. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; with an amendment (Rept. 113–154). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1211. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), to provide for greater public access to information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2067. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a separate compensation and performance management system with respect to persons holding critical scientific, technical, or professional positions within the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury (Rept. 113–156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 300. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2668) to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2667) to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–157). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2576 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2689. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 2690. A bill to enhance the long-term profitability of the United States Postal Service through enhanced innovation, operational flexibility, workforce realignment, and regulatory relief; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 2691. A bill to amend certain appropriation Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2692. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take certain actions related to pesticides that may affect pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 2693. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report to Congress on security screening by the Transportation Security Administration of veterans and other passengers with amputations; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2694. A bill to promote strategic sourcing principles within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 2695. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to exempt from sequestration the public and Indian housing programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 2696. A bill to increase transparency of agencies by requiring a report describing any proposed conference; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2697. A bill to amend title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, in the case of airline pilots who are required by regulation to retire at age 60, to compute the actuarial value of monthly benefits in the form of a life annuity commencing at age 60; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2698. A bill to provide a short-term disability insurance program for Federal employees for disabilities that are not work-related, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2699. A bill to extend the hold harmless provisions of the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program pending reauthorization of the overall program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HALL, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 2700. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a process for waiver of requirements of that title where the requirement is asserted to otherwise result in a significant decrease in access to coverage or significant increase in premiums or other costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 2701. A bill to authorize further assistance to Israel for the Iron Dome anti-rocket defense system and authorization for cooperation on the David's Sling, Arrow, and Arrow 3 anti-missile defense systems; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2702. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding improving environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Res. 301. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2013 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H. Res. 302. A resolution expressing support for designation of August 23 as ''Black Ribbon Day'' to recognize the victims of Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 2689.

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

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2690.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution that empowers Congress to establish Post Offices and post Roads.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2691.

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

Article I, Section 8, Line 18; ''(Congress shall have the power) To make all laws''

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2692.

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

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2693.

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

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2694.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2695.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2696.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 2697.

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

Art. 1 sec. 8, clause 1 and 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2698.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2699.

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

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 2700.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2701.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2702.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 32: Mr. COLE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 96: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 176: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 268: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 292: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 301: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 310: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 366: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 449: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 474: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 503: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 508: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 535: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 556: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 599: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 636: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 641: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 647: Ms. WATERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 649: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 685: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 688: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 690: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 698: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 715: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 721: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 732: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 755: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 763: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 765: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 769: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 792: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 800: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 842: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 850: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 900: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 949: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 958: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 979: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 980: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 996: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1020: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1024: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1025: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1027: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1078: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1094: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1095: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1129: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1176: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1179: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1188: Mr. YOHO and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1250: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1254: Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 1284: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1311: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1318: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1334: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1414: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1416: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1428: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1463: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1464: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1488: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1493: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1518: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1582: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1598: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1630: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1634: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1638: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 1696: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1708: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1726: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1731: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1732: Mr. COOPER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1748: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1761: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1771: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1801: Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1818: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1825: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1827: Mr. POLIS and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1830: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1869: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 1870: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1900: Mr. HARPER, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1908: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1918: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1925: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1945: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 1961: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1962: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1979: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1981: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1985: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1991: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1998: Mr. HIMES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2000: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2009: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2016: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H. R. 2046: Mr. COBLE.
H. R. 2052: Mr. BARR, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. R. 2053: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H. R. 2068: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. WALDEN.
H. R. 2070: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. ENYART.
H. R. 2088: Mr. BARBER.
H. R. 2094: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. R. 2116: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. DINGELL.
H. R. 2122: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H. R. 2125: Mr. RADEL.
H. R. 2141: Mr. CLAY and Mr. PAYNE.
H. R. 2178: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. R. 2199: Mr. GARCIA.
H. R. 2247: Mr. KLINE and Mr. MARCHANT.
H. R. 2308: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. R. 2310: Mr. LATTA.
H. R. 2315: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. R. 2328: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. R. 2329: Mr. REICHERT.
H. R. 2338: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. R. 2385: Mrs. ROBY.
H. R. 2408: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H. R. 2412: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. R. 2429: MR. NUNNELEE, MR. ROKITA, MR. DIAZ-BALART, MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA, MR. BACHUS, MR. PAULSEN, MR. HOLDING, MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA, MRS. WALORSKI, MR. GOHMERT, MR. SALMON, AND MR. FORBES.
H. R. 2445: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STOCKMAN.
H. R. 2449: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H. R. 2458: Mr. LATTA.
H. R. 2463: Mr. COBLE.
H. R. 2476: Mr. COURTNEY.
H. R. 2485: Mr. BARBER.
H. R. 2506: Mr. COOPER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. GABBARD.
H. R. 2520: Ms. NORTON.
H. R. 2539: Mr. NADLER.
H. R. 2542: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H. R. 2557: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H. R. 2568: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2571: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 2575: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2580: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2585: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2590: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 2593: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2611: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 2615: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2632: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2633: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2643: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2646: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R.. 2652: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2663: Mr. TONKO and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 2667: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2668: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KLINE, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2675: Mr. ENYART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 2682: Mr. BARR and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2686: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. JORDAN.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. HARPER.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. NUNES.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. MENG, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Con. Res. 44: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 30: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H. Res. 75: Mr. COOPER.
H. Res. 109: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. DENT.
H. Res. 170: Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Res. 190: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H. Res. 208: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 227: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 231: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LANCE.
H. Res. 250: Mr. JORDAN.
H. Res. 285: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SABLAN.
H. Res. 293: Mr. COBLE and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

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:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2667, ''Authority for Mandate Delay Act,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2668, ''Fairness for American Families Act,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1962. Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 2319: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2359: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.